



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Swansea University E-Theses

The evolution of the role of the headteacher in Greek secondary schools from the beginnings of the modern Greek state to the present, with emphasis on recent years.

Bairaktaris, Panagiotis K

How to cite:

Bairaktaris, Panagiotis K (2002) *The evolution of the role of the headteacher in Greek secondary schools from the beginnings of the modern Greek state to the present, with emphasis on recent years..* thesis, Swansea University.
<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa42972>

Use policy:

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence: copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder. Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

Please link to the metadata record in the Swansea University repository, Cronfa (link given in the citation reference above.)

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

University of Wales Swansea

Department of Education

**THE EVOLUTION OF THE ROLE OF THE HEADTEACHER IN
GREEK SECONDARY SCHOOLS FROM THE BEGINNINGS OF
THE MODERN GREEK STATE TO THE PRESENT, WITH
EMPHASIS ON RECENT YEARS.**

Panagiotis K. Bairaktaris

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy.

March 2002



ProQuest Number: 10821362

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10821362

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Contents

Abstract

Preface

Introduction 1

Chapter I

The role of headteachers in schools founded by the new state following the War of Independence.

1.0 Introduction 8

1.1 The structure of Greek schools under Turkish occupation. 9

1.2 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1821-1856. 18

1.3 Greek Education during the period 1821-1856 25

1.3.1 1821-1827 Education during the War of Independence 25

1.3.2 1828-1831 Education during the years of John Kapodistrias 32

1.3.3 1832-1856 Education during the reign of King Otto 36

1.4 The influence of European Educational systems on the formation of the Greek Educational system. 42

Chapter II

The role of headteachers in secondary schools during the period 1857- 1928

2.1 Social, political and economic situation during the period 1857-1928. 48

2.1 Greek education during the period 1857-1928. 48

2.3 The role of headteachers in Greek secondary education during the period 1857-1928. 50

Chapter III

The role of headteachers in Greek secondary schools during the period 1929-1963

3.1 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1929-1963. 55

3.2 Greek education during the period 1929-1963. 56

3.3 The role of headteachers in Greek secondary education during the period 1929-1963. 57

Chapter IV

The role of headteachers in Greek secondary schools during the period 1964 up to the present day.

4.1 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1964 up to the present day. 60

4.2 Greek education during the period 1964 up to the present day. 61

4.3 The role of headteachers during the period 1964 up to the present day. 62

Chapter V

The Greek Administration

5.1 The Greek administrative system 65

5.2 The evolution of the Greek administrative system. 67

5.3 The present situation within the Greek Administration system 71

Chapter VI

Administration of the Greek educational system

6.1 Organization and administration of the Greek educational system. 80

6.2 The Administration of the Greek Ministry of Education 82

6.3 The Greek Educational system 83

6.4 The organisation and administration of secondary education in general 87

Chapter VII

The role of a head in Greek secondary education.

7.1 The role of a Head in secondary education in general 98

7.2 The role of a Head in Greek secondary education 109

Chapter VIII

The role of Headteachers in recent years.

8.1 The role of headteachers in Greek secondary education, during the period 1974-1999 with special reference to the years following Act 1566/1985. 122

8.2 Method of research	123
8.3 General information on Greek secondary education.	124
8.4 General information about interviewees	127
8.5 Time allocation	128
8.6 Head and students	130
8.7 Relations between Head and Deputy Head	131
8.8 Relations between Heads and teachers	135
8.8.1 Non-official personal relations between Head and teachers beyond those of the official kind	136
8.8.2 How Head resolve conflict among individuals and groups of teachers in their schools	137
8.8.3 Head giving guidance to teachers in their classroom	138
8.8.4 Ways of encouraging teachers to improve their performance, to enhance their morale and inspire them with enthusiasm of their job	138
8.8.5 Public expression of head's opinion concerning teachers and teacher appraisal	140
8.8.6 Checking teachers work in the classroom	142
8.8.7 The control of teachers	144
8.9 Managerial duties of a Head	146
8.10 Head and School Committee	148
8.11 Role of Head in planning	150
8.12 Heads and the Council of Teachers	154
8.13 Heads and superintendents	154
8.14 Heads and people outside the school	156
8.15 Heads and Parents	159
8.16 Head's opinion of his duties	161
8.17 Conclusions	170

Chapter IX

Additional study on Heads situation at present day

9.1 Initial studies and in-service training of Heads	176
9.2 The payment of Headteachers	183
9.3 Teachers' salaries	186
9.4 Female headteachers	191

Chapter X

Conclusions	202
Methodological appendix	211
Bibliography	223

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed(candidate)

Date 22-06-2002

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed(candidate)

Date 22-06-2002

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed(candidate)

Date 22-06-2002

Abbreviations

EEC European Economic Community.

ILO International Labour Organisation - the specialized agency which seeks the promotion of social justice and internationally recognised human and labour rights.

KATEE Institute for Technological Education in Greece.

LEA Local Education Authority.

OECD Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

List of tables

- Table 0 p.75 Number of Greek civil servants in 1992.
- Table 1 p.124 Number of secondary schools
- Table 2 p. 125 Number of students in secondary schools.
- Table 3 p. 125 Size of Greek secondary schools.
- Table 4 p. 126 Number of teachers in secondary schools.
- Table 5 p. 126 Ancillary personnel.
- Table 6 p. 129 Time allocation.
- Table 7 p. 156 Contacts of heads.
- Table 8 p. 184 Percentage of GNP spending on Education from 1955 until 1973.
- Table 9 p. 187-188 Teachers' salaries according to Act 1811 of 1951.
- Table 10 p. 192 Percentages of female teachers in secondary Education in Europe and Worldwide.
- Table 11 p.192 Percentages of female teachers in Greek secondary education.

Abstract.

Educational management is an underdeveloped field in Greece. Although there has been some effort made in the area of educational management in general, there have been no attempts at the study of school management. One possibly fruitful approach to the subject is the study of the role of headteachers within schools. This could aid in explaining many aspects of the situation in which Greek schools find themselves today, and also in introducing improvements into the secondary educational system. It is important to observe exactly how far and in what ways the historical evolution of Greek education has defined the roles of headteachers. An attempt at studying the roles of heads within the framework of Public Administration, the Administration of Education and, more precisely, the administration of secondary education, should give a full picture of the situation existing within the secondary school administrative system.

As for the differences in style and practice which have become discernible in recent years, these lead us to specific conclusions concerning the recent situation in secondary education in Greece. An additional study of the present day situation of Heads, such as the payment of heads, female headteachers etc., gives a more complete view of the roles of Heads and better describes how those roles have evolved. This field of study leads towards conclusions concerning improvements for the secondary school administrative system and introduces measures, which could be of use in the advancement of Greek secondary schools.

Preface

Research, in order to write a Ph.D. thesis, is an important adventure, a unique experience that needs both patience and determination. It is the exercise of mental forces and is well worth the effort. The lonely route of a researcher needs help motivation and understanding. I was assisted along this route by many who showed both patience and willingness in offering their time.

Motivation came from my experience as a teacher and as a Head. Motivation also came through the Ministry of Education, which gave me both the time and economic means with which to carry out this research.

Assistance was also given by Professor Roy Lowe, my supervisor at the University of Wales, Swansea, who gave me encouragement and genuine help throughout my research. I was able to avail myself of numerous libraries: the Education Library of the University of Wales, Swansea, the Education Library of the University of Athens, the Library of the Greek Parliament, the Gennadios Library in Athens and the Library of the Pedagogical Institute in Athens. I was further assisted by a colleague Dimitris Agelidis, a school Adviser, who arranged the interviews in Thrace. I am also indebted to the interviewees who took part in the interviews.

My wife, Chara, who showed great patience and gave me courage to continue and Konstantina, my daughter, were encouragement to me to complete the task. Thanks to all mentioned above and the many others have helped in various ways throughout the past four years, my thesis has come now to an end. It is by no means complete but I hope that it does add various new aspects for future progress within the Administration of Greek Secondary Education.

Introduction

There is controversy over the role of education and therefore schools in our ever-changing world. It is a fact that the role of the teachers within modern society is declining. Teachers are suffering from low morale, diminished self esteem and increasing stress. Organisation and management have become central subjects of discussion in all educational systems. The role of headteachers in leading schools is a crucial point in research on school management. It can be seen from two viewpoints. The first being that of the historical evolution of schools, which gives a better understanding of the present situation, and the other that of research of the present situation using data, statistics and questionnaires. Both viewpoints were used in this research. This led to an effort to explain how Greek schools developed to the present level as well as the evolution of the role of headteachers during the years from the initial efforts to establish Modern Greek State until the present day.

There are at least three main questions which this particular area of research needs to answer. The first is the question of how far and in what ways the historical evolution of Greek education has defined the role of Headteachers. There are various books on the history of Modern Greek education, all of which deal generally with education rather than focusing on the role of Headteachers and the evolution of school administration. It is obvious that the second question, concerning the evolution of the position of Head is of little interest in books dealing with the history of Greek education and in the limited research carried out in Greece in the field of the history of education or of school administration. As will be seen, Headteachers never played a main

productive role within the school system in planning and leading secondary education. Thus, the evolution of the position of Head was not so important to the powerful Greek Ministry of Education. All the above will be researched by tracing carefully the history of the modern Greek state, focusing mainly on sources providing material for detailed analysis of the evolution of Greek education and especially the evolution of secondary Head positions.

The third question concerns the differences in style and in practice discernible in recent years. This last question completes the view of Headteachers and helps in understanding the role of Heads within Greek secondary education today. This will be examined through a number of well-prepared interviews of Heads on the basis of structured set of questions.

At this point, two terms should be clearly defined, those of the leader and of the manager of a school. A leader is the Head of a school, who makes plans and policy for the school, introduces innovations, encourages teachers to experiment and convinces teachers and parents to follow his views. On the other hand, a manager is the Head of a school who feels responsible for applying the law, following the instructions of his superintendents, whose students produce good results and generally keeping the school within the limits of a well-run school.

This extensive research endeavours to discover what is happening with headteachers in Greek secondary schools today. It is an attempt to investigate various aspects of their activities, problems, restrictions and opportunities as they carry out their duties. Finally, conclusions and recommendations complete this research, in order to help to improve and develop the role of headteachers effectively.

Nine chapters constitute this thesis, a summary of which follows.

Chapter I.

This chapter details the role of headteachers in schools founded by the new state following the War of Independence.

It is an attempt at a description of social, economic and political conditions in existence during the period 1821-1856 in Greece. It starts from the period of the Turkish occupation, before the period under examination, and describes the structure of schools existing at that time. Efforts towards the organisation of education in the newly founded state are described. Further research into why the Ministry of Education is so strongly linked with religion and the Church and the efforts made towards the organisation of education follow. Finally, the influence of foreign educational systems on the formation of the Greek educational system is also examined.

Chapter II

In chapter II the social, political and economic situation of the Greek State during the period 1857-1928 is examined. Wars and political instability characterised this period. With two main reforms taking place during that period the one-dimensional structure of Greek education finally keeps ties with classical studies. The role of headteachers was unchanged during the period 1857-1928 and their power was somewhat strengthened.

Chapter III

Firstly, the social, political and economic situation of Greece during the period 1929-1963 is examined. During that period the infrastructure of the Greek State was established. A period of economic and political instability followed

until the Second World War and the subsequent civil war. A period of reorganisation of the country followed and stability characterised economic and political life.

The reform of 1929 changed mainly the external characteristics of the educational structure (organisation-administration) and to a lesser extent, the internal structure (curriculum-methods) and, as had happened with all previous reforms, was suspended following governmental change. The Second World War destroyed the Greek educational system and the civil war made things worse. There was no change in the responsibilities of Heads since the state paid attention only for the inspection and control of schools.

Chapter IV

The social, political and economic situation during the period after 1964 up to the present day is examined in this chapter. Governments covering the whole political spectrum were in power during this period as a progressive political party was followed by the dictatorship and after that Greece had a democracy and took its place among other developed European countries.

Educational reform in 1964 was the most complete and convincing proposal for modernisation of education as it attempted to link schools with society and the economy but unfortunately, following the change of government, was abrogated. The roles of Heads did not change as tenure was introduced and the authorities followed a law which had not been fully developed and completed.

Chapter V

This chapter includes a detailed examination of the administration in Greece with the intention on presenting a clear understanding of the framework within

which Greek education developed. Since the majority of Greek schools are state schools and teachers are civil servants, it is important to understand the role of a head, both as a civil servant and as a leader within the civil service, as in school, bounded and determined within a strictly centralised educational system.

A historical view of the Greek administrative system is made as well as the present situation within the Greek Administration System. Data on the civil service are presented and inherent problems discussed. Finally, the network of local authorities and its evolution are also examined.

Chapter VI

The organisation and administration of the Greek educational system are presented. More often than not, since the establishment of the Modern Greek State, the system of administration has been the main tool for the imposition of the ideology of the State, of power and authority and of the organisation of production and reproduction of the system.

The expansion of educational services created a complex service and the administration of the Greek educational system developed mainly empirically and secondly theoretically, facing great problems. A description of the Greek educational system and information concerning its function are given. Subsequently, the organisation and administration of Greek secondary education are examined. Various components of educational management systems of several European countries are also discussed.

Chapter VII

In this chapter the role of Heads in Greek Secondary Education is presented firstly in general, and secondly with special reference to Greek secondary

education. Furthermore, the origin of Heads as experienced teachers, or as managers recruited according to business and commercial criteria, is discussed. Key management features are exhibited. Differences of leadership and management are under examination too.

In Greece, Heads come from the educational sector without having any special training in management. This has an effect on school management. A description of the Greek legislation concerning school management, a study of Act 1566/85 in particular, which describes mainly the responsibilities of each authority within schools, follows. Finally, Deputy Heads' responsibilities and other components of school management responsibilities are described.

Chapter VIII

In this chapter an effort is made to overview the present situation of heads within secondary schools in Greece. The method of research is described and general information concerning Greek secondary education is given as well as information concerning interviewees.

The allocation of time by heads is researched extensively. Further points researched include relations between heads and students, between heads and deputy heads and finally between heads and teachers. Matters concerning:

- the managerial duties of a Head,
- the Head and the school committee,
- the role of a Head in planning,
- a Head and the Council of Teachers,
- a Head and superintendents,
- a Head and people outside school,

a Head and parents and head's opinion of his duties are also researched.

Finally, conclusions of the research complete chapter VIII.

Chapter IX

Teacher training in school management across Europe, especially in Greece, is examined in this chapter. A description of the various processes of appointing heads within Europe is also included.

The payment system of teachers and headteachers is viewed and commented upon, as well as teachers' salaries remain low worldwide and what the exact role of female headteachers is.

Conclusions

Conclusions of the research are presented and discussed with recommendations for the improvement of school management via the role of headteachers.

CHAPTER I

The role of headteachers in schools founded by the new state following the War of Independence.

1.0 Introduction.

In order to approach the subject of management in Greek secondary schools and more precisely, the role of headteachers, we need to start this study of Education a few hundred years ago. There are many reasons for doing so but we shall underline here the following three:

1. The period of Turkish occupation lasted about four hundred years (1453-1821). It is obvious that that period influenced Greek education very much. There are many elements of Greek education from that time which have remained unchanged in curricula, organization and customs within the Greek education which have their origins hundreds of years ago.
2. The formation of educational systems consists of a very slow process which is influenced by the social, political and economic conditions existing in a country. Moreover, the strong link between education and the public domain has, as a result, a great influence of public administration on the structure, administration and evolution of education.
3. During the first period of the establishment of the modern Greek state all the basic institutions of the country were founded. This is very true for education and many are of the opinion that the basic structure of education has been unchanged up to the present day. It is believed that the administration of schools has its origin at that time and the modus operandi of the administration of education has kept many elements as they were during the first two decades of the new state.

So, it seems meaningful to study the evolution of education and the environment in which it developed in order to form a clear picture of the circumstances under which the administration of education, especially the role of headteachers, was developed.

1.1 The structure of Greek schools under Turkish occupation.

The dawn of modern Greek civilization began around 1000 AD when the whole population of the Byzantine Empire spoke Greek and Greek literature was at its peak. During this period education became very important and all citizens wanted their children to go to school or to follow some form of education. So the school system that existed was well organized. Since the time of ancient Greece, education has been divided into two cycles¹; one being the elementary education and the other further education, that is secondary education and higher education. Most children followed elementary or basic education which started when children were about 5 to 7 years old and included elementary writing, music and gymnastics. There were no schools for elementary education but instead pupils went to private tutors to have lessons. The duration of elementary education was not always the same and lasted for approximately five years. After the first cycle of education, the more gifted children, usually boys, followed a second cycle, that of secondary education. This cycle started between 10 to 12 years of age and lasted for about three or four years. In this cycle the student was taught number theory, geometry, logic, philosophy, and rhetoric at a higher level and more thoroughly. This was usual in the education of the Byzantine Empire. Parents cared very much about the elementary education of their children. They were responsible for choosing the appropriate tutor and paying him in order to give lessons to their children. So, the state did not provide any primary education. Secondary education was run by private institutions and parents had to pay fees. For higher education there were two providers, the State and the Church and there were no fees for students². This was

generally the educational system in Byzantium times and it is very necessary to be familiar with this, as remained stable and this was the basis on which lay the foundations of “proper” education during the years of Turkish occupation³.

The Byzantine era is usually seen as ending in 1453 when Constantinople fell under the Turkish occupation; however, it was much earlier that the Byzantine Empire’s influence started to wane and civilization at that time was passing through a long period of decadence. A detailed account of the history of Greek education for the four centuries of Turkish occupation has not been published so far and the sources available are not always easily accessible. On the other hand, we do not need a detailed study for this period, as our interest lies mainly during the period of modern Greece following the war of independence. The main points of education during the period of Turkish occupation, were as follows.

Following the fall of Constantinople the following events took place:

- 1 The majority of teachers moved to the West where they became accepted by the scholars of the Renaissance, especially in Italy. So, as Zacharopoulos states, “the scholars who remained in the East or those who came back from the West some time after the fall of Constantinople, seem to have been very few, however enough to keep the education in an embryonic form, so little by little, as time passed, a series of scholars, led the Greek nation to the revival of letters of the 17th and 18th centuries and later to awakening and freedom.”⁴
- 2 The Orthodox Church and especially the Ecumenical Patriarchate is the only institution of the Byzantine regime which remained unattached following the Turkish occupation. As Vakalopoulos points out: “ An important milestone in the history of education during the Turkish occupation was the foundation of the Patriarchal School, which was later known as The Patriarchal Academy or The Great School of the

Nation, by the first patriarch after the Fall, Gennadius, in 1454. This school, which is the oldest educational establishment, still exists today and functions as a Greek high school.⁵This school has influenced modern Greek education in many ways. Managerial experience and tradition were transferred to the management of the schools of modern Greece.

As we observe, the only authority which was responsible for the general supervision of Greek schools during the period under examination was the Patriarchate. It was not an educational authority itself but it dealt with matters of education. The Turkish Empire and its sultan were not interested in the education of non Muslims at all so they transferred the authority of the education of Orthodox citizens to the Patriarchate, which sent sigils and synodical letters as directives for schools and was responsible for the following:

1. The foundation of schools and their financial support.
2. The appointment of teachers and persons responsible for the handling of school funds and the management of school property.
3. The syllabus, the working days, the holidays and the general organization of schools.

The Church was in fact in charge of the supervision and control of Greek education. This link between Church and Education has followed Greek Education, to some extent, up to the present day. The evolution of Greek schools progressed to a limited extent due to this strong dependence of Education on Church. Headteachers had, for many years, to be accepted by the Church and act according to the will of the ecclesiastical authorities. There were school boards to deal with the functions of certain schools. The members of these boards were elected by local people or chosen by these who had established the rules of each school. These local councils were

responsible for the management and inspection of schools⁶. Not every child had the opportunity to study in a school. There were no schools in the villages and some of the young children became literate at home while the majority of them did not learn reading and writing at all. Rich parents would pay a tutor to teach their children⁷. Schools were only in the cities, usually run by a priest or a monk and later on by the scholars. In these schools many pupils learnt the basics such as reading, writing and numeration. There were such schools in various areas of the enslaved Greek territory. The study of their history reveals, in effect, several managerial systems for schools due to the following reasons:⁸

1. The non existence of authorities responsible for the establishment of education.
2. The lack of legislation, as the sultans were not interested in the education of the non Muslim inhabitants of the country.
3. The way in which schools were founded, as there was not a single authority but a variety of persons or institutions who founded their own schools in their own way.

Thus, it is clear that the management of schools depended on who founded them or who funded them. The only teacher was the head of the school and he had to face, in his own way, all managerial problems. There were many flourishing Greek communities consisting of rich merchants and each of these ran their own schools. All these schools were directed by the community, or to be more precise by the committee which governed the community. One such school was, that of the Greek community of Venice. It was the Patriarch Ieremias II in 1593 who suggested to all orthodox metropolitan bishops that they should establish schools in their areas⁹. This was not the only reason for the development of Greek schools of the Ottoman Empire. Greeks took on a great part of the responsibility for commerce and shipping, especially in the 18th and 19th centuries, resulting in economic prosperity. Many schools

founded during that period functioned in all Greek areas and many Greek books were printed in Vienna, Venice and Budapest where large Greek communities existed with economical power during the 18th and 19th centuries. After the 18th century the Ecumenical Patriarchate took control of most schools and sending sigils accepted and approved their function. Two examples of such sigils are:

1. The sigil of Theodosius Archbishop of Constantinople¹⁰, which recognized the school of Demetsana ,a small village in the Peloponese.
2. The sigil of Kalinicus¹¹ which, in 1804, recognized the school of Vitina, a village close to Demetsana, established in 1780, and gave directions for its function.

The influence of both schools was great both before and after the war of independence. These two schools together with some others were models on which later schools were established and organized.

The responsibility for the management of schools was undertaken by the councils of local communities. These councils consisted of the rich people of the area where the school was. The members of these councils were representatives of the Church, especially when the school had the recognition of the Patriarchate. The members of the councils were elected by the Church and the elders but not by the people of the area. This management scheme continued long after the war of independence. The main duties of the council were:¹²

1. The handling of money.
2. The selection of scholars.

3. The appointment of teachers and assistant-teachers after the recommendation of the headteacher.
4. The maintenance of buildings.
5. The proper function of the library, if it existed.
6. Teacher appraisal and student assessment.
7. The fixing of school holidays.
8. The fixing of timetables and examinations in co-operation with teachers.
9. The proper function of the school in general.

This structure of school administration was followed by all Greek schools at a time when there were many primary schools run by Greek communities all over Europe. Secondary schools were fewer and were established in Ioannina, Chios, Athens, Thessaloniki, Smyrna, Kydonia, Andrianoupoli, Filipoupoli, Bucharest, Jassy (Iassio), Messologi, Agrafa, Demetsana, Trapezounta, Jerusalem, Alexandria, Cyprus, Crete, Zante, Cephalonia, Patmos and in many other places. There were also Greek schools in Bulgaria, Romania, Russia, Poland, Austria, Hungary, Italy, France, England, Holland, Germany, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal.

Secondary level schools had various names¹³ such as, Secondary, Gymnasium, Lyceum, Museum, Greek Museum (*ellinomoussio*), School, "Frontistirio", Academy and Upper School. Higher level schools existed under the names: The Great School of the Nation in Constantinople, Athonias Academy in mount Athos, The New Academy of Moschopolis, The Academy of Corfu, The 'Flaggiano Frontistirio" of the Greek community of Venice, in Bucharest, in Jassy and elsewhere. Usually schools had the name of their

founder, as for example the “School of Filanthropinon” and the “School of Stratigopoulos” in Ioannina ¹⁴and the “School of Deca” in Athens. Vakalopoulos¹⁵ states that:” in 1811 171 schools existed in the Greek area, 53 of which were on the mainland of Greece, 16 in Constantinople, 42 in Asia minor, 42 on the islands of the Aegean and 18 in Cyprus, and for these schools books published in Greek printing-houses of Paris, Livorno, Venice and Constantinople were in use.”

Most of the schools of that time had two teachers, one of whom was the headteacher, teaching philosophy, theology and mathematics in the upper part of school. The other teacher, called an assistant-teacher, would teach reading and writing of the Greek language. As student number increased, there were more assistant-teachers in each school. The headteacher had the determinant role in the organization and function of the school. His fundamental duties included:

1. The selection of teachers.
2. The internal organization of the school.
3. The definition of the syllabus.
4. The classification of students according to their knowledge.
5. Recommendations for scholarships.
6. The fixing of the timetable.
7. The fixing of examinations.
8. The control of the function of the school.

It should be mentioned here that there were certain cases in which one school had two headteachers, one responsible for the management and the other responsible for the organization and inspection of the teaching. This happened in the Greek schools of Brasov and Simbio in Transylvania. The same system also existed in the Greek school of the Serbian city of Zemun. The above three schools were not under the authority of the Patriarchate but under the influence of the Austrian educational system.

It can be seen that the management scheme of a school was generally set with only a few exceptions. To summarize the system of management of Greek schools under the Turkish occupation, mainly in the 18th and 19th centuries, we can observe that there basically were two ways of establishing a school. Firstly a founder or a group of founders could establish their own school. They decided the way the school should run and set the guidelines for its purpose and function. Usually founders were rich people, monks or scholars. They introduced the members of a school-board responsible for the function of the school as we saw earlier. These members were elders or priests of the area where the school was situated. The second way of establishing a school was through the Ecumenical Patriarchate, as we discussed. This way was not as usual as the first one. The Ecumenical Patriarchate established schools sending sigils and appointing special delegates to cope with the functioning of these schools. In both cases and when there was any special problem, the Patriarchate sent delegates to control these schools. This happened for a certain period or for a certain reason. All schools had a headteacher who, in cooperation with the school board and the delegates, governed them. In some special cases there was a school manager dealing only with the managerial aspects and a headteacher overlooking the teaching aspects. The last component of a school was teachers whose numbers depended on the size of the school but normally there were one or two, called assistant-teachers.

Although Greeks were under Turkish occupation and in many cases there was limited freedom in education, the love of studies was usually strong in the

Greek soul. Education was developed and several schools were preparing Greeks for the revival of the Greek nation. The Enlightenment and generally the progress of education in Europe affected enslaved Greeks. Some well qualified inspiring teachers established and ran schools and these Teachers of the Nation gave direction to the mainstream of Greek education at that time. These Teachers of the Nation were educated in Europe and helped Greek education to adopt the ideas of Enlightenment by writing books and teaching in schools. It was Regas Velestinlis who in his "Constitution of Greeks" (1797) introduced compulsory education for all Greeks¹⁶. In article 22 (human rights) Regas states: "All, without any exception, ought to learn reading and writing. The country must establish schools in every village for all male and female children. Prosperity comes from educated people, and it is necessary for all nations. Study should include the reading of historical authors, and in large cities, the learning of Italian and French as well as Greek." Another Teacher of the Nation and founder of the Greek Enlightenment whose influence on Greek education was strong was Adamandios Coray. He was born in Smyrna of Chiot parents in 1748 educated in Holland and France and lived in Paris to the end of his days in 1833. As J. Gennadius¹⁷ underlines "The strength he lacked in body was entered in the fiery soul which poured forth those appeals, irresistible in eloquence and persuasive in logic, dictating civic duty, counseling healthier modes of education, and laying down the principles of a purer style in language". What Coray did from a distance and by pen, George Gennadius accomplished at close quarters carrying on a war against the tyrant by word and deed. Coming from ancient Epirot stock, he studied in Germany and had a great career in Odessa. Later he came to Greece and was one of the outstanding teachers of that time, having a great influence on Greek education for a long time. There were many other teachers who helped the revival of Greek education, which led the nation to freedom. Therefore, the struggle for freedom was prepared not by politicians but by the great Teachers of the Nation.¹⁸

The Turkish Empire did not follow the progress, which was happening at that time in education, economy and social life in most European countries. The people of Turkey were mainly a warlike people who left the main functions of the state to people who lived under their occupation. Greeks played a great role in commerce and shipping and had close contact with Europe and Russia which was at that time rich and played a main role in the political, social and economic scene. A lot of Greeks had, in the 18th century, considerable roles in the Ottoman Empire, in Russia and in principalities on the Danube. Such examples were many and we should mention here that the Minister of foreign affairs of Russia was John Kapodistrias, later to become governor of Greece, and the adjutant of the Czar was Alexandros Ipsilantis who became a hero in the war of independence. All the above show the progress of the Greek people at that time. The level of education, although considerable for the beginning of the Modern Greek State, was far behind that of Europe.

1.2 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1821-1856.

The study of the social, political and economic situation of the country is necessary, as it forms the frame in which education developed. The existence of schools, their structure and the curricula were strictly linked with society. The period between 1821 and 1856 was crucial for the Greek State because during that period the majority of activities of a well-organized country were founded. It was the period that gave the Modern Greek State its identity and Education took its initial form, which was the basis for development during the whole period up to the present day. Consequently, we shall study the frame in which the independent Greek State developed, looking closely at the political, social and economic life of that period, since cultural, social and economic progress of a nation is strongly related to the education of the people¹⁹. The enslaved Greek nation always hoped that help would come from foreign countries, especially from Russia which was an Orthodox country and where

many Greeks lived making careers in governmental posts or working efficiently in commerce. The expected help did not materialize and in 1821 Greeks organized a revolution which took place in Moldavia (22 September 1821), but which failed. On 25 March 1821 the revolution in the Peloponese started which, after a period of ten years of war, led to the foundation of the Modern Greek State. There were a number of successful rebellions at the same time in mainland Greece, Thessaly and Epirus and unsuccessful attempts in Macedonia and Crete (the latter having been led to failure in June 1821 due to lack of social organization). Moreover, many islands of the Aegean Sea which had large merchant fleets adapted their ships to become warships, helping the war at sea to be successful for Greeks and so contributing to the war of Independence.

At that time Europe had just survived the napoleonic wars and a revolution could have changed the stability enforced by the Holy Alliance. So none of the European governments viewed the Greek problem with much sympathy. However, the people of the European countries had a different opinion from that of their governments. European people marveled at the ancient Greeks and their civilization and the study of classical Greek literature such as the printing of books of modern Greek literature, propagated the friendship and encouraged the help of philhellenes from all over Europe and the United States of America. This movement led to a change of attitudes in Germany when king Louis I came to power in 1825, and the change of foreign policy of England against the Greek revolution in 1823 when George Canning came to power as minister of foreign affairs. All the above delayed the development of Greek Education, as it was earlier during the Turkish occupation, and created a gap in development between that time and the first period of the new Greek State.

The Greek Revolution was a great movement towards progress with moral radiance all over Southeastern Europe and the Near East. Greeks, influenced by modern European ideas, formed the first army in the Balkans which included many officers philhellenes and Greeks educated in Europe. The

need of revolutionary Greeks for organization, in order to face the economical problems and to show that they were an entity to the other countries led them to meet in the monastery of Kaltetze on May 1821. At that meeting representatives from all the areas which had taken up arms gathered and the result of their meeting was the first constitution of Greece, which was formed according to the United States declaration of independence. Unfortunately, immediately after the national assembly of Kaltetze a disagreement broke out between the military and politicians which caused trouble to the new State. As a result of this situation the second national assembly, which took place in Astros at 1823, decided to abolish the local political authorities and encourage the idea of centralized administration. This fact had severe effects on the organization of the state and the result was the strictly centralized administration of Education. Finally, civil war took place in 1824, which created huge problems for the new country some of which, such as the disagreement between the military and politicians, were to remain for a long time.

The first strong and stable Greek government was that of 1825. Having 240000 pounds as a loan, the government spent money on the organization of the country. Receiving loans from Europe, Greece became linked to European capitalism.²⁰ At that time three political parties were formed, one under the influence of England, one of France and one of Russia. It should be mentioned here that these three political parties did not have any special ideology. Their only duty was to support the foreign policy of the country which they represented. It is certain that each of the above countries had its own person in the viceroyalty congress²¹, which governed Greece between 1833-1835, as we shall see later. It is obvious that the influence of large European countries, especially in the foreign policy of Greece, was strong. The Great Powers of that time were England, France and Russia. The result of their rivalry was that on 6th July 1827 the treaty for the independence of Greece was signed in London. The Great Powers were led to that treaty "for humanistic reasons and for their interest in European peace."²² That treaty included provisions for the religious, political and commercial freedom of

Greeks.²³This meant that education was growing in an environment which was caught between freedom and foreign influence. So the selection of goals, methods and administration was made by the Greek authorities under external pressure, as we shall discuss later.

The third national assembly which took place in Trizina on 14 July 1827, elected John Kapodistrias as Governor of Greece for seven years. The new constitution, hoping to eliminate the results of the civil war, introduced even more centralized organization of the country. In January 1828, Kapodistrias came to Nafplio, the capital of Greece, which at that time was just a village.²⁴In the meantime, Turkey, which had refused to accept the London treaty, after an initiative of England, signed a protocol on 3 February 1830 which finally gave independence to Greece. The borders were defined as the line between Volos and Arta, in central Greece. Greece spent 100 years of war to give freedom to all areas which had taken part in the revolution of 1821. Kapodistrias started from a zero level of organization of the State and founded modern Greece. He divided the area of Greece into seven counties, the mainland and six counties within the islands. In each county there was a governor who was given this position by Kapodistrias himself.²⁵ There was no Justice and the elders or the clergymen were judges.²⁶

Although there was an effort towards organization of the state, the social, political and economic situation was not suitable for the progress of education. As Vakalopoulos states "The view of tiny Greece was desperate: ruins, poverty, and epidemics." He continues "Generally all agricultural land suffered huge devastation: fruit-bearing trees disappeared and whole forests were burned." Life started from zero for most Greeks. The economic situation was bad and abject poverty was the rule²⁷. Another loan of 240000 pounds was spent on salaries for civil servants and for the army. After the independence of the Greek State, everybody expected to acquire a piece of land. The government did not give land to the people and there was divergence of opinion between the military and the people. So each sector was hoping for the distribution of land.²⁸A new loan of sixty million francs was accepted, as it

was impossible for the Greeks to live without any help from abroad. The new rising middle class was not satisfied with the government because they did not have the help that they have been expecting.²⁹ The assassination of Kapodistrias, on 27 September 1831, was a national calamity followed by a period of two years of anarchy. The economic disaster was obvious all over the country. This situation becomes very clear in the words of Nikolaos Dragoumis³⁰ who describes the awful state of the country after the death of John Kapodistrias as: “ ... a maze of passion, disputes, mutinies, revenge, civil wars, illegal governments, illegal assemblies, foreign interventions,...”.

The Great Powers decided, on 7 May 1832, that Greece should be an independent hereditary kingdom, with the first king being Otto, the second-born son of Louis I King of Bavaria. The fourth national assembly in Argos accepted the above decision and King Otto came to Greece at the end of January 1832. He was underage and a committee took over the viceroyalty. The power of the government of the country was under the control of foreigners and Greek ministers, who each had the title of the “Secretary of the State”, and who were, in fact, civil servants, under the administration of Bavarians.³¹ The first thing they cared about was the organization of the army and the internal structure of the country. The organization of the country that was introduced was a mixture of the system which existed in Bavaria and of the French centralized system of 1790. This organization has remained unchanged till now. The country was divided into ten prefectures (counties). Each county included regions, the total number of which was forty-seven. Municipalities were the third component of the administrative structure of Greece at that time and were partly independent from the central government.³² This structure had a great effect on the structure of Education which followed hierarchical system, having the power concentrated at the top of the hierarchy.

Greek society at that time was mainly agricultural and could be characterized as primitive. The economy was limited to domestic areas and family income was near to zero. There was a very underdeveloped handicraft industry and

no industry at all. As Svoronos points out "the organization of the economy was absolutely disappointing. The tax system was exactly the same as it has been during the Turkish rule. The ministry of Finance, under the control of viceroyalty, did not bring any sense of order and the country lived in continuous failure during the reign of Otto."³³ On the other hand, Vournas concludes that "the agricultural economy of the country remained within stifling old frames, abandoned to the mercy of money-lenders and robbers. The lack of roads is a problem for the transportation of goods and half of the productive land remains uncultivated."³⁴

A loan of 60.000.000 francs was spent on the expenses of the administration of the viceroyalty, on the Bavarian army and on the interest of the installment for paying off the debt.³⁵ On the first June 1835 King Otto took power. The capital of Greece moved from Nafplio to Athens, which had a population of 5000 at that time³⁶. Many people came to the capital from all parts of Greece shaping those who took the social power surrounding the government and who needed better education for their children. This led to a concerted effort towards better education for the people of Athens. Armasperg, a friend of England, became Prime Minister. The main characteristic of politics of that period was continuous intervention from England, France, Russia, Austria and Germany who strongly influenced Greek political life. The balance of all these powers resulted in Greece not becoming a colony but not being independent either. In September 1843, King Otto, responding to the peoples demand, created a new constitution. A National assembly, which started on January 1844, produced a new constitution for the country. The goal of the Great Powers was to keep equality, freedom and fraternity only at a theoretical level. Their problem was how to "pass" constitutional regulations so as to restrict the real power of the people.³⁷ On March 1844, constitutional monarchy was established with the help of France and England which gave more power to King Otto and no power at all to the people.³⁸ The goal of this English-French cooperation was to keep Russia away from Greece. A period of trouble lasted until 1856.

During that period in the history of modern Greece, the middle class failed to take power. A small minority which had been in power under the Turkish Rule continued to govern the Country under the patronage of the Great Powers. All the governments of Greece, at that time, were under the control of aristocratic and oligarchic sections of Greek society.³⁹ Agricultural workers were not taken into account, as a political entity, in the formation of the new State.⁴⁰ We should mention here that 85% of the Greek population at that time were villagers and only 15% were urban or semi-urban dwellers (urban dwellers numbering more than 5000, semi-urban 2000-5000)⁴¹. Nafplio, the first capital of Greece had, in 1853, 3500 inhabitants. Areas which, in 1830, made the independent kingdom of Greece did not include any of the urban centres, which developed during the Turkish rule and where a cultural revival began during the 18th century. The percentage of illiterate people stood at 90.95% in 1828-30 and in 1840 87,5%.⁴² Two main characteristics of the Education system were free education for all and the single-dimension education. In saying single-dimension education we mean the only way, that of classical studies, in all schools. It was difficult for children to continue their studies after primary school, not only because the expenses were too high but also because the family needed children to contribute their labour. Finally, although the difficulties were great, the number of students at that period was high.⁴³ The standard of living and the cultural level, especially that of agricultural people who were in the majority, did not improve during that period, mainly during the two first decades of the period examined.⁴⁴ People had a very poor diet. Villagers had to borrow money with an interest of 40% per year and many citizens needed help with the translation of official documents to understand the formal language, because they only knew the colloquial form.

Under these circumstances the effort for assimilation into Europe, the European ideology was diffused hastily and mechanistically and a conflict between the liberal European ideology and the populist eastern ideology lasted during the period under examination but relaxed easily.⁴⁵

Summarizing the main points discussed previously in this paragraph, the following should be denoted:

1. The concentration of all services and their control by John Kapodistrias firstly and by the King Otto later, was characteristic of this period.
2. The intervention of the King and the three protector powers, in the political life of the country was a common occurrence, resulting in instability in its governing.
3. Loans coming from abroad were spent in non-productive investments, resulting in a sizeable deficit for the Greek economy.
4. The agricultural population, which was always in the majority, lived under dire financial and cultural circumstances.

All this contributed to the frame in which Greek Education matured and put restrictions within the educational system of the Modern Greek State. In the following paragraph we shall study, in detail, how the Greek Educational system developed and what the results were of this process during the period 1821-1856.

1.3 Greek Education during the period 1821- 1856

1.3.1 1821-1827 Education during the war of independence.

As we saw earlier, during the period of Turkish occupation, a basic structure within the Greek Education existed. This structure was formed under the influence of the Patriarchate. That structure did not form a stable educational system and so we cannot speak about an organized school administration at that period. We saw earlier that there were many cases of independent efforts to organize schools but there was not an educational authority to coordinate them. This was the heritage of Education for the New Greek State at the beginning of the War of Independence. For the first period, 1821-1827, not being a formal State with a stable government but with some free areas and

local governments attempting to organize an army, little effort was made to establish schools. Schools which existed under the Turkish occupation were either closed or completely destroyed⁴⁶. Dimaras⁴⁷ argues that we cannot speak about an educational system during the War of Independence. Additionally, M. Soutzos, minister of Education, was quoted in 1828 as stating to J. Kapodistrias, the first governor of Greece, that: "referring to education I have nothing to say. We have no schools."⁴⁸ The organization of the state of Modern Greece starts typically with the stable government of 1828. The reality of education at that time is described by George Gennadius⁴⁹. He stated that: "We find that in 1828, while the war was raging, no fewer than twenty-two primary schools were established and supported by various communes in mainland Greece and on the islands." It should be said that the population of the free part of Greece at that time was about 753000⁵⁰.

It is important to study the efforts made during the first steps of the organization of education. That period is characterized as a period of great expectations for education. There are documents showing the great concern of the people of free Greek areas for education at that time. Although Dimaras says, that: "It is not so important for a historian if many or few schools functioned here and there. The important thing is to identify those powers which generated or opposed the establishment of schools, which gave them this or that form, this or that content."⁵¹ The record of the appearance of interest in education is also important in order to form a clear picture of the education of that period. This study could be made through investigation of some of the documents of that time. Two early activities referred to education at the beginning of the war of independence. The first was the "Law of Eastern Continental Greece"⁵². Article 24 of that law states that, Aeropagus (the local assembly which took place on 15 November 1821 at Salona) should give priority to the care of schools. A similar event happened in Crete, where the care for popular education led the local authorities setting out guide-lines for better organization of schools⁵³ although there was no provision for the organization of the state at that time.

The Peloponnese was the greatest "free" area directly after the War of Independence. Its government had only three ministries and the Ministry of the Interior was responsible for Education, and expressed its great interest in establishing new schools and support of the old⁵⁴. The Peloponnesian Senate appointed the archimandrite Gregorios Dikeos as an inspector of Education⁵⁵ and expressed its desire to establish a school in Tripolis, for the teaching of Greek, mathematics, Italian and French. There were no fees for study at this school, and the only expenses for the students were their food and books. A newspaper of that time, Morning Messenger⁵⁶ announced the establishment of this school and encouraged all young people to study there. The study of documents shows that temporary governments, while coping with some crucial aspects of education, at the same time were exhausted by various trivial demands. The assembly which took place in Astros, decided⁵⁷ on the introduction of a mutual method of tuition in all Greek schools⁵⁸. The appointment of Theoklitos Farmakidis as an inspector of Education⁵⁹ is of great importance as this helped cement the priority that the government was giving to the education of the people. Unfortunately, he neglected his duties although he had every possible help. It should be underlined here that the authorities had to cope with trivial affairs of education on a regular basis. For example the Ministry of Religion was called to solve the conflict among people of a small village concerning a local school⁶⁰ or to face the protest of a monastery in Argos over a watermill which had been given to a school⁶¹. It should be mentioned here that the Ministry of Religion was dealing with educational problems together with the Ministry of the Interior. Finally, the former took exclusive responsibility for education until the establishment of the Ministry of Education. This fact led to a strong link between education and religion which has lasted up to the present day.

The financial support of schools was typical problem for the authorities. There was no money at all in the public purse of the temporary government and the only sources available were donations from local people and voluntary or compulsory donations from monasteries, which had money and property at that time. There are many documents proving the priority of education given by the revolutionary Greeks. In such documents we see that Tripolis had

requested money to establish a school⁶² and the Senate had given money in 1823 for this purpose⁶³ although the war in that area had not ceased. As we have seen the structure of Education in this very small, new and semi-organized country was totally centralized. The result of this was that the provision of books for a local school became the responsibility of the central government⁶⁴ and a teacher would apply to the central authority for the payment of his salary⁶⁵. The government decided, on 9 July 1824, that "... in Mikromani there is a monastery with plentiful funds, being misspent by a monk ... This income is enough to feed a teacher, and the monastery could be used as a school."⁶⁶ On 15 July 1824, the establishment of this school was announced.⁶⁷ These are some examples of the trivial affairs which the government had to face and portray a totally centralized system holding all the power and responsibility.

There were only a few cases where the Government decided about important matters of education which were of general interest. A manuscript in the Library of Parliament⁶⁸ reports the formation of a five-member committee, presided over by the teacher of the Nation Anthimos Gazis, responsible for making a plan for the organization of education. This plan introduced⁶⁹ for first time a syllabus in Greek schools and suggested the introduction of technical subjects. It also defined the two levels of education as follows:

- Primary A class schools (in villages)
- B class schools (in cities and towns)

- Secondary Greek Schools
- Lyceum

This was the first plan of organization of education and was accepted by the government.⁷⁰ At that time Gregorios Konstantas was appointed as the head of the school of Argos and John Varvakis donated a huge amount of money⁷¹ towards the establishment of this school which, unfortunately, never actually came into being. Later in Athensⁱ a new state school was opened⁷² in the same building as the old school of Deca which has been in acme for many

ⁱ Athens at that time, was a small village in decay with a population of less than 5000.

decades during the Turkish occupation. For the appointment of a teacher for this school there was an announcement⁷³ and the importance of this announcement was that the qualifications of the teacher should be proved through a letter of recommendation, as there were not certificates at that time. The appointment of a teacher was the duty of the local authorities but it was on the approval of the government,⁷⁴ which was usually responsible for examining the qualifications of the applicant and their suitability⁷⁵ for the position. As already seen, there was a lack of revenues and the "government" tried to face various urgent problems requesting money from the monasteries. In the "Greek Chronicles" of 2nd October 1824⁷⁶ we see that all the schools of Athens could not function due to lack of finances and the "government" ordered the four wealthy monasteries of the area to pay the amount of 5000 piastresⁱ annually for the salary of three teachers. At the same time the "government" allotted mosques for schools and for the public library⁷⁷. On the other hand private efforts were made towards the organization of schools, as for example the reorganization of "*filomoussos eteria*" (the company of the lovers of culture) who called on the people of Athens to help⁷⁸ its effort towards the establishment of a new school. Many old schools which were at their acme during the period of Turkish occupation fell into decay and the local authorities requested help from the provisional government in order to keep them operational. The people of Demetsana asked, for example, for the help of the Minister of Religion to allow the school to continue functioning⁷⁹ and the Ministry responded immediately.⁸⁰ The authorities never forgot the historical schools giving them property⁸¹ and resources,⁸² when available. This happened with most of the old schools. Two other examples are, the school of Vtina⁸³ and the school of the island of Naxos⁸⁴. The State had to provide for the payment of teachers⁸⁵, the building of schools,⁸⁶ the appointment of committees dealing with the financing and control of each school.⁸⁷ The appointment of committees was not always done under favorable circumstances, as many people tried to illegally take over the school property⁸⁸

ⁱ pastres is an old Turkish currency.

A very important event took place on 25th July 1824⁸⁹ concerning the education of that time. This was the appointment of Gregorios Konstantas as Inspector of Education⁹⁰. Konstantas was one of the Teachers of the Nation highly qualified in Western Europe and having long experience in teaching in several Greek schools. He started working towards the organization of Education immediately and asked for guidance and help from the government, for the betterment of his effort. Parliament gave him some general instructions⁹¹ about what to do and how to do it and the Executive body ordered the Ministry of the Interior to give him every help visiting most of the schools of the country.⁹² The Ministry of the Interior reacted immediately,⁹³ sending directives to all local authorities, to accept him and help him in his duties. It is worth emphasizing the duties of the Inspector of Education Gr. Konstantas⁹⁴ as they give an image of efforts made towards organization of the administration of schools. These duties included:

1. The visiting of schools.
2. The recording of schools.
3. The supervision of teaching methods.
4. The appointment of honest and efficient teachers.
5. The improvement of schools.
6. The control of school financing.
7. The collection of reports of teachers, referred to their schools.
8. The supply of books.
9. The collection of antiquities by teachers (there was not at that time an archaeological service).
10. The introduction of syllabi and teaching methods for each subject.

Konstantas worked extremely hard under unfavorable circumstances and traveled the country, and sometimes abroad where there were Greek schools. That was the only joint effort for a well-organized educational system during that period but due to the war, there was not much success. We should mention here that many reports from teachers, which were sent to G. Konstantas, give information about the organization of schools at that time.

At the same time the effort to re-establish some schools was continued. Such an effort towards reorganizing a school in Tripolis⁹⁵ failed not due to lack of interest but because of lack of money. Many efforts were made towards the organization of Education in Athens, where there was finally a boost in education. There were at least three schools put in operation⁹⁶ and there was an effort towards coordination of all schools under the authority of George Gennadius.⁹⁷ An important aspect of education at that time was the foundation of a school for girls in Athens, whose administration was organized using as a model the organization of the Greek government.⁹⁸ It was the first time in which there was enough care taken over the administration of schools. On this matter there is a reference in "The Newspaper of Athens", (no 20, 1st February 1826,p.81), saying that the way of administration of schools in Athens, was the same as that of the schools in the Ionian islands, which were under English occupation.⁹⁹ This means that an English oriented organizational scheme was introduced into the education of the new state but unfortunately was not generally accepted. We should mention here that a public printing-house started working, in order to print books for all the schools.¹⁰⁰ Everybody at that time was hoping for national education for all and a national curriculum was one of the components in achieving this.

The number of schools functioning during that period is not so important. We have mentioned that the crucial point is to find the powers that caused or obstructed the establishment of new schools, who gave them this or that form, this or that content. As Dimaras states: "the period 1821-27 is possibly the only one in our later history during which there was identification of popular hopes and a state policy in educational matters."¹⁰¹ The administration of schools was at a primitive level and there was no clear distinction between primary and secondary education. The success or decline of a school was identified by the role played by the headteacher. The selection of each headteacher was a decision of the central government although, in fact the headteacher would have the acceptance of the local people.

During this period there were three characteristics in education, which are summarized here:

1. Although the government had no money to spend, education was free for all citizens. Students did not have to pay fees at all.
2. The administration of education was strictly centralized. There was the opinion that education was good for all and the central authority should care for the education of the people. On the other hand the central authority was the only authority which was able to face the problem of lack of good teachers and educational means, calling Greek teachers from Europe and collecting money to buy books and equipment for schools.
3. The Ministry of Religion was responsible for education during the years at the beginning of that period. It is clear that religion was strictly linked at that time with education, mainly through language, because these were the two components that the Greek nation followed during the four centuries of enslavement. Later the Ministry of Education was to become responsible for Religion. This link remains unchanged up to the present day.

These were the characteristics of that period which formed a basis for the education that followed. As we shall see in the next paragraph, the state started organizing education to a greater extent although some problems remained unchanged.

1.3.2 1828-1831 Education during the years of John Kapodistrias.

John Kapodistrias, the first governor of Greece, came to Aegina on 11th January 1828. Aegina, a small island in the Saronic golf, very close to Nafplio and Attica was the temporary capital of Greece. This happened due to the needs of the war. As seen earlier during the struggle, education was not totally organized, although some schools functioned independently. Efforts of temporary governments were not fully integrated¹⁰². Some days after Kapodistrias arrival, M. Soutzos the Secretary of Education, underlined that although there had been many efforts to improve education, results were very

poor.¹⁰³ Although there had been great difficulties in organizing of the state, Kapodistrias included education within the most important aspects of his policy. There was no time to cope with an integrated plan for education but governors' interest in education was expressed continuously, encouraging an interest in the establishment of new schools. The first official speech of Kapodistrias was that of 11th July 1829, when he introduced to the fourth National assembly, in Argos, his ideas about the organization of primary and secondary education¹⁰⁴. He said that there should be two levels of activity: the first one being the establishment of schools all over the country and the second one the organization of the ministry of Education. In establishing schools priority was given to primary schools, mainly schools to which the Lancasterian method of tuition was introduced. Secondary education was an issue under examination at that time and there was a general plan for the foundation of one secondary school in each area, where the most gifted children could continue their studies after completing primary school.¹⁰⁵ After the close of the fourth National Assembly, on 3rd October 1829, Kapodistrias announced the reestablishment of "Secretary for Church affairs and for Public Education". Up to then, everybody dealing with education had had to contact the governor personally.

After reestablishment of the ministry of Education, various plans were put in action¹⁰⁶. There were plans for economic support of education, the establishment of military and religious schools, for naval and many other schools of special interest. A first step was the foundation of a fund dealing exclusively with educational needs¹⁰⁷. Kapodistrias shared the responsibility of education with Nikolaos Chrysogelos, who was the first minister of Education and Andreas Moustoxidis, who came from Europe to help the governor in the administration of education. Both were highly educated and they had the same ideas and plans about the education of Greeks as Kapodistrias. The Ministry of Education tried to collect information about the situation from all over the country. They tried to see exactly how many schools existed, what were the opportunities to collect money for education and what could be the sources of economic help. Another concern of the government was the

establishment of a unique method of tuition for all schools and a national syllabus, starting with the printing of books for all students. The latter was a problem that involved time and effort.

Moustoxidis was the right person to undertake the co-ordination of education and after coming to Greece, in October 1829, a boost in all educational matters was registered. Moustoxidis undertook many responsibilities¹⁰⁸ because of his expertise and due to the lack of highly educated people in Greece at that time. One of his main responsibilities was the organization and running of an orphans' home in Aegina¹⁰⁹, whose children were students of schools which had been founded there. Organization of these schools was a model for the organization of all other schools in Greece at that time.

Another activity of Kapodistrias was the establishment of the Institution of Supervision and Control of Schools. For this reason ephors were appointed who were members of the school board. This institution existed, as we have seen, before Kapodistrias' time and during the Turkish rule¹¹⁰. School boards coped mainly with administration of schools and particularly with financial support. Each school board had three to five members who were appointed by the government after the recommendation of local governors. During 1830 the government decided on the duties of school boards which, except of the management of the school, were, in coordination with the teacher, syllabus, examinations etc¹¹¹. Thus the involvement of school boards in the whole process of education was essential. Due to the lack of highly educated people to form school boards, the government tried to find persons to fit this office. So the need of school inspectors was introduced, the first of whom was John Kokonis who was responsible for the general functioning of schools in the Peloponese¹¹².

Another important step for the organization of education was the establishment of the "Education committee"¹¹³ which was responsible for all the problems of education and cooperated with Moustoxidis to introduce a plan for administration of schools. The formation of the committee brought

hope for the formation of uniform schools all over the country, having a national curriculum and unique teaching methods. The committee dealt, unfortunately with various problems that took a long time and spent much effort solving only secondary problems of administration. Finally a legislative decree, the result of the committee's work, determined the basic principles of the running of schools.

After the organization of primary schools, Kapodistrias started working on the establishment of secondary schools¹¹⁴ which were called model or typical or Greek schools. The fulfillment of the plan was announced at the fourth National Assembly. Studies in these schools lasted three years and their school leavers could either continue in higher education or teach in primary schools. Each of those schools had at least three teachers, the headteacher and two assistant teachers. There was a plan to establish such schools in all towns and on all islands. Higher schools were the Central, Ecclesiastical and Military schools, where students were accepted after entry examinations. Age of entry for primary education was seven and for school leavers from the Central school sixteen¹¹⁵. In 1831 Michael Schinas, a scholar of that time, introduced a plan for "Greek schools" which was the first complete plan for secondary education¹¹⁶. This plan was characterized as being unsuccessful and failed.

The intention of the Governor was the establishment of Model or Greek schools¹¹⁷. The first model school begun functioning in Aegina during 1829. Its students were selected graduates of other schools and after their graduation they could work as teachers in primary schools. Lessons at this school were of a high level and it was difficult for students to succeed. On the other hand, the Central school begun functioning on 1st November 1829. Its purpose was to prepare teachers to teach in model schools¹¹⁸. Studies in the Central school lasted three years. In April 1830 it had 210 students. The Ephor of the Central school was Moustoxidis as he was the ephor of all schools on Aegina. G. Gennadius and J. Ventilos who were teachers of the Central school were the interchanging heads of the school. They

interchanged roles every three months in the management of the school and were responsible for the functioning of the school¹¹⁹.

On 12th February 1831 Kapodistrias signed a common rule for both schools, the Model and the Central, whose first four articles dealt with the duties of the ephor and head of both schools¹²⁰. The ephor had the management of schools, was responsible for entrance examinations, for inspecting teachers and students and executing the governments orders. The ephor used to visit every teacher in his class once per month, without any notice and was responsible for the curriculum and was also president of the examining board and of teachers' meetings.

The period when Kapodistrias governed Greece could be seen as the beginning of organization of Greek education. During that period efforts towards the organization of the administration of education and management of schools could be observed. There were no educational structures according to modern terms but it is obvious how they started. It is important to see how the educational politics of Kapodistrias influenced Greek education in the years after his government. In the following paragraph, the administration of education and the management of schools during the years of King Otto will be studied.

1.3.3 1832-1856 Education during the reign of King Otto.

During the period under examination two main facts took place. The first one was the formation of a Committee for Education in 1833 and the second one was the presidential decree of 31st December 1836 dealing with secondary education. The decree of 22nd March 1833 ordered the formation of a committee whose members were "experts" on education and were responsible for the introduction of certain measures concerning the organization of education. Unfortunately, instead of the study of circumstances that existed in Greek society and factors which limited the potential of education at that time, they transplanted a ready-made

educational structure, that of Bavaria¹²¹. As Lefas states: "It is as if we received a piece of a building and put it clumsily on the pieces of another building and so we constructed our educational system, which tortured the Greek people for a hundred years"¹²². A law concerning primary education followed (the law of February 1834), which was reluctantly accepted by the people.

The decree of 31st of December 1836 dealt with "the rules of Greek Schools and high schools" and was the basis for secondary education for about a hundred years. Thus the structure of education developed as follows: A four-year primary period, a three-year Greek school period and a four-year high school period. Compulsory education was seven years but this rule was not always adhered to.

For the legislation of education during that period the following comments could be made:

1. It was not based on the Greek experience and situation but was an exact imitation of the correspondent legislation of France and Germany, which was successful in those countries but did not fit into the Greek system. The centralized educational system centered the power on the Ministry of Education, which undertook all the expenses for secondary education.¹²³
2. The structure of education referred to earlier, remained unchanged until 1929.
3. The entire structure of education was planned only for boys. A very important aspect for education of girls was the foundation of three schools specifically for girls by "*Filekpedeftiki Eteria*" which was a private institution.
4. It could be said that during the whole period Greek education was under the control of the State being centralized, following uniformity and having the monolithic structure of secondary education.¹²⁴

It is useful to discuss the main points of the presidential decree of 1836 for two reasons. Firstly, it was the first piece of legislation which described clearly the management of schools and the duties of the Head and secondly, it was the only important piece of educational legislation during the 19th century. Three parts of the decree should be discussed : the duties of the Head of Greek Schools, the school board and the Head of high schools.

Article 6 of the decree laid down that the teacher of the higher class of Greek schools was at the same time the Head of the school. He was responsible for receiving orders from the Ministry of Education and executing them and giving reports on every aspect to the Ministry. In the cities where there were high schools their Head was at the same time the Head of the Greek School. Articles 22,30 and 32 say that the Head was responsible for keeping records, signing certificates and giving reports to the Ministry of Education. In article 32 it refers to the fact that at the end of each school year, the Head should submit to the Ministry of Education a report about examinations, the general situation of the school, and anything else he could think that was important for the school. At the same time the Head, working together with teachers, decided about the syllabus which was sent to the Ministry of Education and announced to students. In article 48 it described relations between the Head and the school board, in article 52 it described the duties of the Head in connection with school economics, in article 55 it stated that he was also responsible for the punishment of students and article 57 made him responsible for students' behavior in and out of the school. The Head was president of the teachers' board which, according to article 60, had to meet at least once per month.

Section six of the decree dealt with the school boards. Every school had its own school board consisting of persons who were appointed by the government. They were usually the governor of the area, the judge, a priest and two other persons. The duties of the school board included the examination of students, the inspection of teachers to see if they followed the orders of the Ministry of Education and finally to be an arbitrator in possible

disputes between the Head and teachers. The role of the school board was significant but usually its members did not undertake this with pleasure, having as a result the sub-functioning of schools.

Provisions for high schools were similar to those of Greek Schools. Article 66 states that in each high school there should be five teachers. Article 67 requires that the teacher of the upper class of high schools was at the same time to be the Head of the school and mainly responsible for the normal attendance of students (article 83). The Head was also responsible, in cooperation with the teachers, for drawing up the rules of the school (article 109) and when necessary calling meetings of the teachers and sometimes calling the school board to these meetings (article 110). Article 113 states that the Head should send, at the end of each school year, a detailed report about the functioning of the school with a plan for the next academic year. The Head of high schools was also the Head of a cooperating Greek School and the inspector of all Greek Schools of the area. His power was quite great and he had high social prestige. Although there was a centralized educational system, because of lack of good management of the Ministry of Education, the Head had full control of the school and his power was so great that he could organize or disorganize a school rapidly. The only authority which had control over the schools was the local society. It can be seen from the study of ministerial regulations, that the Ministry of Education dealt only with trivial and bureaucratic affairs and therefore lost the real power of centralized authority. Thus, Greek education passed a period when the Head of a school had concentrated power and authority over that school.

Although the presidential decree of 31-12-1836 was the main legislation for secondary education for about a hundred years, it is worth studying other legislation from that period, in which the duties of a Head are described, concerning certain schools. Between 1836 and 1856 the "Rizarios Church School", the Technical School of Athens, an agricultural school in Tiryns, a "Teacher-Training College" and various seminaries were established. The presidential decree of 25-1-1843 (File of the Official Gazette, FOG 4/1843)

dealt with the establishment of the "Rizarios Church School", which was very important for Greek secondary education and played a significant role for many decades, many of whose graduates undertook high governmental posts and is still a high quality school today. Part A of Chapter Four of the above mentioned decree deals with the duties of the Head of the school. It was the first time the duties of a Head had been described in a legislation. According to the decree (paragraph 12) the duties of the Head were:

1. To keep order within the school and make sure regulations were adhered to.
2. To give advice to the personnel of the school and to check the execution of his/her advice.
3. To plan and introduce further development towards the improvement of the school.
4. To assess students seeking entrance to the school.
5. To develop and introduce the syllabus and timetable of the school.
6. To organize examinations.
7. To check the behaviour of students.
8. To observe lessons and asses teaching methods.
9. To remind all teachers of their duties and to help them through advice.
10. To be informed of new books and help in the function of the school library,
11. To process all official papers.

As will be seen later in further detail, these were the main duties for Heads of many other schools. The decree of 22-10-1843¹²⁵ concerning the establishment of "The Technical school of Athens" dealt with only two points pertinent to the duties of the Head. It states that the Head was the only one responsible for the property of the school and that he was responsible for the strict keeping of the timetable. This technical school later became the "Athens Technical University " which is nowadays the best technical university in Greece.

Agricultural schools were very important for an agricultural country, so one of the first concerns of the Greek state was the establishment of such a school in Tiryns in the Peloponese. There were, therefore, the Act AZ' of 9-6-1846¹²⁶ concerning "the establishment of the agricultural school in Tiryns" and the royal decree of 22-11-1850¹²⁷ concerning "the organization of the agricultural school of Tiryns". In the Act AZ' the only reference to the Head concerned the salary but the decree of 22-11-1850 includes a chapter where the duties of the Head are described in details. Between the three articles and the twenty six paragraphs of chapter six of the decree, all the duties of the Head, which are included in the previous regulations, as well as other details are described. It should be stressed that the Head was not obliged to take into account teachers' opinions and was responsible for the income and expenditures of the school. Finally, it should be mentioned here that there was no Deputy Head and when the Head was absent the eldest teacher was responsible for the function of the school.

The decree of 25-3-1856 describes extensively the rules of "The Royal Teacher Training College". Although the regulations cover five pages of no. 18 of 25-3-1856 File of the Official Gazette, there are only two points where the duties of the Head are described: one point stating "the Head is responsible for applying the regulations of the school" and the other is where the Head is obliged to keep discipline in the school. It should be stressed here that in this decree the duties of the porter of the school are described more extensively than of those of the Head.

Finally, the decree of 24-11-1856¹²⁸ refers to the establishment of Church Schools (seminaries) and describes the duties of the Head similarly to those described in the decree of 31-12-1836.

As can be seen, during the period under examination, and not only during that, the main legislation which describes the duties of the Head was the decree of 31-12-1836 which was the guide for all other decrees of the same content. The need for a more extensive description of the organization of schools and of the duties of the Head was not great, as all schools at that time were small with only a few teachers and the main point was the enforcement of the laws and of the governmental regulations in a very much centralized system. The reputation of the Head was very high and sometimes his decisions were law.

1.4 The influence of Foreign Educational systems on the formation of the Greek Educational system.

It is obvious that the Greek educational system, being newly born, in a newly developed state had the strong influence of the developed educational systems of Western Europe. There were many ways in which ideas and educational models were imported. Foreign people working as consultants and Greeks who had studied in Europe and taken high positions in the hierarchy of the new state greatly influenced Greek education. Greek schools abroad and foreign schools introduced into the country were able to offer the more gifted children teaching in foreign languages and an introduction to European civilization. Finally, donations from foreign institutions were a necessary aid in the development of many schools.

After the coming of Kapodistrias to Greece a few foreigners, mainly Philhellenes came to help him with administrative affairs. There was a need for educated people who helped the government. One such example is

K. Dutrone, a Frenchman who was one of the three members of the Education Committee. He was responsible for collecting information and introducing foreign methods of administration into the Greek educational system. He translated many French textbooks and a booklet with instructions for inspectors of Education.¹²⁹

On the other hand, there were some Greeks educated in Europe who helped education very much. We saw Coray, who did not return to Greece but who helped Greek education by sending from Paris, where he was living, teachers, books and advice. Others educated in Europe were G. Gennadius, G. Konstantas, and A. Moustoxidis who played a central role in education, as we have seen. Each of them transferred knowledge and experience from abroad and helped in the formation of the main structure of Education. Except for these three there was a small number of teachers coming from Europe to teach in Greek schools, who introduced materials, methods and ideas as well as undertaking the management of schools.¹³⁰

Children of some selected rich families did not want to study in the underdeveloped schools of Greece and sought to study in Europe, where the teaching language, however, was not Greek. Wanting to "cure" this problem, some of the great countries of Europe established schools specially for Greeks, where both languages, Greek and the language of the host country, were taught. Such schools existed in Paris¹³¹, Basel¹³² in Switzerland and Munich¹³³. The Greek Lyceum of Paris had as its goal the education of young Greeks in order to become teachers in secondary schools. Thus they hoped to influence Greek education transferring their methods and organization and at the same time establishing French as the main foreign language of Greek schools. A part of the expenses of the school was undertaken by the French government with the hope that political influence was possible through education.¹³⁴ A similar situation existed in the Greek School of Munich¹³⁵. In both schools students could follow higher studies in Law, Medicine, Politics, etc.

The United States of America although very far, had their contribution to make towards the Greek education. The Americans preferred to establish schools in Greece¹³⁶ and sent materials for Greek schools.¹³⁷ Some schools of the Catholic Church should be mentioned, which were established on certain Aegean islands where Catholic people lived.

Finally, it should be said that advisers of King Otto had been dealing with education in Greece for a long time and had formed the Greek educational system modeled on the system in Bavaria. This influence was probably the more strong and determined on the educational system of Greece.

Foreign educational foundations had a positive influence on Greek education. Greece received the necessary help to establish and improve its educational institutions. Although, sometimes there were extreme examples, imitation of foreign systems helped Greek education, to a certain extent, to mature.

- ¹ Evagelopoulos S. *History of modern Greek Education*, Danias publications, Athens 1989, p.19.
- ² Zacharopoulos N., *Education under the Turkish occupation*. Pourmaras publications, Thessaloniki 1994, p.21.
- ³ Evagelopoulos S., *ibid*, p.20.
- ⁴ Zacharopoulos N. *ibid*, p.36.
- ⁵ Vakalopoulos A. *Modern Greek History 1204-1985*. Vantias, Thessaloniki 1992. P.80.
- ⁶ Evagelopoulos S. *ibid*, p. 59.
- ⁷ Zacharopoulos N. *ibid*, p.38.
- ⁸ Chatzopoulos K. *Greek schools in the period of Ottoman occupation, 1453-1821*, Vantias, Thessaloniki 1991, p.308.
- ⁹ Vakalopoulos A. *ibid*, p.81.
- ¹⁰ *About the school of Dimitsana*. A. Koromilas (publisher), Athens 1847.
- ¹¹ *About the school of Vitina and its first teachers*, Nafplio 1858.
- ¹² Chatzopoulos K. *ibid*, p.311.
- ¹³ Evagelopoulos S. *ibid*, p.61.
- ¹⁴ Chatzopoulos K. *ibid*, p.45.
- ¹⁵ Vakalopoulos A. *The Greek students in 1821*. Eteria Makedonikon Spoudon, Thessaloniki 1978, p.13.
- ¹⁶ Daskalakis A. *Texts-sources of the history of Greek Revolution. Volume three. About education, first part*. Athens 1968.
- ¹⁷ Gennadius J. *A sketch of history of Education in Greece*. Edinburgh 1925, p.19.
- ¹⁸ Gennadius J. *ibid*, p.20.
- ¹⁹ Dimaras A. Education during the struggle, in *Nea Estia* vol 88, issue 1043, Christmas 1970, p.51.-Kokkotas P. *The role of Education in economic development of Greece*, Athens 1978, pp 23-31.
- ²⁰ Papanikolaou L., The social history of the Greek Revolution of 19th century. *Sinchroni Epochi*, Athens 1991, p.211.
- ²¹ Pirgiotakis George, *Problems of the history of education of teachers the first fifty years after the liberation (1828-1878)*, edit. Christianakis, Athens 1981, p. 61
- ²² Paparigopoulos K., *History of the Greek Nation*, vol 6, p.178.
- ²³ Vasdravellis I., *The Greek Revolution of 1821 and the interests of great powers*. Thessaloniki 1975, p 26.
- ²⁴ Tsoukalas K., *Dependence and Reproduction. The role of Educational mechanisms in Greece (1830-1922)*, Themelio, 1977, p.164.
- ²⁵ Pirgiotakis George, *ibid*. p .27.
- ²⁶ Dragoumis K., *Justice, Education, Church in Greece, 1821-1831*, Athens 1873, p.2.
- ²⁷ Lefas Chr. *The history of Education*, Athens 1942, p.158.
- ²⁸ Papanikolaou L., *ibid*, p.173 and p.181.
- ²⁹ Papanikolaou L., *ibid*, p.183.
- ³⁰ Dragoumis N., *Historical memories*, Athens 1925.
- ³¹ Pirgiotakis George, *ibid*, p. 60.
- ³² *Encyclopaedia Eleftheroudakis*, Administration in Greece, vol. 5, p. 414.
- ³³ Svoronos N., *Review of the Modern Greek History*, Athens 1977, p.78.
- ³⁴ Vournas T., *History of Modern Greece*, Athens
- ³⁵ Svoronos N., *ibid*, p. 78.
- ³⁶ *Encyclopaedia Eleftheroudakis*, vol. 5, p.421.
- ³⁷ Filias B. *Society and power in Greece*. 2nd ed. Sinchrona Keimena 1975, p. 68.
- ³⁸ Papanikolaou L., *ibid*, p.257.
- ³⁹ Filias B., *ibid*, p.68.
- ⁴⁰ Papanikolaou L., *ibid*, p.292.
- ⁴¹ Tsoukalas K., *ibid*, p.164.
- ⁴² *Statistical calendar of Greece*, 1933.
- ⁴³ Tsoukalas K., *ibid*, p. 402.
- ⁴⁴ Pirgiorakis G., *ibid*, p.68.
- ⁴⁵ Moskof K., *National and social consciousness in Greece 1830-1909*, 2nd ed., Athens 1974, p.271.

- ⁴⁶ Gennadius J., *ibid.*
- ⁴⁷ Dimaras Al. *Modern Greek Education (A sketch of History)*, Athens 1965.
- ⁴⁸ Lazaridis Ad. *Attempts of organization of Education (1821-1833)*, Athens 1973.
- ⁴⁹ J.Gennadius. *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁰ *Encyclopaedia Eleftheroudakis*, vol. 5, p. 421.
- ⁵¹ Dimaras A., *Modern Greek Education (A sketch of History)*, Athens 1965.
- ⁵² Ap.Daskalakis, *Texts-sources of the history of Greek Revolution. Vol. One*, Athens 1966, p.243.
- ⁵³ Ap. Daskalakis. *Ibid*,p.264.
- ⁵⁴ Ap. Daskalakis. *Texts-Sources of the History of Greek Revolution. Volume three. About Education*. First part.Atens 1968,p.28.
- ⁵⁵ *Archives of the Greek Regeneration*, p.252.
- ⁵⁶ Newspaper "Morning Messenger (*Proinos tachidromos*)", 6 May 1865.
- ⁵⁷ Ap. Daskalakis. *Ibid* p.37.
- ⁵⁸ The mutual or reciprocal educational system in Greece known as the Lancasterian system of tuition, was founded by Joseph Lancaster (1778-1838) and introduced to Greece by George Cleovoulos. This was the main method of tuition for many years in the majority of Greek schools.
- ⁵⁹ *Archives of Greek Regeneration*, p515.
- ⁶⁰ *General Archives of the State (GAS). Ministry of Religion*, File 3 scholastic 1823.
- ⁶¹ GAS, *Ministry of Religion*, f.4, *monastery*, 1824. ⁶¹
- ⁶² Ap. Daskalakis, *ibid*,p.35
- ⁶³ Ap. Daskalakis, *Ibid* p.36.
- ⁶⁴ *Greek Chronicles (Ellinika chronika) A*. No 43,28 May 1824.
- ⁶⁵ GAS *Ministry of Religion* 1823 f.2 scholastic.
- ⁶⁶ GAS *Ministry of Interior* 1824, f.36.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁸ *Library of Parliament manuscript* 241, p.377.
- ⁶⁹ GAS *Ministry of Religion* f.57, *scholastic*, undated.
- ⁷⁰ N.Dragoumis, *Historical memories*, 3rd Ed. Vol. A, p.178.
- ⁷¹ *Library of Parliament, manuscript* No 236, p.60.
- ⁷² Athens Newspaper (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*),18 September 1824 and 11 March 1825.
- ⁷³ Athens Newspaper 1824-Greek Chronicles (*Ellinika chronika*), 2 October 1824.
- ⁷⁴ Ap. Daskalakis, *ibid* p.35.
- ⁷⁵ GAS *Ministry of Religion*, f.1, *scholastic*, 1822.
- ⁷⁶ Greek Chronicles (*Ellinika chronika*) A no. 82, 2 October 1824.
- ⁷⁷ Sourmelis D., *The history of Athens*, p.93.
- ⁷⁸ GAS *Vlachogiannis archives*, Δ 12γ, Athens Newspaper (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*), no 16 25 October 1824.
- ⁷⁹ GAS 1824, *Ministry of Religion*, f.5, *scholastic*.
- ⁸⁰ GAS *Ministry of Education*, f. 6, *monastery* 1824.
- ⁸¹ GAS *Ministry of Justice*, f. 33, 1827.
- ⁸² GAS *Vlachogiannis Collection, Executive*, f.10 1825.
- ⁸³ GAS 1824 *Ministry of Religion*, *scholastic* f.6.
- ⁸⁴ GAS *ibid.*
- ⁸⁵ *The Library of parliament, manuscript* no. 236, p.67
- ⁸⁶ GAS *Vlachogiannis Collection, Executive*, f.7 1825.
- ⁸⁷ *The Library of Parliament, manuscript* no 236, p.141.
- ⁸⁸ GAS 1825. *Ministry of Education*. *Scholastic* f.82.
- ⁸⁹ *The Library of Parliament manuscript* 241, p.394 –Newspaper The Friend of Law (*O filou tou Nomou*) and The Newspaper of Athens (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*) 24 of January 1825.
- ⁹⁰ Th. Sperantsa, *Calendar of the Company of Cycladic studies*, A p.49.
- ⁹¹ *The Library of Parliament, manuscript* no 236 p.100.
- ⁹² GAS *Vlachogiannis Collection. Executive*, f.7.
- ⁹³ GAS *Ministry of Interior* f.53, 1825.
- ⁹⁴ The Newspaper of Athens (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*) no. 38, 24 January 1825.
- ⁹⁵ *The Library of Parliament, manuscript* 236, p.106 – GAS, *Vlachogiannis collection Executive*, f.7, 1825.
- ⁹⁶ The Newspaper of Athens, (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*), no37, 21 January 1825.

- ⁹⁷ The Newspaper of Athens, (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*), no 40, January 1825, M.Goudas *Parallel Lives*, p.318, Vlachogiannis, Athens archive, A, p.408.
- ⁹⁸ Sourmelis D., *ibid*, p.132.
- ⁹⁹ The Athens Newspaper (*Ephemeris ton Athinon*), no 20, 1st February 1826, p.81.
- ¹⁰⁰ GAS 1827, *Ministry of Education, Scholastic*, f. 17.
- ¹⁰¹ Dimaras A., *Education during the struggle in Nea Estia vol. 88, issue 1043*, Christmas 1970, p.52.
- ¹⁰² Koukou E., *Kapodistrias and Education (1827-1832), B Scholastic foundations in Aegina*, Athens 1992
- ¹⁰³ M.Soutzos, *Rapport sur l' instruction publique adresse le 14 Janvier 1828 a S.Ex. Jean Kapodistrias, president*, in *Letters to J. Kapodistrias*, Athens 1841, vol.A, pp. 399-400.
- ¹⁰⁴ Mamoukas A., *About revival of Greece*, v.A, Piraeus, 1839 p.137
- ¹⁰⁵ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.11.
- ¹⁰⁶ General Newspaper, "*Geniki Ephemeris*", issue 63, 1829 p.256.
- ¹⁰⁷ Mamoukas A., *ibid*, v.IA, p.100.
- ¹⁰⁸ Dimaras K., *Kapodistrias-Moustoxidis-Koutloumousianos*, Venice, v.1, 1962 p.50.
- ¹⁰⁹ G.A.S. , *Ministry of Education, scholastic 1829*.
- ¹¹⁰ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.28.
- ¹¹¹ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.30.
- ¹¹² G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.32, 1830.
- ¹¹³ G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.20 1829- General newspaper, "*Geniki ephemeris*", issue 73, 31 Oct.1829.
- ¹¹⁴ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.51.
- ¹¹⁵ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.51.
- ¹¹⁶ G.A.S. , *Ministry of Education*, f.41, 1831.
- ¹¹⁷ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.73.
- ¹¹⁸ Kapodistrias J., *Letters*, Athens 1841, v.C, p.265.
- ¹¹⁹ Koukou E., *ibid*, p.121.
- ¹²⁰ G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.36, 1831- General newspaper, "*Geniki ephemeris*", issue 16, 1831.
- ¹²¹ Chatzistefanidis Th., *History of Modern Greek Education (1821-1986)*, Papadimas 1986, p.48.
- ¹²² Lefas Ch., *ibid*, p.10.
- ¹²³ Isigonis A., *History of Education*, Athens 1974, p.226.
- ¹²⁴ Lefas Ch., *ibid*, p.16.
- ¹²⁵ FOG 38, 1843
- ¹²⁶ FOG 15, 1846
- ¹²⁷ FOG 42, 1850
- ¹²⁸ FOG 79, 1856
- ¹²⁹ Koukou E., *ibid* , p.34.
- ¹³⁰ G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.30 1830 no.1145.
- ¹³¹ General Newspaper (*Geniki Ephemeris*), 1830, no. 35, p. 140.
- ¹³² General Newspaper (*Geniki Ephemeris*), 1830, no.39, p.156.
- ¹³³ G.A.S. *Ministry of Education* f.26, 1830.
- ¹³⁴ General Newspaper (*Geniki Ephemeris*), 1831, no.43, p.245.
- ¹³⁵ General Newspaper (*Geniki Ephemeris*), no. 18, 7-3-1831.
- ¹³⁶ Newspaper *Aeginea*, 1831, p.123.
- ¹³⁷ G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.31, 1830. Newspaper *Aeginea* 1831, p.55. G.A.S. *Ministry of Education*, f.37, 1831.

CHAPTER II

The role of headteachers in secondary schools during the period 1857-1928.

2.1 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1857-1928.

The period which followed saw a boost in the Greek education both within the Greek territory and outside of it, wherever there were Greek communities, especially in Macedonia which was not yet part of the Greek State. Many new schools, cultural societies and educational companies were established. The political scene was not so clear because of the disaffection of people against King Otto, which led the King to leave Greece after a thirty-year reign and return to Bavaria by the end of 1862. Thus, a period of political instability and economic hardship came to an end and a new period started for the Greek State.

King George I was the second King of modern Greece who came to Greece donating the Ionian Islands as a gift to the state, which were embodied to the Greek State in 1864. That constitution of 1864 remained unchanged until 1967 and was the frame around which the Greek State developed. A long period of wars extended Greek borders. During that period education was developed and an indication of this is the fact that in 1830 there were about 10 000 students and by 1874 their number had grown to 93 588. Unfortunately, progress in education was not followed by progress of a similar level in economic and political areas and many Greeks immigrated to other countries. In spite of the difficulties, Greece during that period developed and became a country ready to approach Europe on equal terms.

2.2 Greek education during the years 1857-1928.

During the period under examination there were two main attempts at reform in education, that of 1895, 1899 and that of 1913-1917. The act called BTMΘ tried to correct and improve the educational system which had many problems

following its introduction in 1836. Although six naval schools were established during 1867 the main direction of education was towards classical studies¹. Approaching the end of 19th century there was a wave among educated people towards a popular idiom of the Greek language, and thus demotic Greek introduced². In 1883 fourteen inspectors visited about all the schools of the country and in their reports underlined all the main problems of Greek education at that time. A small change in the curriculum during 1884 and 1886 did not make much difference because the direction towards classical studies remained as the timetable of high schools included 66 hours of ancient Greek per week and only 22 hours of mathematics. The structure of education remained unchanged, one-dimensional from primary school to university, and the students had to take examinations in order to go from one level to the next.

That period was characterized as the time when priority was given to primary education, as also happened during the years of J. Kapodistrias. King Otto and his Bavarian advisers gave emphasis to secondary education because they wanted to prepare civil servants but the result of this was the development of over-educated people at the same time as a great many citizens remained illiterate³. Positive action included the establishment of infant schools⁴, orientation towards practical aspects of life and preparation of pupils for life itself. At that time the institution of inspection was established, which remained unchanged until 1929. Excesses in duty led inspectors to be authoritarian, controlling not only the school life but also the political, social and cultural life of teachers.

The government under G. Theotokis, during 1899, introduced laws concerning primary and secondary education in order to give the same quality of education nationwide and to lead pupils towards practical knowledge during the six years of primary school. It was an effort towards modernization of education and satisfaction of the practical needs of the people⁵. Another aspect of the 1899 acts was the differentiation between the "classical lyceum" and the "practical lyceum". Unfortunately most of the education acts of 1899

were never put into force because of, as Fragoudaki states, "the deep crisis in which the Greek society was at that time"⁶.

The reforms of 1913 and 1917 were the first convincing attempt towards educational change in the 20th century. The first attempt took place during 1913 in an attempt to correct all the difficulties in the functioning of education caused by the Act of 1834. The main demand was for the change of educational goals of schools, which meant the demand for preparation of pupils for life and not only for civil servants. Two other very important aspects of that educational reform were the establishment of technical education and the correspondence between educational levels and social classes⁷. The aim of the reform attempts of 1913 and 1917 was the adaptation of the educational system to the needs of economic development⁸. During that period a significant development in schoolbooks occurred and the language in which these books were written was demotic, the language of the people. This was the reason that the School of Philosophy of the University of Athens opposed the reforms⁹ and finally, when Venizelos left the government the successive government totally destroyed the whole of the educational reforms, so that that period ended in chaos after two successful attempts at reform and two counter-reforms.

2.3 The role of headteachers in Greek secondary education during the years 1857-1928.

It is known that the previous period was characterized by the decree of 31st December 1836. This same decree was the main legislation during the period 1857-1928. This second period of Greek education mainly involved legislation concerning certain secondary schools, as many of them were established and organized during the seventy-one years of its duration. It is worth studying a sector of the legislation referring to the role of Headmasters within the secondary schools of that period.

Regulation no.3 of 1-3-1858 of the Ministry of Education¹⁰ dealt with the meetings of the Council of Teachers. Authority in that Council was given to

the president of the school committee and the Head had only a secondary role in informing teachers about the regulations.

The establishment of The Technical School of Athens was very important for Greek Education at that time and a new decree came into being to complete its organization¹¹. Although the decree of 22-10-1843, as seen in the previous chapter, was very brief it led to the establishment of the school. The new decree dealt extensively with the organization of the school and gave the Head the authority to deal with trivial and bureaucratic affairs of the school. The real power to manage the school was given to the school council with a few responsibilities being given to the Council of Teachers.

A very important decree for teachers and Head was that of 2-1-1886¹² which gave them permanent employment. A teacher or a Head could be dismissed only when:

- a) he had been on duty less than one month,
- b) If he was not able to work because of illness for more than three months,
- c) if he was ineffectual or negligent in his duties, or his conduct was inappropriate. All these had to be proved in a court,
- d) if their post was abolished. Hence, in practice, teachers and Head became partly independent of the local authorities, school councils and politicians.

There are various decrees which dealt with the establishment and organization of schools and followed the same pattern, which meant that the school committee was responsible for the function of the school and the Head was responsible for executing their directives. The framework of the head's duties was approximately the same as that of the decree of 31-12-1836. An important decree in the organization of secondary schools is that of the organization of the Teacher's College and of its model school of 28-8-1878¹³. In that decree there were two new aspects apart from the usual duties of the Head. Firstly, the Head, in cases where teachers did not work properly, could

refer the matter to the Ministry of Education to penalize them and secondly, the Head was able, in a case where he thought that a decision of the Teachers' Council was not fitting, to refuse to apply it until the Ministry of Education came to a decision. These were two points that gave authority to the Head. For the first time the decree¹⁴ of 2-4-1880 dealt with the Deputy Head but did not give precise a description of his duties. This happened later, in the regulations of "Charokopios Vocational School of Housekeeping"¹⁵, where, in article nine, all the duties of the Deputy Head were described.

It was not only the authority of the Head that increased but also the authority of the Ministry of Education over the Head. Law ΩΝΘ' of 9-5-1880¹⁶ said that the Minister of Education could penalize a Head, the greatest penalty being dismissal for one month.

Law 240 concerning the management of primary and secondary education¹⁷ is the first with such content following that of 1836. New aspects appearing in that law were provisions for inspectors and their council, which took control of primary and secondary education. In chapter six, paragraph nineteen were described the duties of the Head but there was nothing further to that of the decree of 1836 which remained the basic law for primary and secondary education.

The lack of detailed reference concerning the duties of a Head was overcome by the school rules which were often described in detail.¹⁸ On 28-8-1919 a decree about the codification of the legislation concerning secondary education was signed.¹⁹ Nothing of particular importance was included in that decree, apart from article forty, in which the description of the duties of the school committee were different to those of previous decrees. In each school there was to be a five-member committee whose president was to be the Head and the other four persons would be parents appointed by the prefect. The school committee was responsible only for maintenance of school buildings and the financial control of a school's money and property. This decree was the end of the omnipotence of the school committee which had up to then full control of a school. As a result of this was the greater power was given to the Head of "Sivitanidios Technical and Vocational School" which

was established in 1928²⁰ and is famous even today. This school became partly independent from the Ministry of education and all the power of the management of the school, the management of its property and the direction of the school was given to the Head. A Deputy Head with increased power helped the Head in his duties. This model of management was not the case but it was an exception which, as can be seen later, followed only by certain special schools. All other schools followed the management model of the decree of 1836 although it was then a century old.

-
- ¹ Dimaras A., *The reform that never happened*, Hermes, Athens 1988, Vol. A, p.206.
 - ² Frangoudaki A., *Educational reform and liberal intellectuals*, Kedros, 5th edition, Athens 1977.
 - ³ Evagelopoulos S., *History of Modern Greek education*, vol. A, Danias, Athens 1989, pp.83-90.
 - ⁴ Kiriazopoulou-Valinaki P., *Nipiagogiki*, vol. 1 Athens p. 231.
 - ⁵ Delmouzos A., *The secret school*, Athens 1950, p.16.
 - ⁶ Frangoudaki A., *ibid*, p.26.
 - ⁷ Dimaras A., *ibid*, vol. B, p.93.
 - ⁸ Frangoudaki A., *ibid*, pp. 35-48.
 - ⁹ Dimaras A., *ibid*, vol. B, p.99.
 - ¹⁰ *File of the Official Gazette of the Greek State (FOG) no 8, 18-3-1858.*
 - ¹¹ FOG no 33, 14-9-1863.
 - ¹² FOG no 1, 2-1-1886.
 - ¹³ FOG no 49, 28-8-1878
 - ¹⁴ FOG no 26, 2-4-1880.
 - ¹⁵ FOG no 201, 21-7-1914.
 - ¹⁶ FOG no 52, 12-5-1880.
 - ¹⁷ FOG no 97, 16-4-1914.
 - ¹⁸ FOG no 231, 5-11-1918.
 - ¹⁹ FOG no 190, 28-8-1919.
 - ²⁰ FOG no 143, 30-7-1928.

CHAPTER III

The role of headteachers in Greek secondary schools during the years 1929-1963.

3.1 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1929-1963.

At the beginning of 1929 Venizelos, a great politician, came to power and a period of international cooperation and economic and social development started. Educational reform, reorganization of universities, building of new schools and libraries were some of the priorities that Venizelos put forward for education. The establishment of technical, agricultural and economics schools, was an effort to move students from classical studies towards sciences.

The economic situation of the country was good and many great works helped develop the infrastructure of the country until the great crash of 1929 influenced Greece during 1931-32 and political instability followed a prosperous period. A conservative government followed and on 1st March 1935 a military coup took place having a significant effect on the political and social evolution of the country. King George I came back into power and in 1936 the dictator John Metaxas governed Greece until the Second World War. The German and Italian occupation of Greece destroyed all financial and political structures and an indication of this is that the national income of Greek people decreased by 41% during the war. After the end of the war a new government under George Papandreou came to power but unfortunately on December 1944 a civil war began. The civil war lasted five years and it resulted in a vital change (increase in population of the cities, immigration to other countries) and a full disruption of economic, social and cultural development of the country. During 1946 the King, who was abroad after the war, returned and a conservative government under K. Tsaldaris took power but, not caring too much about Greece, his priority was how to keep his political party in power.

A period of reorganization of the country followed and until the period 1950-52 the economy reached the level, which it had been before the war. There was an increase of 6% per year of national income but the per capita income remained low. There was an increase in agricultural and industrial production but the country remained mainly agricultural. The increase of merchant shipping together with tourism and the money, which was coming from the emigrants, were the main sources of income of the country for some decades. During that period huge development projects were undertaken which changed the infrastructure of the country and a boost in the cultural level of the country took place. The last decade of that period, more precisely from 1955 until 1963, a conservative government under K. Karamanlis was in power. That period was characterized as the most stable period of the history of modern Greece. The economic situation started to improve and a result of that was the link of Greece to the EEC, which started in 1961.

3.2 Greek Education during the period 1929-1963.

As soon as the new government of Venizelos came to power two new acts on education were introduced. There was the act 4397/16-8-1929 for primary education and the act 4373/13-8-1929 for the secondary sector. It was once again an effort to solve the accumulated problems and so it was a repetition of the reform of 1913. By that time the problems had become greater as 80% of Greeks had insufficient exposure to education¹. The establishment of technical schools² and a movement from classical studies towards social and economic actuality³ led state schools towards maturity⁴.

The reform of 1929 changed mainly the external characteristics of the educational structure (organization – administration) and to a lesser extent the internal (curriculum – methods)⁵ and, as happened with all previous reforms, was suspended after the resignation of Venizelos.

The dictatorship of Metaxas during 1936 suspended basic functions of the state and changed basic structures of education. The occupation of Greece by Italian and German troops during the second World War halted the functioning of schools. So, during the school year 1940-41, schools were open only for three months and for the school year 1941-42 only for twenty days⁶. During the occupation some schools functioned in areas which were free but there was a lack of books and teachers, so it is difficult to speak about Greek education during the years of the Second World War.

Education after the war was insufficient and educational expenses were very low. The civil war that followed made things worse and the need for educational reform was urgent⁷. During 1957 a special Education Committee studied the problems of education and in 1959 the Act 3971 for General, Technical and Vocational education changed some areas in education but the result was very poor.

3.3 The role of headteachers during the period 1929-1963.

The study of legislation referring to the organization of secondary schools shows that during the period under examination there were no significant changes to the role of the Head. The period before and after the Second World War was not a fruitful period for Greek education. The Civil War 1944-49, hindered any improvement in education for many years and only during 1956 and 1963 were attempts made towards change in education. Before studying the major changes it is important to discuss some minor points in the management of schools.

In article four of Law 6379/34⁸ of 5-11-1934 the effort of the State to find teachers willing to be Head is quite clear. At that time the economic status of the Greek provinces was at a very low level and many teachers preferred to teach in city schools rather than be Head of schools in rural areas. Thus article four of the above mentioned law stated that, the promotion to position

of Head was compulsorily accepted by teachers, and nobody could refuse to be a Head. Exceptions could be made only for teachers with special qualifications, which meant that the Head of rural schools were usually under-qualified. Article six states that the Head could only be teacher of the Greek language.

The decree of 14-11-1935⁹ gave to Head the power of disciplinary authority over teachers. It was the period of the dictatorship and the Head had to please the government, so in effect the government had the educational system under control. Emergency law 770 of 13-7-1937¹⁰ stated in article seven that the Head always had to be a Greek language teacher except in Practical Schools where the Head had to be mathematics or science teacher. The acts 1800¹¹ and 1849¹² of 1939 concerning the administration of Secondary schools did not state anything concerning the administration of each particular school or the duties of the Head. Their interest focused on the inspection and control of schools by the central government. The decree¹³ of 30-6-1943 described extensively the duties of the Head of the Vocational School of Piraeus "Saint Spyridon" in article 20. Little more than the typical bureaucratic duties of the Head were described and only matters dealing with the control of the school by the central authority were included. Another decree¹⁴, of the same date concerned "the organisation of the School for Machinists and Industrial Crafts". In article 14 the duties of the Head are described and it should be mentioned that certain broader powers were given to the Head, such as part of the control of the School remaining with the School board and the Head. That particular school was not under the Ministry of Education but under the Ministry of Finance.

During the dictatorship period of 1936, during the Second World War, and during the civil war which followed, the main interest of the State was how to control more strictly the function of schools. So, a great part of legislation concerned the inspection and control of every activity of each school by the Ministry of Education

-
- ¹ Charalambidis Th., *The main milestones in Educational Politics of Greece*, Athens 1971, p.15.
 - ² Fragoudaki A., *Educational reform and liberal intellectuals*, Athens 1977, p.60.
 - ³ Bouzakis S., *Modern Greek Education (1821-1985)*, Gutenberg, Athens 1996, p.86.
 - ⁴ Papandreou G., *Democracy and Popular Education*, "Anniversary of Primary Education", 1932, p. 5.
 - ⁵ Bouzakis S., *ibid*, p. 88.
 - ⁶ Sakellariou Ch., *Education during resistance*, Athens 1979.
 - ⁷ Invrioti R., *Revival of Education in "Educational Reform"* Ed.EDA, Athens 1966, p.86.
 - ⁸ FOG 385, 5-11-1934.
 - ⁹ FOG 550, 14-11-1935.
 - ¹⁰ FOG 263, 13-7-1937.
 - ¹¹ FOG 244, 17-6-1939.
 - ¹² FOG 300, 25-7-1939.
 - ¹³ FOG 190, 30-6-1943.
 - ¹⁴ FOG 192, 30-6-1943.

CHAPTER IV

The role of headteachers in Greek secondary schools during the period 1964 up to the present day

4.1 The social, political and economic situation during the period 1964 up to the present day.

After a long period of conservative governments, a progressive party took power and the government of George Papandreou took care of education taking certain measures such as the cutting out of fees for examinations, giving of scholarships, establishing of universities in Patras and Ioannina etc. That period did not last more than two years and unstable governments followed. A conservative government came to power but it was weak and the dictatorship that followed from 1967 until 1974 stopped every attempt at progress and disrupted the normal function of the country. Many primary and secondary teachers, professors of universities, officers, judges and thousands of civil servants retired en masse and that had short-term and long-term implications for the country. During the dictatorship the monarchy was abolished and Greece became isolated and the result of this was the economic crisis of 1973 which led to the collapse of the dictatorship.

Fortunately, Greece came back to democracy in 1974 and C. Karamanlis established a well-organized democracy. The discrimination of citizens, which had started during the civil war ceased and the reorganization of the army absorbed huge amounts of money as the government had to modernize the country in line with the EEC. Many university schools and a new university in Crete were established during that period. The national income increased and on 1st January 1981 Greece became the 10th member of the EEC. A new conservative government under George Rallis came in and during the seventeen months of his power he introduced various reforms in education, especially in technical education. Many problems occurred in higher education where the level of studies was lowered.

At the end of 1981 a socialist party under A. Papandreou came to power and great changes occurred in the public sector, in higher education, in health etc.

Four new universities were established during 1985 although the level of studies was continuously lowered. After Papandreou's death a change in Greek politics occurred and an improvement in the economy and an effort towards reform in education is observed.

4.2 Greek Education during the period 1964 up to the present day.

George Papandreou's government submitted three new acts concerning education to Parliament: in 1964 the law "about the organization and administration of primary and secondary education, law 4379, on May 1965 the laws "about technical education" and "about the establishment of universities". The above three laws express the educational reform of 1964 and introduced:

- a. Fee-free education from 6 to 15 years.
- b. The teaching of the demotic language.
- c. A great increase in funds available for education.
- d. A turn towards technical and vocational education.
- e. Other measures which were benefit for the lower social classes¹.

The educational reform of 1964 was the most complete and convincing proposal for modernization of education because it tried to link schools with society and the economy².

During 1965 the government changed and the reform abrogated. The dictatorship that followed, in 1967, changed all the educational laws which were relevant to the reform and obliged many teachers to resign³. An exception to the dictatorship's calamity was the establishment of higher technical schools, called KATEE, whose purpose was the production of middle executives for industry.

After the fall of the dictatorship, during 1974, the effort to cure the great problems of education had as a result Act 309 of 1976 concerning the organization and management of secondary education and the Act 576 of 1977 concerning technical and vocational education. Meanwhile, the constitution of 1975 established the duration of compulsory education as nine years and the fee-free education at all levels and for all Greeks⁴. It was the first time a conservative government had made such a reform in education taking the same measures which had been opposed twelve years earlier during the reform of 1964. The main component of educational reform of 1975-76 was a trend towards technical and vocational education. Actually, the basic goals of that educational reform did not succeed as there were no conditions and measures to support them.

During 1981 a socialist party came to power and tried a new educational reform. It was the first time in the history of the education of modern Greece that there was no abolition but instead a completion of the previous reforms. Some of the new aspects of educational reforms of 1981 were the establishment of comprehensive high schools, less centralized control of education, improvement of school books, the introduction of school advisers instead of school inspectors and other improvements in education. Act 1566/1985 is still in force today and will be examined in detail later.

4.3.3 The role of Headteachers during the period 1964 up to now.

The years of this final period have nothing new to reveal. School administration remained unchanged and only law 1566 of 1985, which is still in force, promised any kind of change. Decree 4379 of 1964⁵ "concerning the organisation and administration of general education" although dealing once more with the inspection and control of education, did not refer to the administration of schools. Act 789 of 31-12-1970⁶ introduced the tenure of the Head for three or five years instead of the unlimited period which had existed in prior legislation. Another act which preceded, the Act 651⁷, concerned the organisation and management of Secondary Education. In article fifteen the

disciplinary authority of the Head upon teachers is described, which was extensive. In article 36, paragraph 4, it states that: "for the position of the Head of a school, morals, devotion and faith in Greek and Christian ideals were to be especially appreciated as well as an ability in management, possessing of leadership qualities and a powerful moral personality. " It was the period of the dictatorship and being under these strict moral rules meant mainly allegiance to the dictators.

Act 309 of 1976⁸ was the first following the Act of 1836 concerning Secondary Education, which included articles about the organisation and management of schools but the duties of Head would be described later in decrees. Act 1566 concerning the "structure and function of Primary and Secondary Education" stated that the organs of school management were the Head, the Deputy Head and the Council of teachers. The new and important element was that a teacher could be a Head if he wanted to and only in schools of his preference. This was very important for schools in rural areas and on small islands because it was easier for a teacher of, let us say, a small island to be Head of the school of the island than for a teacher from a big city. The selection of Head had to be made with "subjective criteria" which in fact were not subjective at all. Finally, the description of the duties of the Head was not so much different than that of the decree of 1836. Act 1566/85 will be examined and discussed more extensively later. Two very important decrees which were introduced later in 1990⁹, dealt in detail with the organisation and management of secondary schools but there was nothing relevant to the Head. Thus, we reach in 1985, when Act 1566 was introduced and gave a new structure to the organisation of education and described a slightly different way of school management.

¹ Bouzakis S., *Modern Greek Education (1821-1985)*, Gutenberg, Athens 1996, p.106.

² Bouzakis S., *ibid*, p.108.

³ Evagelopoulos S. *History of Modern Greek education*, vol. B, Danias Athens 1989, p.30.

⁴ Evagelopoulos S. *ibid*, p.16.

⁵ FOG 182, 24-10-1964.

⁶ FOG 293, 31-12-1970.

⁷ FOG 179, 29-8-1970.

⁸ FOG 100, 30-4-1976.

⁹ The decree 392, FOG 155, 21-11-1990 and the decree 393, FOG 156, 21-11-1990.

CHAPTER V

5.1 The Greek Administrative System.

This closer look at the administration in Greece is intended to give a clear understanding of the framework within which Greek education developed. Since the vast majority of Greek schools are state schools and teachers are civil servants, it is important to understand the situation within the public administration sector as well as the role of civil servants within this system. On the other hand, schools are affected by the public administration system because they receive funds from local and central authorities and therefore must follow the directives of the ministry of education. The role of a head, both as a civil servant and as a leader within the civil service, as in school, is bound and determined within a strictly centralized educational system.

Greek society has taken great steps towards progress in economic, social, educational and cultural fields. Greece has become a member of the European Union and is among the developed countries of the World. The Greek administrative system has managed to make some isolated improvements but not to such a great extent. This is the main reason for the focus of this research being on the weaknesses of the Greek Administration rather than the stronger, more successful areas.

There are no extensive studies on the Greek administrative system neither within private sector nor within the public sector due to the lack of extensive research and the underdevelopment of the science of management in

Greece.¹ On the other hand the development of the public administration system is at such a low level resulting in an analogous level of appreciation and acceptance by the public. Although 80.7% of the population seem to have a very low appreciation of public services², the demand for public services in Health and Education is very high, at a level of 97% and 94% respectively. It would therefore seem to be true since most young Greeks attend public schools and the study of the Greek Education system is in fact the study of state education.

One main problem, which has greatly affected administration, is the short period of power of each consecutive government.³ During 168 years of national existence from the time of the first governor, J. Kapodistrias, and the government of 1997, more than 171 different governments and 90 Prime ministers have changed at the top level. This means that the average period in power of each government is less than one year and is possibly the shortest period of governmental power within Europe.⁴ Thus the main negative characteristic of the Greek administration system is the instability of the political system which has created many problems as far as the development of Education is concerned.

Another characteristic of the Greek public administration system is that many highly qualified scientists have entered the civil service due to unemployment, especially after 1970.⁵ They have carried great expectations both for their careers and for society itself but tend to work less enthusiastically due to the fact that they have job security for life. Thus, a powerful body of civil servants

has been created and as part in the formation of political decision making process.⁶

The personnel within the education system could be seen as both educational and managerial. Educational personnel include heads, although they have in fact both educational and managerial duties. As managerial personnel within Education only secretaries and auxiliary personnel are considered and at the end of the eighties included 676 people (14.1%) in the central service (Ministry of Education) and 4122 (85.9%) in local authorities and in schools.⁷ These negative aspects will be discussed at a later point.

5.2 The Evolution of the Greek administrative system.

As seen earlier, the situation following the beginning of the establishment of the Greek State was very bad since a new country was rebuilding itself on the ruins following a long period of war. Thus, it was reasonable to presume that nobody wanted to be a civil servant at that time. For this reason Kapodistrias, the first governor of modern Greece, appointed people from the Ionian Islands as they were educated, since the Ionian Islands were at that time under English occupation and education there was at a high level. Efforts were made to establish municipal authorities in some towns (there were no cities in Greece at that time) as existed during the Turkish occupation and people were familiar with the structure of local authorities. Thus, the Act of 27 December 1833 described the responsibilities of the mayor and the municipal authorities. Members of the municipal council were elected people with high incomes. The king, from three people proposed by the municipal council,

appointed the mayor. This was the case until 1912. Municipal responsibility was very broad at that time and is compared with today's competence of the State in that they were responsible for Health, Welfare, Primary Education, Police etc.⁸

The pattern, which was followed for the establishment of the system of administration, followed that of France, having been established by Napoleon and introduced during the revolution. This structure consisted of two parts, one involving the central government and the other the decentralized administration which was, in fact, the State operating at a local level. There were never independent local authorities in Greece. Thus, the Greek administrative system became centralized soon after its birth⁹ and this resulted in the centralization of education.

The main concerns of the public administration were the appointment and dismissal of public servants, their qualifications and their appraisal. The royal decree of 3 April 1833 established that the King had power to make the appointment and dismissal of every civil servant. The act of 6 February 1833 described the qualifications needed for primary and secondary teachers and the decree of 30 August 1833 introduced the appraisal of civil servants. Unfortunately, the 19th century passed without any solution to the main problems within the structure and function of the system.¹⁰ In 1912 a crucial change took place taking over power from the local authorities to the central government. Although the regime was supposedly a parliamentary democracy, in fact only the King and the army were in power until the 70's. This fact resulted in a controlled centralized system. There was one exception

during 1869 when Zaimis' government introduced an act laying down rules for civil servants. Unfortunately, due to governmental change, this act had never been enforced.

During the period between 1864 and 1974 the problem of permanency of civil servants and the problem of description of their qualifications appeared. During 1869 criteria for appointment of government employees were introduced and in 1884 for the first time, the permanency of civil servants in telecommunications was applied. A great change occurred during 1911 when Venizelos' government established the permanency of civil servants, which remains to the present day. The situation remained stable, with only a few exceptions, until 1950. In 1951 the Clerical Code introduced common legislation for all civil servants and was the framework within which the state administration operated until 1974.

The last dictatorship in Greece lasted seven years and ended in 1974. Since then there have been great changes in Greece but public administration has not yet changed. This last period can be divided in three parts. The first period (1975-1980) is the period when public administration removed many but not all of the elements of dictatorship, but instead of progressing it actually regressed. This period is characterized by the accession of Greece in the European Union, which was a strong reason for the modernization of public administration. Unfortunately, nothing happened in this direction and Greece lost one more opportunity to reach the level of developed European countries in this field. Thus, an old fashioned administrative system remained unchanged once more.¹¹ The second period (1981-1989) could be

characterized as the period of conscious departure from the challenge of adaptation. The main characteristics of this period were:

1. The effort towards embodiment in sociopolitical institutions of people who were at a lower social level.
2. Supposed intensive equality for all.
3. Doubling of the number of civil servants (343989 in 1974 and about 700000 in 1989).

In '80 the political leaders were afraid that civil servants would not cooperate in a broad field of change in Greek society.¹² This resulted in the retirement of all those at the top of public administration and their substitution by failed politicians.

During the third and last period (1990 up to the present day) 'modernization' was the goal of all governments. The content of 'modernization' was not always the same and in practice most of the initiatives were against the modernization. Meritocracy in appointment of civil servants has not always been the case and an attempt at decentralization was very weak. Thus, the situation in public administration has not changed, the main reason being the interference of politicians in administration. As Makridimitris¹³ states:

"centralization did not come by chance and this is the reason that its limitation is not easy. A study in Modern Greek history sufficiently proves this assertion. After a long struggle for independence, the state was built on a weak economy and a society of citizens, almost without roots in it... The new state

should be built quickly on new establishments different to those of the Ottoman Empire. Furthermore, national completion did not take place gradually but periodically: The Ionian islands embodied in 1864, Thessaly and a part of Epirus in 1881, the remaining part of Epirus, Crete, Macedonia and the islands of northern Aegean in 1912, Thrace in 1923 and finally Dodecanese in 1948.

The formation of a united national state was not unhindered. Thus, Kapodistrias met opposition and was finally assassinated before completing his undertaking. The weak administration of Bavarians, national disunity and the civil war were reasons for more centralized administration and the need for unified settlements.

The result was that where there had previously been no state, finally, 170 years later, we reached a situation where state and political parties, which were in power, absorbed all political activities and were rather an obstacle than a means for the development of economy and society. There were efforts towards decentralization during the 1950s and even more so during the 1980s, as now, which are still in progress to a certain degree but the results of which have not been so.”

Centralization helped politicians to control public administration and as will be seen later this is the main problem of the Greek administrative system.

5.3 The present situation within the Greek Administration System.

All students of the Greek administration system would certainly agree that the organizational-administration underdevelopment, together with the fiscal, is indeed great and is the main obstacle towards development. The underdevelopment of the state and its administration were initially the result of a series of unsuccessful actions but they are now the main reasons for socioeconomic underdevelopment.¹⁴ Indisputably there has been much effort to improve the level of state administration in Greece but to no avail; the main reason being the handling of problems in a fragmentary way. Vegleris underlines that:

“The basic reason for administrative immaturity in Greece is that the efforts made are piecemeal, without always having a logical link between them and not being linked with a broad plan or a certain goal. Usually these efforts are spontaneous or temporary and in most cases they remain incomplete or they fail.”¹⁵

On the other hand, it seems that the change of methods and procedures at a technical level does not necessarily change outlook and behaviour. This is actually the case in Greece where a difference between administrative practice and theory exists. There have been improvements at a technical level within Greek society, as for example, in technology, telecommunications, medicine, consumerism etc. but at the same time other social fields remain underdeveloped with traditional ways of organization and functioning not affected at all by modernization.¹⁶

The correct way to study the evolution of the Greek public administrative system would be to follow the reports of experts on this subject over the last fifty years. Immediately after the Second World War and the civil war, although Greece was in a very bad situation, there was an effort to organize the Greek economy. For this reason Kiriakos Varvaressos, an academic and former politician, wrote a report on the reconstruction of the Greek economy and administration, which he completed in 1952. He mentioned that the situation in the Greek public Administration was, at that time, at a very low level so it was impossible for the State to run even basic services, such as the collection of taxes. He also stated that there was no hope for any improvement of state economics since the problems within public administration were not suitably handed.¹⁷The main problems that Varvaressos underlined were:

1. The unequal distribution of personnel between the central and regional services, which resulted in the underdevelopment of rural areas.
2. The low level of morale, the indifference of civil servants job, the low level of efficiency and the even lower salaries of executives resulting from favouritism shown towards certain individuals. It caused a shortfall of experts within the administrative section and the bad quality of public services.
3. Bureaucracy and legalities were barriers to the improvement of performance in public services and the advancement of the economy.

Thus, Varvaressos recommended in his report measures to improve the administrative sector. He suggested an decrease in the number of civil servants removing all these who were incapable from their posts, the increase of salaries and the application of the meritocracy in employment.

At the time when Varvaressos had presented his report, Maragopoulos wrote another report on Public Administration¹⁸. He underlined the problem of the quality of civil servants and introduced in-service training.

Fifteen years later another report found that although it was vital to have reform within the administrative sector, nothing important had actually happened. Professor George Langrod, an OECD expert, found that nothing had changed except some secondary alterations.¹⁹

The fourth report on Greek public Administration was that of Professor F. Wilson in 1965. He stressed the problem of lack of coordination between

different services and introduced ways to correct it. His suggestions were never taken into account because of the dictatorship, which came into force in April 1967.

Another OECD expert, Professor D. Argyriadis produced his report on the Greek Public Administration during 1970. He focused on the modernization of the organization and administration mechanism of the State, which, to a great extent, was malfunctioning. He discovered the problems, which had been underlined in previous reports, and mentioned that the situation was deteriorating especially in the field of morale. The dictatorship created great problems in all sectors and also in Public Administration, which suffered greatly. All the above are described in the first report concerning the Public Administration which was written after the dictatorship. The report was made by the Centre for Planning and Economic Research and they found that the main problem within Administration was the great number of civil services, functioning independently without cooperating. Different forms of management, different salary scales and various kinds of organization of these services created chaos within the functioning of the State.

Some later reports followed, which focused on the modernization of the Public Administration sector. This, of course, was to be elusive since the basic problems of organization within the Public Administration remain unsolved.

It is useful to see data on the civil service in order to have a better view of the problems discussed earlier. Extensive emigration depopulated the countryside. This was due to the civil war (1945-1949) and resulted in the shift

of labour to the cities. The percentage yearly increase in the number of civil servants was greater than the percentage increase of the population. Thus, the number of civil servants was 54,909 during 1940 and increased to 72,671 in 1952, a mean yearly increase of 4.7 percent. The majority of civil servants were employed within the central Administration. Thus, huge organizations were created with low levels of productivity and efficiency.

During 1992 civil servants made up 17 % of the active population of the country. One out of three Greeks working in the tertiary sector was a civil servant. The following table clearly shows the number of Greek civil servants in 1992:

Sectors	Figures	Percentages
Civil servants (total)	615,956	
Education	117,000	19%
Security forces	51,230	8,3%
Armed forces	47,000	7,7%

Table 0 :The number of Greek civil servants in 1992.

More specifically, 49,000 civil servants were involved in primary Education as teachers, 59,000 in secondary Education and 9,600 at tertiary level. Since 1992 there has been effort to decrease the number of civil servants, thus decreasing the size of the civil service. 46,4 % of civil servants were working within the broader area of Athens and 52,8 % of those civil servants having a university degree were working in Athens.²⁰ Comparing these figures it becomes clear that the Athens area is developed while at the same time all other areas of Greece remain underdeveloped.

Another important feature concerning civil servants is that in 1992, 48,8% of civil servants were graduates of secondary education and only 13,9% had university degrees. Thus, 74,5% were educated at secondary level and so the myth of super-educated Greek civil servants is diminished. On the other hand, salaries of civil servants were and still are very low, whatever their qualifications. The group of graduates at secondary education level is very strong within the civil servants' union and tends to control its action. This resulted in the acceptance of the traditional, old fashioned model of civil servants and their union determines legislation which is according to this tradition and opposes every kind of modernization.

Another important aspect of Public Administration is the secondary level of local authorities. Since the Greek State was established in 1833, a network of local authorities has been established. There were improvements within the system during 1899, 1923 and 1950. In all cases, the local authorities were not independent and usually managed by second-rate politicians.²¹ Recent changes do not seem to have improved the situation.²²

In conclusion, it could be said that the political undermining of the Administration, especially during the last twenty years, is one of the main problems of the administrative system. Another main problem is the legalities, which very often substitute the normal functioning of state services²³ and, combined with the low level of personnel and management methods, creates a negative environment within the Administration. The absence of any well-organized further training of personnel and the lack of personnel with postgraduate qualifications are characteristics of the modern Greek Public Administration while the lack of any objective appraisal has led to the low quality of leaders within state services.

Within this administrative environment and under the circumstances, it is difficult to expect a high level of development of the Greek public administrative system. Thus, Mouzelis underlines the fact that reform in public administration has two dimensions. The first dimension being the technical improvement of public administration and the second the revision of the balance of forces between state and society.²⁴ He believes that both are necessary for reform within public administration. The enforcement of decentralization includes these elements and is one step towards modernization²⁵ and gives hope for the improvement of the Greek State Administration. Cooperation with other members of the EEC is one reason for the improvement of the Administration as the comparison with the administration of other developed European countries gives a measure of the problems within the Greek Administration and creates opportunities for

improvement. The political stability of the last few years will undoubtedly help in a more steady advancement of Administration.

Greek Education is severely affected by the administrative system of the Greek State. The environment in which Greek Education has been developed has not always been so healthy and the conditions under which it has operated have not always been of the best. The influence and the control of political parties over education, the lack of well-educated personnel in administration, the low level of allowances of heads and other administrative personnel, the frequent changes in legislation, the lack of any kind of appraisal system and the malfunction of teachers' unions have created a framework within which headteachers must work. These are the main constraints in the development of a school policy and in the administration of a school unit as can be seen later.

-
- ¹ Makridimitris A., *Administration and Society*, Themelio, Athens 1999, p.95.
- ² Report of research made by EKKE (National Center for Social Research) and published in the newspaper TA NEA, 28-29 May 1990.
- ³ Mesthaneos B., Thoughts for the Application of hierarchical relations in Greek Public Administration, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 2, May 1995.
- ⁴ Makridimitris A., *The Great Patient*, Papazisis, Athens, 1999, p. 274.
- ⁵ Mesthaneos B., *ibid.*
- ⁶ Flogaitis S., *The Greek administrative system*, Sakkoulas, Athens 1987p. 208.
- ⁷ Flogaitis S., *ibid.* P.294.
- ⁸ Flogaitis S., *ibid.* p. 167.
- ⁹ Flogaitis S., *ibid.* P.116.
- ¹⁰ Flogaitis S., *ibid.* p. 209.
- ¹¹ Makridimitris A., *Administration and Society*, Themelio, Athens, 1999, p.126.
- ¹² Flogaitis S., *ibid.* p. 54.
- ¹³ Makridimitris A., *The Great Patient*, Papazisis, Athens, 1999, p. 63.
- ¹⁴ Makridimitris A., *Administration and society*, Themelio, Athens, 1999, p.89.
- ¹⁵ Vegleris F., The National Need for Administrative Reform, *Nea Ikonomia*, February 1965, p. 105-112.
- ¹⁶ Makridimitris A., *ibid.*, p.138.
- ¹⁷ Makridimitris A., Michalopoulos N., (editors),*Reports of experts concerning Public Administration 1950-1998*. Papazisis, Athens 2000.
- ¹⁸ Makridimitris a., Michalopoulos N., *ibid.* P.33.
- ¹⁹ Makridimitris A., Michalopoulos N., *ibid.* p. 38.
- ²⁰ Makridimitris A., *Administration and Society*, p.270.
- ²¹ Makridimitris A., Administration and local authority in the county, *Review of Public Law and Administrative Law*, vol. 156, 1995.
- ²² Flogaitis S., *ibid.* p. 125.
- ²³ Alexiadis A., Peristeras B., Efficiency-productivity in the state administration, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7, January 1997, pp. 25-38.
- ²⁴ Mouzelis N., *In the preface of the" A. Makridimitris, Administration and Society"*, Themelio, Athens, 1999.
- ²⁵ Makridimitris A., *Administration and Society*, Themelio, Athens, 1999.

CHAPTER VI

6.1 Organization and administration of the Greek educational system.

Every system needs organization in order to function correctly and to achieve its goal. Organization is a tool to aid the achievement of the purpose of the system. A system of administration is the activation and function of this tool. Education as a subsystem of the State, has its own organization and administration which are directly affected by the organization and administration of the state and which bear its limitations and problems as detailed in the previous chapter. It must be mentioned here that a system of administration should be faced as a science and an art, which is necessary for the improvement of the efficiency of a system, for the rational distribution of the labour, and for the development of harmonious social relations.

The Greek State was a kingdom for approximately one and a half centuries. During that period the King and the army had absolute power. It was a period of wars, dictatorships and civil wars. Thus, the system of administration was the main tool for the imposition of the ideology of the State, of power and authority and of the organization of production and reproduction of the system.¹

In a centralized system there is only one authority, which holds all the power and Head the system of administration. All the other substructures of the system do not have any power, authority or independence. One main aspect

of a centralized system is to what extent an authority keeps all the power as a unique authority and to what extent all other substructures of a system are linked with a central authority.

This structure leads to an authoritarian authority and a despotic relation between authority and people. This is an extreme case of concentration of power linked with a strict hierarchy. All decisions are taken at the top of this hierarchy and all those underneath have no say and must only accept and implement the decisions. This is the case in the educational system in Greece. Historical reasons, as described in previous chapters, formed the base for such a system. Although there has been a great attempt towards democratization of the system during the last twenty five years, other reasons, such as the rapid expansion of the need for education, the increase of the population following the Second World War, the movement of people from the rural areas to the cities and mainly to Athens and Thessaloniki after the civil war, did not allow for creation of opportunities for improvement of the situation. The rapid increase of the number of the students and teachers, the greater number of schools and the need for more complex educational services created problems inside the school administration system. The low expenditure for education combined with the increase in demand for education created great changes in the structure of education. Thus, the administration of the Greek Education System, which reflects its level and quality, developed mainly empirically and secondly theoretically, facing great problems. Thus, its final structure is a linear one with variety in the balance of concentration and deconcentration of power depending on the historical

period and the political party in power at the time. Andreou and Papakonstantinou describe the Greek educational system as follows:

“The Greek educational system which is characterized as complicated, due to its size and the great number of structures, and is similar to bureaucratic models with certain unusual aspects.”²

It is useful to describe the Greek educational system and to give some information concerning its function. The description of the system will include the description of the structure, the function and the role of the Ministry of Education and the description of all other authorities, which function under the Ministry of Education.

6.2 The Administration of the Greek Ministry of Education.

As can be concluded, The Ministry of Education is not able to plan an educational policy for various reasons. First of all the concentration of too many duties, many of which are not so significant, leads the Ministry to play an executive role. Another reason is that the personnel have to cope with much triviality. The low level of education and expertise of the personnel does not allow them to work on the planning of educational politics and even more so on educational reform.³ Furthermore, the model of numerous hierarchical levels within the structure of the Ministry of Education makes things complicated and the procedures become arduous. Taking into account the fact that the Ministry of Education is the only educational authority in the whole system, which takes decisions, it, can be seen to be difficult to attempt educational planning and reform. Programming within the Greek educational

system does not exist except for financial programming. There is a service for programming within the Ministry of education but councils of 'experts' are often used and the result is that with every change of Minister there is also a change of councils and programming. Thus, there is no continuity in educational policy and there is no constant direction of education in order to cooperate with other policies of the State. As education needs rapid adaptation to this changing world, it is obvious that the existing centralized educational system does not allow for progress.

6.3 The Greek educational system.

According to legislation (Act 1304/82 and Act 1566/85) the administrative structure of primary and secondary education includes three successive levels of administration. The lower one is that of the school unit. Each school unit has a headteacher who is responsible for the proper functioning of the school and the observance of the law and one or two deputy headteachers who substitute for the Head when he is absent. The Teacher Council is responsible for the guidance of the school, for the application of the educational policy and the better functioning of the school. There also exist the municipal board for education and the School Board, which help with the functioning of the school. The latter plays a very crucial role since they are responsible for the allocation of money within the school and the control of many aspects concerning the functioning of the school.

The second level of administration of primary and secondary education is that of the prefectural level. In each prefecture there is one branch of Local

Authority for primary and one for secondary education. There are also several Offices of Education depending on the number of schools in each prefecture. All over Greece, there are 116 branches of Local Authorities and 223 Offices of Education for both primary and secondary education. Their main duties include the correspondence with the central service of the Ministry of Education concerning educational and managerial matters as well as financial affairs. In each prefecture there are regional educational councils, prefectural education councils that do not have real power and authority in the formation of educational policy. At a national level, there is a central service of the Ministry of Education, which is organised by the presidential decree 147/1976 and has six General Directories, Three Special Secretariats, 36 Directories, 117 Departments and approximately twelve Offices. Its personnel total approximately six hundred people and approximately 40% of them have university degrees. Other educational services at a national level are the Pedagogical Institute dealing mainly with curriculum design and book production, the Organisation for maintenance within school buildings and the Organisation for the publishing of school books.

As the administrative structure of education is a linear one it could be said that it forms a pyramid, with the Ministry of Education at the top and schools at the base. Administration and managerial responsibilities are concentrated at the top of the pyramid and at the base there are no such responsibilities remaining. The only responsibilities of Head of schools are executive responsibilities. The level of managerial responsibility could be described as an inverse pyramid with given instability.⁴All intermediate superintendents do

not have any authority over their subordinates, so they cannot be considered as leaders. Concerning the authority of the prefecture over education, it should be mentioned that their only responsibility and authority is limited to the maintenance of buildings.

It is useful to study the evolution of the Greek educational system during the last twenty-five years. The period 1976-1980 could be considered as a fruitful period for the modernization of the Greek education system. The same cannot be said for the administration of education, since the main problem in the organization of education still remains. The central problem was the complexity of the educational system that remained unchanged, the difficulty in planning and controlling and the great cost of administration. During this period a number of laws (i.e. 15,51,295/77 and 819,820/78) determined the structure of secondary education. According to these laws, Greece was divided into fifteen higher educational regions and one hundred and forty educational regions for secondary education. The supervisory personnel were general inspectors and supervisors. It was the first time that official and disciplinary councils had been established. Such councils included the central, the regional and the prefectural. Inspectors were also given authority to elect headteachers.

During the period 1981-1989 some main changes occurred according to Act 1304/82, 1238/82 and 1566/85. Thus, the positions of superintendents and general directors were abolished. Inspectors' positions were also abolished and instead positions of school advisers and superintendents of branches of local authorities and Offices of Education were established. School advisers

undertook the work of scientific and pedagogical guidance and superintendents of branches of Local Education Authorities and Offices of Education undertook managerial work. At that time, established organs of popular participation in education existed at three levels: national, regional and local. Except for school councils all other organs still do not participate significantly in administration of education. Lastly during that period, Head had a tenure of office for four years and it was the first time a number of yardsticks of evaluation were introduced for leading executives of education.

The period 1990-93 is characterized by the restoration of the previous system with permanent places for leading executives of education. It was a trial period of improvement in educational administration and decentralization, but the results were very poor, as the changes were very limited. From 1993 up to the present day there have not been any important changes in secondary education and especially in the administration system.

It should be underlined that during the twenty-four years of the period under examination certain changes have taken place in secondary education, but it cannot be said that educational administration has followed these changes. More than likely is the conservative and bureaucratic structure of the Greek Administration that restricts any attempt towards modernization of the structure and function of secondary education. Although there has been much discussion about the modernization of the role of local educational authorities and schools. There does not seem anywhere near the important changes as, for example, have happened in England and Wales during the last few years.⁵

6.4 The organisation and administration of secondary education in general.

A very crucial question about school administration is that of whether administrative decisions can be divorced from professional ones⁶ and Sayer responds:

“Delegation of finances to schools makes that a very difficult distinction to make. I cannot honestly say that in twenty years of headship I could distinguish between them. We try to make schools places in which the administration is appropriate to the main purpose of teaching and learning. Any decision includes both.”

M. Bottery insists that:

“... educational managers, as a professional group, do not like to get involved in social and political issues, preferring instead to see their core values in teaching, disseminating subject knowledge, pastoral care and managing the boundaries of their schools. Evidence suggests that they prefer to locate their work at the level of the individual and the institution. It also suggests that they are too burdened, too busy, too tired or too preoccupied with firefighting or implementation issues to really address these problems.”⁷

It is true that schools are complex organisations and their management includes a relatively high number of activities. Many of the activities within schools are unique and only experienced teachers can undertake them. As a lot of other activities exist i.e. financial control, accountability for achieving prescribed or agreed objectives within a given resource framework etc. many insist that industrial and commercial management techniques should be adopted in education for reasons of efficiency and effectiveness.⁸ However,

great attention must be given to the terminology as the use of certain terms such as 'quality', 'competence', 'target setting' etc. differ in business and in education. Another view of matters is that of the total absorption of business terminology. Bottery⁹ states that:

"It is also one which accepts a business terminology of standards, value-added targets, outcomes and benchmarking, all set within a competitive framework. In such a scenario, a schoolteacher becomes an implementor of external directives, a professional manager as much as teacher, and the monitor, evaluator and manager of pupils and pupil standards just as their proposals are for them. Such a role is then determined by policies which in turn are driven by state mediation of global forces-attempts at greater legitimation, control, and international economic competitiveness."

It is useful for educators to study theories and practices from other sectors, having in mind the difference in the meaning of terms and the nature of the organization. Indeed, there are many valuable lessons to be learnt from the business world as far as training of people is concerned and as schools become more business-like in order to meet criteria that globalization has established.

On the other hand, there are many who believe that schools are very different from business and given that the concept 'effectiveness' is problematic, there can be no single answer to the question of what is effective school management.¹⁰ Another significant difference is that in education the product is not easily measurable, so success cannot be measured.¹¹ Finally, there is an element which creates much difference between school and business. This is fundamental, as a question is raised concerning students: "Are they

workers, clients or products?" As society expects much from schools, they must always be flexible organisations, so they must develop more and more complex structures. Their management and administration become more difficult as the quality of schooling becomes progressively higher. Since schools are not businesses, it is useful to be aware of what kind of organisations they are.

There are different approaches to school management. One is the so-called Scientific Management Approach, which considers that all relations are based on a managerial manner. These structures are well organised, ignore human relations and needs and promote economic factors as unique in the system. The second approach is the so-called Human Relations Approach, which accepts human beings and their relations as being very important within a system. In fact there are combinations of the two above approaches, already in use. There are variations to the above approach but all¹² converge on the description of management features for effective schools. Ray Bolam¹³ describes them thoroughly as follows:

"... effective schools are likely to display certain common management features, including:

- Strong, purposive leadership by headteachers;
- Broad agreement and consistency between headteachers and teachers on school goals, values, mission and policy;
- Headteachers and their deputies working together as cohesive management teams;

- Involvement of teachers in decisions concerning school goals, values and mission;
- A collaborative professional and technical substructure;
- Norms of continuous improvement for staff and students;
- A leadership strategy which promotes the maintenance and development of these and related features of the school's culture;
- An enhanced capacity to engage in problem-solving related to the implementation of the national reforms.”

It is difficult to include all these aspects in school management training courses mainly because a real link does not exist between theory and practice. There is also a severe problem with literature in this field as it falls into at least four fairly distinct different types -produced by theorists, researchers, policy-makers and practitioners – and is rarely mutually informative and often contradictory. On the other hand, educational management is based on numerous subfields, some of which have a strong discipline base and some of which do not.

Educational managers, however, are also urged to examine what happens in other countries. Although educational systems are not always similar, there is a trend to merge educational systems of developed countries. This also happens in Europe where, The European Union encourages such a convergence and all other European countries when improving their educational system, have this in mind. This is difficult due to the different origins and organisations of European educational systems. Thus, the headteacher in a Spanish school is democratically elected from among the

members of the teaching staff for a term of office of approximately three years. Headteachers in England are selected and employed by the Governing Bodies on the basis of their qualifications and previous experience for an indefinite period. There are also differences in the proportional weight of representation of the principal groups in Governing bodies of the two countries.¹⁴ Thus, it is useful to have a look at some aspects of different management systems of schools. An OECD report of 1989 discusses the increase of school-based management instead of power of central authorities.¹⁵ This agrees with what was seen earlier and will be met in the following description of European efforts towards better education. In most countries there is debate about the correct balance between centralised and decentralised elements. Fons van Wieringen¹⁶ stated that:

“Moving away from an extremely centralised system, which also combined centralization with bureaucratization and exclusive party domination, was the first step towards a considerable degree of autonomy for schools. This has now resulted in a new combination of governance at central and local levels, which is probably still quite unstable.”

This is so in Sweden where¹⁷ the restructured educational system is based on decentralization, deregulation and the increased jurisdiction of local authorities. In Dutch schools directors act as employers as they are responsible for the quality of their school, they have their own budget, which is barely adequate and is sometimes supplemented by money from sponsors.¹⁸ In the Dutch educational system there is a situation very similar to that in England and Wales. Although Germany is traditionally a very centralized and regulated country, the first signs of increased autonomy are beginning to

emerge. In Italy the first debates on the topic of making schools less dependent on the government have only begun recently.¹⁹ The situation in France is very similar to that in Greece. Karastanije²⁰ describes the French situation as follows:

“... the director of a school is known as a ‘proviseur’, meaning provider. The ‘proviseur’ is someone who channels directives from the ministry to the school, and makes sure that these are carried out properly. These directives are also fairly detailed, and are meant to be followed to the letter.

The headteacher or ‘proviseur’ is a civil servant. Financial matters and personnel fall under the responsibility of the ministry. Employment, promotion and dismissal are tasks assigned to the inspector, who is also responsible for the quality of the personnel.

... it is not surprising that finances are fairly strictly regulated from above. Consequently, Head of schools are not that directly involved in the primary process in schools. This is why school management programs are so unusual in France.”

Another group of countries is those of central and Eastern Europe which were under a totalitarian regime. These countries have a long tradition of treating education as a political instrument controlled by the party, thus the first element of any reform is the depoliticizing of the educational system. There is a strong possibility that the educational systems of most of these countries could simply ‘change roles’, i.e. from being a servant of the state political machinery to being a servant within the free market economy. For example, in Hungary, the Education Act of 1985 gave more autonomy to schools and school Head but the insecure political system and the insufficient financing of schools restricted this autonomy. In Lithuania, in Romania and in Bulgaria

attempts were made towards educational changes after the fall of totalitarian regimes.

Thus, in most countries all teachers are employees of the state. This influences the position of the school Head, whatever the structure of the educational system.

There are many educationists who believe that schools must be independent and headteachers must have authority to employ teachers and fix salaries. They believe that these requirements should be the main focal point for independent schools.²¹

Globalization of the economy also affects education. Bottery states:

“... there is little doubt that the phenomenon of globalization has an impact upon organization, individuals and values, which is both greater and smaller than the nation-state, the benchmark for most people’s values for the last 200-300 years”²²

Until recently, schools in some countries used to create their own rules within their organizations. At the present time, strong demands for educational change tend to come from outside school, that is from industry and business. This leads to an increased dependence of schools on outside financial aid and to institutional uniformity.²³ One result of the above situation is that schools become, in a sense, more political than ever before and takes part more in social and economic progress. Thus, it should not be forgotten that schools have not yet become, and must not become market-oriented

institutions and it is also important to remember that the primary task of schools is that of educational nature.²⁴ One very important aspect of school management is that of political influence upon schools. No matter the level of decentralization, it is rather common for political parties to influence the functioning of schools. Peter Ribbins, in commending this influence states.²⁵

“Indeed there are indications that, despite the governments’ evident desire to reduce the level of political influence over schools, local political parties in some areas are reproducing themselves within governing bodies.”

Another result of the present situation is that, in order to have successful reforms in the educational system, these must be introduced in parallel with reforms in other areas such as economic and political areas. If education were to be examined worldwide, one could say that education is expanding and “as a society we have never been better educated. On the other hand, there is much evil in the delivery of education as one can imagine. This apparent contradiction, or inconsistency, is a consequence of treating all that is “good” as being the same.”²⁶

Eriksson,²⁷ in defending the traditional system, states:

“Anyway local initiative in a real sense has not been needed and encouraged. The school leader mainly has had a monitoring and administrating role (preserving and defending the system).

...it is important not to forget that there were good intentions behind the design of the old system. One of the reasons was the important intention to offer equal educational opportunity to all citizens wherever they live in our

wide country and irrespectively of the financial and other relevant resources of the community.”

This is true for most European educational systems and this is also the case within the Greek educational system. There are, of course, propositions for changes and reform according to economic and social reforms, but the feeling is that all these propositions are at a theoretical level, only. The assumption that educational administration can follow rules of administration within business and factories has not yet effectively been proved.

J. Sayer²⁸ describes the status of Head in several countries as follows:

“There are still some countries in which schools are managed by remote control, from outside, whether by State or by Church. That also affects what happens inside. The Head may then be either the senior teacher, primus inter pares, taking orders from offices and officers, or more probably may be the officer, the chief executive or branch manager appointed to carry out the company’s program in the branch. In the first case, there may be a sort of democracy among slaves, perhaps with staff electing the Head, all kinds of collegiate exercises, elections, rotations, collective responsibility, but with very little left to decide, beyond making sure that what is required is done properly. ... In the second case, the Head or perhaps a group of Head and deputies are vested with external authority.”

At the same time “ certain European countries are moving from that situation of remote control towards decentralization and indeed towards devolution of the school itself as a largely self-managing organisation in its immediate community.”²⁹ Two main problems are therefore introduced. The first is whether it is easy to allocate the power given to schools, between the Head and the governing body³⁰ and the second is that in an insecure society,

decentralization may lead to more control through accountability, rather than to more autonomy.³¹

Concluding, Fons van Wieringen³² states that:

“Too much centralization stifles local initiative. Too much responsibility at local level can jeopardize the realization of key tasks. The construction of a new balance between central and local accountability within a polycentric view of governance is a task that must be faced in the coming years.”

The study of theories of educational administration is of great importance. It is also important to study as many different international educational systems as possible, not only in the present context but also their evolution and history. However, it is not possible to examine all these areas at the present time, as it would involve extensive study of large mass of material. This chapter has included only the relevant aspects of educational administration focusing on secondary education, in order to assist in the study of the role of Head within Greek secondary education, which is reviewed in the following chapter.

-
- ¹ Andreou, A., Papakonstantinou G., *Authority and Organisation-Administration of Educational System*, Nea Sinora, Athens 1994, p. 112.
- ² Andreou, A., Papakonstantinou G., *ibid*, p.136.
- ³ Saitis Ch., Management of total quality: a new methodology for the modernization of the system of Education, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 9, 1997, pp. 4-51.
- ⁴ Andreou, A., Papakonstantinou G., *ibid*, p.137.
- ⁵ Riley K., Docking J. and Rowles D., Can Local Education Authorities Make a Difference?, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 27(1), pp. 29-44, 1999.
- ⁶ Sayer, J. *Training for school management in Europe in Training for Educational Management in Europe* edited by Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann, 1999.
- ⁷ Bottery, M., Global Forces National Mediations and Management of Educational Institutions, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 27(3), pp.299-312, 1999.
- ⁸ Bolam, R., Management Development for Headteachers, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3) 1997, pp. 265-283.
- ⁹ Bottery, M., *ibid*.
- ¹⁰ Bolam, R., *ibid*.
- ¹¹ Iordanidis, G., Schools and industrial or commercial organisations: similarities and differences, *Nea Paedia*, vol.85, 1998, pp. 84-94.
- ¹² Karagiorgis, A. Educational Administration, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 21-26, Andreou A., Papakonstantinou, G. *ibid*. p. 89.
- ¹³ Bolam, R., *ibid*.
- ¹⁴ MaLaffitte, R., A responsive approach to effective management development in European schools in Education management across Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993, p.124.
- ¹⁵ Bolam, R., *European problems and trends in Educational Management and Research in Educational management across Europe* edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993.
- ¹⁶ Fons van Wieringen 1989
- ¹⁷ Berg, G., *Steering school leadership and the invisible contract* in Research on Educational Management in Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons Van Wieringen, 1999.
- ¹⁸ Karstanje, P., *Developments in school management from a European perspective* in Research on Educational Management in Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons Van Wieringen, 1999, p.13.
- ¹⁹ Karstanje, P. *ibid*. p.14.
- ²⁰ Karastanje, P., *ibid*. p.12.
- ²¹ Psacharopoulos G., *Economics of Education*, Papazisis1999, p. 133.
- ²² Bottery, M., *ibid*, p.300.
- ²³ Fons van Wieringen , *Training for Educational Management in Europe*.
- ²⁴ Mapstone, R., *Staff management and the school principal in Local Management of Schools* edited by Ernie Cave and Cyril Wilkinson, 1990, p 111.
- ²⁵ Ribbins, P., *Managing Secondary Schools after the Act: Participation and Partnership?* In The Changing Secondary School edited by Roy Lowe, The Falmer Press. p.207
- ²⁶ Lang D., A New theory of Leadership, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 27(2), pp. 167-181, 1999.
- ²⁷ Eriksson, B., Autonomy and school-based management in Training for Educational Management in Europe edited by Fons Van Wieringen, Waxmann, 1999, p.46.
- ²⁸ Sayer J., *ibid.*, p.21
- ²⁹ Sayer, J., *ibid*. P.22.
- ³⁰ Ribbins P., *ibid*. p.194.
- ³¹ Sayer J., *ibid.*,p.25
- ³² Fons van Wieringen, *Social context of educational management*, in Research on Educational Management in Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1999.

CHAPTER VII

The role of a Head in Greek Secondary Education.

7.1 The role of a Head in secondary education in general.

The progress of a school is strongly linked with the ability of a Head. Personality, expertise and generally the quality of a Head strongly affect the whole organisation in a school. Thus, the main restriction, facing schools in any attempt towards change is ineffective management. Iordanidis¹ describes the situation in Greek schools as follows:

“ Possibly the most important problem facing schools during change is that of ineffective management. This concerns characteristics such as: lack of leadership and clear targets, Head with low intellectual skills, limited understanding and application of principles of programming, economic planning or achievement of mobilization and evaluation.”

However it is not only the Head's personality which affects the improvement of a school, but also the social framework surrounding schools which limits change to a certain extent. It depends on the Head's ability to work within a school society because there are social links between teachers (friendships, cliques, etc.) which are strong. Thus, a Head must have an ability to manage human relations in order to keep cooperation amongst teachers within a school. Schools are usually regarded as being conservative institutions and more often than not teachers absorb changes without, in fact, changing

anything. The present situation is possibly different to any previous situation as schools are changing their traditional structure and are becoming more complex organizations. In such a new environment Head have to play a more significant role. This is clear in the following quote by Hughes²:

“The general development of scale and size of operations within the educational system as a means of achieving greater economy tends to impose a system of authority whose principles of legitimacy are neither traditional to the professional organization nor acceptable to it, because of the limit of discretion of the teacher in serving the individual client. This then tends to focus upon the role of the Headmaster within the modern school, since it is he who, in one way or another, carries the responsibility for the economy and efficiency of the school system.”

There are two main streams in the way Head should be recruited. Firstly that Head are teachers and work with teachers so, they must come from the teaching profession and secondly that schools are organizations, which must be cost effective so Head must be recruited according to business and commercial criteria. There are many reasons leading to the conclusion that Head and other school administrators must be recruited from the teaching profession and must have a strong specialization and expertise in school management³. The central problem is the lack of provision for improving expertise in school management for teachers on such a required scale. It is true that Head do very little actual teaching and spend their time on secretarial or managerial work. Decision-making skills are needed, which affect the functioning of schools but very often their duties simply include pedagogical and teaching expertise. Hughes stresses this fact as follows:

“The fact that he must carry it out in a situation in which many of the ‘subordinates’ are also both similarly trained and highly experienced, is a complication likely to increase the strain upon him, and incidentally to differentiate him from many managerial specialists in industry (who are often recruited from a totally different background and thus ‘protected from this problem)”.⁴

It is true that Head have to work within an environment where all employees have approximately the same origins, being all graduates of universities, they all have pedagogical and teaching expertise, thus Head must have training and expertise of a high quality in their subject and in the teaching profession, together with high level training and expertise in management. In many cases, researchers⁵ believe that professionalization of school management has increased the power of school managers relative to their communities. One question, which needs to be answered, is that of whether it is possible to describe what effective school management means. It is accepted that technical efficiency in the form of improved student outcome is measurable and can provide grounds for organizational legitimacy. In this case, schools have an external acceptance but this is not sufficient for the proper functioning of a school. As Willower⁶ states:

“... In any event, a clear implication is that school managers should be politically astute individuals who can cope with multiple demands from the environment and fashion some sort of negotiated order that features external legitimation and support and the internal autonomy required for responsible decision making.”

It is obvious that Head must engage in the successful functioning of schools and this is not a matter of external acceptance but rather a matter of good internal organization. Mapstone⁷ states that:

“Headteachers have a major responsibility towards the internal organization, management, and control of the school. They should direct their skills to establishing effective structures and processes which are as simple, clear, and understandable as possible.”

The internal structure of a school means mainly the professional development of teachers and their help in the development of quality teaching. “Principals are faced with a dilemma: they have to act as managers taking decisions in the interest of the organization and they also have to support the professional values of their colleagues which defines good practice. So, in order to increase the policy making capacity of schools, principals should strike a balance between administrative and educational functions within their total work.”⁸

It should be mentioned that in both fields, managerial and educational Head is the key to the introduction of any innovation⁹. Some think that the pedagogical and the scientific roles of a Head should be distinguished¹⁰. Thus, a Head has a three-dimensional job to do with all sectors being equally important. Considering that education, after a long period in which the educational system was centrally steered, has developed a decentralised system increasing the autonomy of schools, Head have to play a more important role. In increasing the autonomy of schools, Head are not only responsible within a given framework for the functioning of the school but also included within this



framework are strict economic factors and limits. "It is this which separates his role from that of professional colleague without the status of being a 'Head'."11

There are some people¹² who believe that the similarities between Head and managers in businesses are more than the differences. Researchers do not accept this. The most common idea on this subject is that: "Instructional leadership and administrative management should not be seen separately from each other, but seen as two activities which are interwoven. So, effective school leadership requires for a balance between administrative and educational aspects within the total work of the principal."¹³ In fact Head spend most of their time on administrative tasks, while at the same time wishing to spend more time on the educational aspects of their work. As autonomy within schools is increased, the administrative role of Head could become more central. K. Peters¹⁴ referring to this problem states that:

"Dutch research on school organisations has shown that schools become better capable of policy-making if the administrative and instructional domains are more attuned. In other words, schools are better policy makers if school management and teachers cooperate more closely and show joint responsibility for both domains.

...This means that teachers are primarily, but not exclusively, responsible for the instructional (professional) domain, and that school managers are primarily, but not exclusively, responsible for the administrative (bureaucratic) domain."

It seems that two main aspects are necessary for a good Head. The first being a knowledge of the nature of what it is to be human and the other is the

dinstinction between leadership and management.¹⁵ These two conditions are essential as the role of teachers and school leaders often overlap and a complicated internal relation links all components of a school. G. Berg¹⁶ analyses and stresses the same aspects from a different point view. He states that:

“ If the tasks of school leaders are regarded from a point of pure legality, the demands can be formulated in such a way as that the school leaders' function is one of being responsible for the activity. Conversely, if we look at school leaders from the point of view of teacher legitimacy, the demands can be formulated in such a way as that school leaders are first and foremost expected to act as a 'primary bureaucrat'. The main task of school leaders in their capacity as responsible for the activity is making sure that government directives are followed, whereas the main function of a primary bureaucrat is to administer and run the activity on its own terms. These divergent demands can in fact be seen as diametrically opposed points on a scale expressing the various (in this case the state's and teachers' respectively) demands on school leaders as a professional group.”

Teachers control the content and form of teaching, while school leaders control administration and the day to day running of the school. If we assume that this is true, it follows that an 'invisible contract' between school leaders and teachers exists with the following implications: Administration is left to school leaders on the condition that school leaders do not interfere with the content and form of teaching. In other words, the role of the school leader as purely one of being responsible for the school activity must in some way intrude into the domain of teachers as expressed above in the description of the 'invisible contract'. It is likely that a potential source of conflict between the professions of teachers and school leaders can be discerned here.”

Bottery¹⁷ insists that the cooperation between Head and teachers is not a genuine participative collegiality. He adds that as the communication between schools is limited, as “schools struggle to survive in an educational market place, the final implication is one of increased pressure and stress upon the individual at the Head of the school, and the alienation of the teachers. As governments increasingly espouse a management literature which sees the principal in heroic and pivotal mould, and as inspection reports increasingly stress the primacy of good leadership in the search for more effective and efficient schools, one should not be surprised by increasing evidence of early retirements, increased stress and the slower take-up of such senior management positions.” On the other hand, it is accepted that high salaries and social status, which are linked with the higher positions in an organization, are strong reasons for managerial positions being attractive.¹⁸ It is true that a headship is for many teachers, a way of moving out of the stability which a long-term teaching gives¹⁹ but a headship is not an easy job because it requires the headteacher to have personnel management abilities and a strong sense of personal self-worth.

Bolam²⁰ dealing with heads' qualities stated that: “... research and experience indicate that effective schools are likely to display certain key management features, including:

- a. strong, purposeful leadership by headteachers,
- b. broad agreement and consistency between headteachers on school goals, values, mission and policy;

- c. headteachers and their deputies working as cohesive management teams;
- d. involvement of teachers in decisions about school goals, values and mission;
- e. a collaborative professional and technical sub-structure;
- f. norms of continuous improvement for staff and students;
- g. A leadership strategy which promotes the maintenance and development, of these and related features of the school's culture.
- h. An enhanced capacity to engage in problem-solving related to the implementation of national reforms.”

All the above characteristics are essential for the everyday running of a school, but is something more needed for the development of an organisation.

The essential characteristic of a leader is to have vision. As Lang²¹ states:

“They (leaders) are ‘ends-oriented’, whereas managers are ‘means-oriented’, helping leaders to get to where they want to go. This independency is not only necessary, it is unavoidable. Hodginson argues consistently that matters of administration or leadership are fundamentally philosophical while matters of management are fundamentally scientific.

The movement (from administration/policy to management/science) is always in the same direction: from ideas to things, from the abstract to the concrete, and always via the mediation of people.”

It needs long discussion if Heads are to function more as leaders than as managers do. As they spend most of their time in school for certain activities there is not much possibility to move out of the margins. There are many classifications of the headteachers' responsibilities where only a very small area includes policy making instead of the main volume of the heads' work which is managerial, time consuming with only a slight possibility of making plans for the future. Mac Clearly and Thompson²² classified the headteacher's job responsibilities into the following nine task areas:

1. Program development (curriculum, instructional leadership)
2. Personnel (evaluation, advising, conferencing, recruiting)
3. School Management (weekly calendar, office budget, correspondence, memos, etc.)
4. Student activities (meetings, Supervision, planning)
5. Student behaviour (discipline, attendance, meetings)
6. Community (advisory groups, parent conferences, etc.)
7. District Office (meetings, task forces, reports, etc.)
8. Professional Development (reading, conferences, etc.)
9. Planning (annual, long term).

It is clear that only a few of the above mentioned responsibilities refer to a leader, they are rather the responsibilities of a manager. Taking into account that the Greek educational system is strictly centralised, Greek headteachers could be considered rather as representatives of the Ministry of Education than as independent managers of schools. It is very rare for a Greek headteacher to be a leader. Headteachers must at least be prepared firstly, in technical matters of administration, such as methods and procedures of education, economics and logistics of education, etc. and secondly, they must have the human expertise of communication and cooperation on an individual/group basis. Lastly, conceptual ability of a Head is needed, in order to shape the total image of the functioning of a school. It is an urgent task to give Greek schools much greater independence in order to have Head who can be managers and in some cases leaders. It is believed²³ that this is the proper way to support educational changes and reforms.

There are many who try to compare the position of Head with that of managers in business as seen earlier. There are different approaches to the subject and it seems that there is no unique way of doing this. It is rather easier to underline various differences between the two roles than to compare them systematically. As seen earlier, the role of a Head is limited and there is no possibility for long term planning, while the role of a manager is mainly to plan and organize their organization for the future. Head deal very much with students and spend much time communicating with parents. Thus, Head deal mainly with the internal problems of a school while managers are interested mainly in competition within a broad external environment. Iordanidis²⁴ in

trying to describe differences between Head and managers underlines the fact that:

“ The most noticeable element of a school for anybody who comes from another organization is the absence of offices. It seems a joke but the fact is that there are few offices in a school for the Head, the deputy Head and the secretary. The lack of management offices or meeting rooms is the visible side of this characteristic of schools. Moreover, most teachers would like to concentrate on their teaching and to restrict, as far as possible, their occupation with administration.”

There are also some, who believe that there are many similarities between Head and managers in business. They²⁵ underline bureaucratic and planning similarities but forget that Head deal mainly with students and parents, which is far different from producing products. Another element of comparison between Head and managers in business is that all their organizations have to survive within a competitive environment, but in fact the pressure level is not the same. Relations between Head and teachers are rather better than relations between managers and experts in business, because in the second case there is a race to prove which member of staff is the most capable and profitable for the company. Relations amongst schools are not so important for their functioning and all the external pressure on schools tends to come from superintendents and society, while businesses have continuous pressure from comparison with other businesses.

Thus, any discussion about the nature of a headteacher's job tends to be very long and needs more extensive research than is done here. It is evident that a

Head is not only a manager but also an educationist. Because of the complex organization of a school, Head should be considered as a separate class of leaders within an organization.

7.2 The role of a Head in Greek secondary education.

What is usual today in Greek secondary education is that Head follow the traditional way. They come from the educational sector, after a long successful career in teaching. The question is whether a successful teaching career is enough to guarantee a successful headship. A good teacher cannot automatically be transformed into a good manager.²⁶ Both professions require special qualifications and experience. The way of preparation, election and evaluation is also different in each area. As a teacher has special problems in teaching his own subject, so Head have special problems in running schools within a certain legal framework. Saitis²⁷ describes these problems as follows:

“Looking at the function of any school system we can see that it is defined by a net of legal rules (i.e. acts, presidential decrees, etc.) which determine all sides of educational procedure. This means that all schools within our country are under the supervision and control of central administration.

In fact, however, the existing framework of school legislation does not help executives of education in their work. This happens because school legislation:

- Changes very often and easily, due to a lack of long term planning and programming and frequent governmental changes.

- Increases rapidly which means that there is the phenomenon of multiple legislation.
- Presents samples of legal disagreement.
- It is common to meet legal gaps and obscurities, which create a bad labour environment and difficulties in the functioning of schools. The determination of responsibilities between the Head of a school and the Teachers Council is one such example.”

In conclusion, it could be stated that the functioning of any school system has its limits because of multiple legislation, a lack of legislation and ambiguity of legislation. All the above certainly create great problems in school administration and Head devote much of their time and effort in order to overcome bureaucratic legal obstacles. Thus, there is little time left for Head to deal with the student environment and so they restrict their interest and effort within school. Usually Head do not create opportunities for the school system to follow the path set by society due to an incomplete legal framework and lack of management training for Head. Saitis²⁸ states that 88% of Head had never had any specific training in school management.

Article 11 of Act 1566/85 states that “... the Head of a school is mainly responsible for the proper function of the school, coordination of school life, observance of laws, circulars and official directives and application of decisions of the Teachers Council...” In fact, Head have many other duties to fulfil such as communication with students and parents, supervision of school buildings, teaching, official correspondence, keeping records, communication

with municipal authorities, with local educational authorities etc. which are necessary for the school to function properly.

As seen previously, a strict inspection system was in power within the framework of a centralized educational system. This led to the abolishment of teacher appraisal since 1982, the tenure of office for four years for Head and some other crucial changes in school administration. Under these circumstances legislation gives power to Head but, in fact, they in turn, do not have any way of wielding that power over teachers. It is not only that teachers have permanent contracts, but also that they do not have any fear of appraisal and finally their salary depends only on seniority. There was a long period from the beginning of the Greek State during which the position of headteachers had high prestige. This was linked more with their leading role and less with their salaries, a matter, which will be examined in the following chapter. It must be underlined that during that period the number of secondary schools was small and society had a different appreciation of Head.²⁹ During the dictatorship, the number of secondary schools increased but appreciation of the job of teachers and Head decreased. During the period after the dictatorship (1974 to the present day) the frequent changes of Head due to tenure of office, their election according to their political beliefs, although this is not true for all Head, led to the lowering of appreciation of the contribution made by Head. It is accepted that teacher appraisal is urgently needed and is very crucial to Greek education since the teaching profession has now been without any form of control for the last twenty years.

The role of a Head under the present circumstances is vague and this creates a feeling of insecurity. Although Head share responsibilities with the Teachers Council, society sees Head as being responsible for everything that happens in schools. Every Head has many responsibilities which are not written in their job description but which are necessary for the proper functioning of schools i.e. Head have to help newly appointed teachers and guide them in order to be effective.³⁰ Unfortunately, today many Head are not well prepared for their duties and they cannot face school problems effectively.

It is useful at this point to see what Greek legislation provides for school management. A headteacher is the top of the hierarchy within school management and the deputy Head substitutes for him in the case of absence. In some schools there is a secretary who helps with the paperwork. The Teachers' Council is the other power within the framework of school management. There are also the School Board and School Committee and the Municipal Committee for education, which play secondary role in the whole management of a school. It is useful to study Act 1566/85, which describes mainly the responsibilities of each of the above-mentioned authorities.

So, according to Act 1566/85 the Head of a school should be competent and responsible for the proper function of school, the coordination of school life, the observance of the law, circulars, and official directives and the implementation of decisions of The Teachers Council. He takes part in teachers' appraisal within his school and cooperates with School Advisors.

The Headteacher is also the President of the School Council, of which all teachers are members and is responsible for planning, for better and more efficient application of educational policy and the proper functioning of the school. His main responsibilities are:

- The implementation of timetable and curriculum.
- The health and protection of students, the cleanliness of the school building and the organisation of school life.
- The scale of school requirements and their implementation.

As can be seen, Act 1566/85 describes Head responsibilities in a very general way and does not give strict and complete descriptions for every one of these. Circular 6492/11-1-83 of the Ministry of Education describes more completely Head responsibilities. It states that a headteacher:

1. Represents a school in all external relations.
2. Informs the Teachers Council about laws, and is responsible for their observance.
3. He is responsible for keeping official books and for official correspondence.

4. He signs qualification papers, agrees to students registration according to the law, etc.
5. He is responsible for school timetables.
6. He is responsible for recording students' grades.
7. He calls parents and informs them of matters which he thinks necessitate personal contact.
8. He is responsible for sanitary arrangements within the school.
9. He takes care of the maintenance and repairing of school buildings.
10. He is responsible for teachers' payment and keeps relevant records.
11. He recommends the employment of cleaners.
12. As secretary of The School Board, he suggests drawing attention to the needs of the school in repairs, furniture and materials necessary for the correct functioning of the school.
13. He forms committees for examinations.
14. He keeps records of teachers.

This is a general description of a Head responsibilities, which does not include many important responsibilities, necessary for the functioning of a school. The Deputy headteacher has no independent power and is simply employed to assist the Head. According to Act 1566/85 a Deputy Head substitutes for the Head when necessary, helping him in running the school and being responsible for school administration. Circular 6492/11-1-83 of the Ministry of Education describes a Deputy Heads' responsibilities as follows:

1. Substitutes the Head.
2. Signs school leaving certificates given by the school.
3. He is the one responsible for completing and sending statistical indices.
4. He makes out the list of on duty teachers for each day.
5. He is informed on correspondence of school and takes care of forwarding and filing documents.
6. He is responsible for the final report on individual student behaviour.
7. He takes care of the proper functioning of the school.

Thus, it becomes clear that deputies are not independent and have no crucial responsibilities. Their role is not well described and it depends on a certain deputy and on a certain Head what the role of a deputy could be within school

administration. In most cases, deputies simply observe what Head is doing and only in some cases do Head and deputies act as a team. Head and deputy Head must usually do paperwork, which takes a great deal of their time and effort. Although most schools should have secretaries, the fact is that few schools have a secretary and, furthermore, it is rare that a secretary is trained to do his job efficiently. Introduction of the establishment of secretaries in schools was a step towards an independent administrative service within schools, different from the educational service, run by experts in this field.³¹ Although Act 817/78 introduced secretaries into schools and Act 1566/85 repeated this, only 35% of secondary schools, which should have a secretary according the law, now have. There are also small schools, with fewer than 200 students, which have no secretaries by law. The level of services which secretaries offer to schools and their expertise is very low.

Another important component of school administration is The Teachers Council. Act 1566/85 and circular 6492/11-1-83 of the Ministry of Education describe its structure and responsibilities as follows:

1. All teachers of a school are members of its Teacher Council.
2. In Teachers Council meetings the Head of the school is President and in case he is absent, the President is the Deputy Head.
3. Subjects of discussion in Teachers Council must not be the exclusive responsibility of the Head or another school authority.

4. Representatives of students can participate in Teachers Council Meetings to express their opinions.
5. The Teachers' Council is responsible for the legal functioning of the school.
6. The Teachers Council, cooperating with The Parents Association and The Students Council decides on the improvement of conditions in the functioning of the school.

It is obvious that the law considers The Teachers Council as the main power, together with that of the Head, who guides and runs schools. Unfortunately, The Teachers Council responsibilities and authority are not described in details. Act 1566/85 states that presidential decrees will define Head authority and responsibilities as well as The Teachers Council authority and responsibilities but these decrees have not appeared yet although sixteen years have passed. As a result, there is an overlapping of responsibilities and authority; there are conflicts between Head and teachers which create severe problems in the functioning of schools.

Another organ, which plays a role in school management, is the School Council. It is an organ, which faces various problems within the framework of a school. Members of The School Council is made up of all the teachers, members of the administration of The Parents Association and three student representatives. This Council is responsible for the proper functioning of the school, for finding ways of better communication between school and parents,

for student health and the improvement of the school environment. Although it seems that this council helps in school management, in fact it does not work properly and often, when it does work, tends not to come to successful conclusions. The functioning of The School Council will be researched later.

The School Committee is the last council within the school administration structure, which helps in the running of a school. It is linked with the financial affairs of schools, so it plays a key role. A School Committee is usually responsible for more than one school and its members are the Head of the schools participating in this particular committee, a member of The Parents Association from each school and a student representative from each school. This committee is responsible for allocation of money in order to cover operational costs, maintenance and repairs of buildings and their equipment. Other responsibilities of The School Committee are to introduce to The Local Educational Authority the requirements of schools concerning furniture, equipment and books for school libraries. Lastly, The School Committee is responsible for suggesting any measures for the managerial support of schools. The functioning of School Committees will be researched in the following chapter.

In order to complete the study of the framework of Greek school administration two committees should be described, which work outside schools but directly affect them. These are Municipal committees for Education and Prefectural Committees for Education. Both were introduced through Act 1566/85. The Municipal Education Committee is a board responsible for planning and acting on educational problems at a municipal

level. It can make suggestions to the mayor about the organization of schools, allocation of money among schools and the maintenance and repairs of school buildings. Although The Municipal Education Committee has to play a very important role, in fact this depends on its members. Usually conflicts among political parties are transferred within this committee, which often patronizes a certain political party. This is the main but not the only reason for its malfunction.

The Prefectural Education Committee is responsible for planning and acting at prefecture level. It suggests to the prefect any necessary information concerning the establishment of new schools, the merging of others or the division of schools. It also allocates money for repairs and maintenance of schools at a prefectural level. This committee faces the same problems as the previous one and has difficulty in functioning efficiently.

It became clear that the role of headteachers is crucial for the correct functioning of a school and affects the level of secondary education. As seen, heads do not do the same job as managers in business because the nature of schools is completely different from that of other organizations. Schools are becoming more complex and more competitive organizations, so they need heads better trained in all components of their job, the managerial, the professional and the educational. Head in Greek schools follow the traditional way of directing. They are not specially trained in management and the usual criterion for the election of a Head is seniority. The centralized Greek Educational System does not allow Head to be leaders of a school and the only role which they have is to apply orders. Although there has been no

teacher appraisal at all for more than twenty years, secondary schools are working at a high level. This is not of course reason for leaving things unchanged. It is obvious that in our continuous changing economic and social environment, changes in education and especially in educational management are urgent. It is broadly accepted that Head could play a central role in any effort towards change. A better profile of Head could also give a better profile to schools. There is no time left for Greek secondary education to follow European standards. As seen up to this point, the evolution of Greek education has followed a very conservative path and it is important to research what the situation is at the present time. This will be done in the following chapter.

-
- ¹ Iordanidis G., Managerial approach to organisations and schools, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 11, 1998, pp. 84-94.
- ² Hughes, M., *Secondary school Administration. A Management Approach*. Pergamon Press, 1974, p. 52.
- ³ Hughes, M., *ibid.*, p. 25.
- ⁴ Hughes, M, *ibid.*, p. 63.
- ⁵ Willower D., *Organization theory and the management of schools* in World Yearbook of Education 1986, edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page, 1986, P.30.
- ⁶ Willower D., *ibid.*, p31.
- ⁷ Mapstone, R., *Staff management and the school principal* in Local Management of Schools edited by Ernie Cave and Cyril Wilkinson, 1990. p.104.
- ⁸ Peters, K., Slegers P. and Bergen T., *The task of perception and the task orientation of Dutch principals: results of a preliminary study* in Research on Educational Management, 1999.
- ⁹ Mavroskoufis D., The matter of evaluation of Heads' selection: Historical dimension and present situation, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 87, 1998, pp. 143-159.
- ¹⁰ Kothali E., The cooperation of headteachers with school advisers. *Logos kai praxi*. Vol. 31, 1987 pp. 75-79.
- ¹¹ Hughes, M. *ibid.*, p. 64.
- ¹² Iordanidis, G., Schools and industrial or commercial organisations: similarities and differences, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 85, 1998, pp. 130-136.
- ¹³ Peters, K. et al., *ibid.*
- ¹⁴ Peters K. et al., *ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Lang D., A New Theory of Leadership, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol 27(2), pp. 167-181, 1999.
- ¹⁶ Berg G., *Steering school leadership and the invisible contract* in Research on Educational Management in Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1999.
- ¹⁷ Bottery M., Global Forces, National Mediations and Management of Educational Institutions, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 27(3), pp. 299-312, 1999.
- ¹⁸ Trilianos A., Exercise of authority and Heads, *Logos kai Praxi*, 1987.
- ¹⁹ Benaim Y., Humphreys K., Gaining entry: challenges for the novice headteacher, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 17, No 1, pp. 81-94, 1997.
- ²⁰ Bolam R., *European problems and trends* in Educational management and Research in Educational Management across Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993. p. 16.
- ²¹ Lang D., *ibid.*
- ²² Mc Clearly and Thomson, *The Senior High School Principals, Volume III, The Summary Report*. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- ²³ Pasiardis P., Models of Educational Management, A critical approach, *Paedagogiki Epitheorisi*, 18, 1993, pp. 5-29.
- ²⁴ Iordanidis, G., *ibid.*
- ²⁵ Iordanidis, G., *ibid.*
- ²⁶ Pasiardis, P., *ibid.*
- ²⁷ Saitis, Ch., Management of total quality: a new methodology for the modernization of the system of Education, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 9, 1997, pp. 21-51.
- ²⁸ Saitis Ch., *ibid.*
- ²⁹ Mavroskoufis D., *ibid.*
- ³⁰ Kothali E., *ibid.*
- ³¹ Alamanis Th., The establishment of Secretary of schools and its offer in running schools. *Diavazo*. 334, 1994, pp. 25-33.

Chapter VIII

The role of Headteachers in recent years.

8.1 The role of Headteachers in Greek secondary education, during the period 1974-1999 with special reference to the years following Act 1566/1985.

In this chapter an effort is made to overview the present situation of Heads of secondary schools in Greece. The evolution of the role of Head within the framework of Greek Education from 1821 up to the present day having been studied in previous chapters. Other subjects, such as the initial studies and the in-service training of Headteachers, the selection and appraisal of Head teachers, the payment of Headteachers and the role of women as Headteachers we will examine in next chapter. Finally, an outline of the Greek administrative system, of the organization and administration of the Greek educational system and of the organization and administration of Greek Secondary Education was attempted. The main area of interest is Act 1566/1985 in which the role of the Head in secondary schools is spelt out quite clearly. Thus, a study of the present situation in the light of Act 1566\1985 will give a profile of Heads of present day Greek secondary schools.

Act 1566 of 1985 is the basic law by which the government tried to reform all levels of education. Especially for secondary education Act 1566/85 changed both the structure and organisation within secondary schools. There were crucial changes within the area of school management with an effort towards decentralisation, which remained incomplete, as many details which should have been described in presidential decrees, were never actually published.

In order to make this research more effective; three areas of relative research were studied initially. The first was the “analysis and perceptions of leadership behaviour of Greek secondary school administrators” by Myron Zavlanos¹, which is probably the only research focused on Greek secondary school Heads. The second was an MA dissertation by A. Lainas under the title “Administrative organization of Primary Schools in Greece with special Reference to the Role of the Head.” The third was the research done by Saitis who, together with his colleagues, examined many aspects of primary school leadership. As can be clearly seen, there is no systematic research on the subject, as school management and administration are not considered to be important by the Greek educational authorities.

8.2 Method of research.

As educational administration is an important area for all developed countries, it is believed that the Greek educational authorities will soon start working in the direction of development of knowledge and research. Although studies on primary teachers in school administration at university level do actually exist, no studies have been done on secondary teachers. This is one of the main reasons for attempting this research. Interviewing was preferred as the research method for various reasons. It gives the opportunity for extensive personalisation with the possibility of further questioning, so it allowed research in greater depth than with other methods of data collection, providing access to further information on what a person likes or dislikes (values and preferences) and what a person thinks (attitudes and beliefs). There are, of course, limitations in the method as, amongst other limitations, the number of respondents was small, and the process was time-consuming. After some experimental interviews giving the interviewer initial experience, he was able to put the interviewee at ease and so obtain his full co-operation. Before meeting the interviewee, information was collected on him as such his background and career, his ability in school administration, etc. One main problem was that some interviewees tended to answer as they thought fitting to the interview situation rather than openly and honestly. This problem was overcome by using additional

questions. There was a schedule of interviews, divided into two parts. One involved scheduled questions with the expectation of a certain form of answer. In this case all alternatives were included so a simple tick could indicate the correct choice. The other, the most extensive, involved unstructured interviewing, in order to gain more personal information. The conversation was recorded, and studied later. Most interviewees agreed to this process and only five of them decided to actually write down their answers. There was one particular occasion where the Head refused to answer the questionnaire at all. Finally, some questions needed a scaled response and a ranking response as this helped to decrease the time of the interview and increase the depth of results. Experience was gained through the visits to various schools, the personal contact with various Heads and the informal discussions which followed every interview. The time spent on each interview was about one hour on average. The time needed for preparation, transportation and decoding was more than three hours per interview. The sample was such that it included all kinds of schools, large and small, general and vocational and in rural and urban areas.

8.3 General information on Greek secondary education.

Some useful information, concerning Greek secondary education, will be given in order to have an idea of schools as a whole and of secondary schools separately. All data given below is taken from the Greek Statistical Service and concern the school year 1997-98.

	Lower high school	Upper high school	Total
State	1755 92%	1141 93.1%	2896 92.3%
Private	158 8%	84 6.9%	242 7.7%

Table 1. Number of secondary schools.

	Lower high school	Upper high school	Total
State	375654 95%	218893 94%	594547 95%
Private	17165 5%	14366 6%	31531 5%

Table 2. Number of students in secondary schools.

The study of tables 1 and 2 shows clearly that the vast majority of secondary schools in Greece are state schools, where students receive free education. The administration, structure and studies in private schools are the same as in state schools, due to the centralized educational system and the power of educational laws over all Greek schools. The following table gives the student size of Greek secondary schools.

Size	Lower high schools	Upper high schools	Total
Up to 100 students	428	327	755 26,5%
101-200	378	261	639 22,4%
201-300	407	240	647 22,6%
301-400	365	161	526 18,5%
401-500	142	76	222 7,8%
501-600	28	27	55 1,9%
601-700	5	4	9 0,3%
701-800	2	-	2 0,07%
Total	1755	1096	2851

Table 3. Size of Greek secondary schools.

As can be seen from the above table generally speaking the size of Greek secondary schools is small since 71.5% of them have less than 300 students and only 10% have more than 400. It must be underlined that one quarter of secondary schools have less than 100 students. This is due to the low birthrate and due to life on the small islands where it is not possible to transfer

students daily to another place as often happens on the mainland. The small size of schools causes various managerial problems, as will be seen later. It is useful to mention that the ratio of students per class is about 22 and the ratio of students per teacher is 11. Other useful data includes the level of personnel in education. Table 4 gives the number of teachers in secondary schools.

	Lower high school		Upper high school		Total	
	total	women	total	women	total	Women
Permanent	33147	21253	18428	9254	51575	30507
Temporary	3993	2300	2045	1195	6038	3495
Total	37140	23553	20473	10449	57613	34002

Table 4. Number of teachers in secondary schools.

It should be underlined that 63% of lower high school teachers and 51% of upper high school teachers are women. Another important figure is that 1.6% of secondary teachers have an MA and 0.8% a Ph.D. although 33% have some kind of further education beyond university. Referring to the age of secondary teachers it should be said that 40.6% are under 33 years of age, 44.1% are between 33 and 43 while, 15.3% are over 43 years of age.

It must be mentioned here that there is lack of ancillary personnel, as is shown in the following table.

	Lower high schools	Upper high schools	Total
Secretaries	406	352	758
Caretakers-cleaners	2482	1367	3489

Table 5. Ancillary personnel.

Thus, only 26% of secondary schools have a secretary and every school has, on average 1.32 persons for cleaning and maintenance. Thus, Headteachers, in most cases, undertake the responsibilities of both the secretary and the caretaker of the school. This information is not quite accurate as concerns

school cleaners as there are school cleaners who are paid by local authorities and are not included in the statistics.

Unfortunately, the statistical service of the Education Department does not have information and statistics concerning Heads and Deputy Heads. This fact shows how little importance the central Education Authority gives to Heads and Deputy Heads. Eurostat, the official European office of statistics has requested information concerning school administrators, with a view to collecting such information.

8.4 General information about interviewees.

Sixty-two Heads were interviewed in their offices. Most of them were Heads in secondary schools in the area of Attica. Schools in all parts of Attica were visited and many of them were in suburban areas. Twenty-six schools were visited in Thrace spread throughout suburban and rural areas. 52,7% were schools in urban areas, 21,8% were in suburban areas and 25,5% were in rural areas. Some of the schools were technical or vocational schools but most were schools of general education. Finally, two particular schools combined both general education and music. The average number of students was 211 per school and the average number of teachers per school was 22.5, which meant a ratio of 9.4 students corresponding to one teacher.

Although female teachers outnumber men in secondary schools they make up only 16.3% of Heads while the vast majority, 83.7% are men. Similar data as proof Saitis² gives and comments that " somebody could argue that school leadership in general is male, although there are laws on equality between men and women and the struggle for equal treatment continues." Usually women put family at the top of their priority list rather than undertaking professional responsibility. The average number of years of service was twenty-four and years of service as Head were 8,5. This means that, taking into consideration the age-span of teachers; Heads are usually among the older teachers in schools. This is true, since seniority is crucial in the election of Heads. Years of service in the same school stands at 14.4. Heads in Thrace stay longer in the same school than those in Attica. One extreme

example is a Head who has been in service for 31 years and he has been the Head of the same school for twenty-four years.

Only one Head had postgraduate studies at MA level and nobody held a Ph.D. Saitis³ states that for primary teachers “only 0.5% had postgraduate studies in MA level.” This shows that postgraduate studies are not in fact qualifications for Headship, since Education Authorities consider other factors as being more important for promoting a teacher to the position of Head.

8.5 Time allocation.

It is difficult to study the time allocation of a Head because each Head deals with many different issues every day. One way of doing this is to visit certain schools, remain in the head's office and record every activity of the Head throughout the day. Such a research project is described in “Headteachers at Work” (Valerie Hall et al).⁴ Another way of studying the allocation of time is by questioning Heads using structured questions, as Saitis⁵ did when working with primary Heads. Here the second method is followed, due to the time limitation and the questions asked concerned activities according to Act 1566/85. Article 11 states that the Head is responsible for the normal function of the school, the coordination of school life, the observance of the law, the decrees and official directives and the implementation of decisions of the Teachers' Council. Article 14 paragraph 13a describes the compulsory periods of teaching per week, which in theory must be between three and eight depending on the size of the school. However, in practice most Heads do not teach at all.

In Saitis' research⁶ it is clear that Heads deal mainly with routine matters. He states that “ the majority of Heads of schools do not respond to the demands of modern schools, as they deal mainly with routine matters on a daily basis and less with creative initiatives.” This happens mainly because many decisions are made at a national level by the Ministry of Education. As Hughes⁷ underlines, the purpose of efficient methods in schools is to save time and energy and thought for the more important duties which are firstly, to teach and secondly, to provide pastoral care and firm guidance to both staff

and students. However things are not always as such. Hall et al. State that “ the main features in the working day are: 1) fragmentation of activity i.e. Heads carry out a large number of different duties; 2) people intensive i.e. Heads interact with a variety of people; and 3) range of tasks i.e. educational, administrative and managerial tasks both within the school and also without.”⁸

They found that contacts with the main groups within the school, teaching staff (49 %) pupils (20 %) and non-teaching (ancillary) staff (11 %) were the predominant contacts and the relative weighting consistent with these three groups was fairly consistent across all schools. Finally, they recorded contacts with LEA staff (7 %), local community (3 %), other headteachers (3 %) and professional associations (1 %).

The following table shows the time allocation of the 62 secondary school Heads interviewed.

	a lot	enough	very little	None at all
Teaching	5.5%	7.1%	67.8%	19.6%
Paperwork	38%	44.8%	17.2%	0%
Supervision of the school	62%	34.5%	3.5%	0%
Contact with municipality	31.6%	38.6%	28%	1.80%
Contact with teachers	62.7%	37.3%	0%	0%
Contact with Education Authority	34%	56%	10%	0%
Contact with parents	42.4%	42.4%	13.6%	1.6%
Dealing with student problems	58.9%	39.3%	1.8%	0%
Communicating with other schools	15.8%	40.3%	40.3%	3,6%
Communicating with associations	14.5%	38.2%	47.3%	0%
Communicating with School Advisers	7.2%	25%	46.4%	21.4%

Table 6. Time allocation.

A comparison of the above table with the respective table for primary Heads⁹ indicates that Secondary Heads deal much more with the supervision of schools and have contact with teachers and students' problems than primary Heads do. This happens because of the age of secondary students and the different structure and size of secondary schools. Ironically School Advisers do not seem to visit secondary schools very often although they do visit primary schools quite often. One secondary Head who answered "very little" to the final question meant once or twice in the last two or three years, which could be viewed as "not at all". Schools, which School Advisers visited often, were all the rural schools of Thrace. In the Athens area, all matters concerning school advisers do not seem to be at a good level. As will be seen later a great problem exists between School Advisers and schools.

It is clear that secondary Heads have no time to deal with school management and waste their time on trivial and non-productive tasks. As a result of this, the indifference of many Heads concerning the main aspects of the function of the school causes difficulties in many cases. It will be seen more clearly later how the lack of ancillary staff affects the functioning of the school and how the changing of the role of the Head from the governor of the school to the maintenance and repairs of school buildings also affects that same functioning. Another aspect needing mention is that secondary school Heads have much more work to do than primary Heads.

8.6 Head and students.

There are two kinds of Head. The first one is friendly and very close to students and has discussions with them very often. He cares very much about student problems, etc. The other is the Head who 'keeps a distance' between himself and the students, is very official and authoritative. The first type was met in most cases and this was clear from the answers to the question "how often do students want to see the Head?"» 73 % of Heads responded 'very often' and 27 % 'a little'. This was usually the case. Usually the Head had an open-door policy and students would come to see the Head for various

reasons. They would ask permission to go home early for various reasons, to go on excursions, to organize cultural events, to ask if a teacher was absent, to ask for a ball or even some chalk. It is clear, although it seems democratic, that Heads usually welcome students, teachers and other persons however, it is difficult to have time for administration and planning. He spends all day on rather trivial tasks instead of guiding the functioning of the school. The small size of the school and the time that the Head spends with students allow him to get to know most of his students' nicknames. Thus, 18 % of Heads responded that they know all their students personally although they do not teach them and only 27 % of them know just a few of the students. All the others (55 %) replied that they know most of the students in their school. It is very good for students to feel comfortable at school, even in the Head's office, but it is rather inconvenient for the Head not to have, in fact, a private office in the school.

8.7 Relations between Head and Deputy Head.

The role of Deputy Head within the administration of a school is examined in this paragraph. His assignment takes place after the decision of the prefect¹⁰ and his main duty is to substitute for the Head when he is absent. The Deputy Head, according to Act 1566/85 helps the Head and the specific duties are to be described in a presidential decree, which unfortunately has not appeared yet, although some fifteen years have passed.

Each secondary school with more than nine classes has one Deputy Head. If there are more than twelve classes, the school has two Deputy Heads. The election of a Deputy Head is for two or four years and the Deputy Head allowance is rather low. The Deputy Head must teach fourteen periods per week, instead of eighteen or sixteen, which are compulsory for a secondary school teacher. On the other hand, as Theodorou states "there is no preparation for teachers to undertake the post of Deputy Head, which is mainly managerial."¹¹ Saitis¹², in his research concerning primary school Deputy Heads, found that 77.8% of primary Deputy Heads did not have any kind of training in managerial work and 66.8% did not have any practice in

the paper work involved. He ended by stating that it is difficult to say that teachers are fully prepared to undertake the post of Deputy Head.

One crucial point is that it is not clear what exactly is the role of the Deputy Head and which are his duties. There are no special duties for Deputy Heads, except for certain secondary duties, and the main responsibility for the school remains with the Head. So, Theodorou adds, "according to laws and regulations concerning the functioning of schools, the Head is the only person responsible for everything in a school. In a centralized system of administration, it is even more imperative that somebody should undertake all the responsibilities if needed."¹³ It depends upon the Head whether he cooperates with the Deputy Head and to what extent.¹⁴

The problem of the definition of a Deputy Head's duties does not exist only in Greek schools. As Peter Ribbins underlines in his studies in English Schools "... the position of Deputy Headmaster has not been clearly defined, and, in part, this has arisen from a similar lack of role definition for Headteachers, who have tended to exercise the powers of paternal autocrat. As a result Headteachers have viewed their deputies as extensions of their own role ... many (complain) that they are frequently reduced to carrying out a few minor technical or clerical duties which do not encourage, or even allow them, to use their initiative and expertise."¹⁵ Peter Ribbins, completing his investigation, adds that there are "... three main aspects to the role of Deputy. First, he sometimes substitutes for the Head. Secondly, he is learning to be a Head so he needs the opportunity to try a variety of tasks and gain the necessary experience. Thirdly, the role is also that of a dogsbody. It is part of the learning process ... picking problems up, filling in the jigsaw, noticing what has not been done and doing it." And concludes, "while very many of them openly admit to "loving" being a Head, very few enjoyed being a Deputy."¹⁶

Two points are examined concerning the relations between the Head and the Deputy Head. Firstly, whether the Head allocates extra duties to his Deputy Head and secondly, the role of the Deputy Head as intermediary between the Head and teachers.

As the duties of the Deputy Head are not clearly defined, in many cases Heads transfer some of their responsibilities to the Deputy Heads. This happens in the case where there is actually a Deputy Head, although there are schools which do not have Deputy Head and, if this is the case, as happens at evening schools, the Head has a lot of work to do without any extra help.¹⁷ As Saitis showed in his research on Primary Deputy Heads, they want more administrative responsibilities but they need fewer teaching periods per week in order to have enough time to deal with the managerial side of the position.¹⁸

In schools where there is a Deputy Head usually the Head prefers to work in a strict way according to the law, so the Deputy Head feels safe against any arbitrary action.¹⁹ The problem is that the law is confusing and Theodorou states that " The problem, which appears when analyzing and examining the role of the Deputy Head, is the non-existence of regulations concerning his duties and responsibilities. Is the Deputy Head an assistant of the Head of the school or is he the Deputy Head of the school?"²⁰

Whilst working, the Deputy Head under the Head's authority wonders if he is seen "as a yes-man (to the Head), who, at best, could only step into the head's shoes and do what he had been told to do?"²¹ Peter Ribbins, in his research concerning the role of Deputy Head, examined various cases and arrived at the conclusion that, as "in most schools, delegation to the Deputy Head appears to be limited, mainly involving the performance of routine tasks on the head's behalf", but in certain large schools he met Deputy Heads who were almost working in the capacity of Heads. Ribbins concludes that the idea that Deputy should carry significant individual responsibilities was stressed by many other Headteachers although how they described and justified this could vary a great deal. He concurs with one head's opinion, who states "To me, you deal with the details as a Deputy...One of my Deputies...is brilliant at the student affairs end of things and as a project manager...The other Deputy, has a background on the pastoral side... she does the work brilliantly. I feel comfortable about her handling the timetable, the staffing and the curriculum...The third Deputy manages the

budget...playing to the people's strengths and looking for the gaps and seeing what we haven't got. Then asking if there is anybody who could do it."²²

In the question about the extra responsibilities of Deputy Heads, eighteen Heads said that in their school there was no Deputy and their work was very hard because there was no extra help, twenty two with interviewees responding that they did not give any extra responsibilities to their Deputy. Although there was no formal allocation of duties one Head stated that "... there is simply good communication between us and we share many responsibilities". Another Head added, " the Deputy Head usually has the initiative to undertake and deal with even the head's duties." And on the other hand another Head stated that "the Deputy Head does not undertake even the limited responsibilities, which are defined by the law." On the other side, there were twenty-one Heads that declared that they had some kind of sharing of responsibilities and duties with their Deputies? "It is not so clear which duties each one of us has, usually we share duties independently of what the law says," said the Head of a large school and another one added that "it is inevitable because of the peculiarity of our school". One extreme case was a school where the Head and Deputy Head worked together as one and the Head said "we are "Siamese twins" and we do all the work together. There is total cooperation."

Greek secondary schools, as observed earlier, are not large and so the number of teachers is small. In this case it is easy for the Head to have contact with all teachers. Karagiorgis states that "Human relations in educational management are determined by the kind of mentality of the Head, the level of acceptance of his colleagues, the range of goodwill, the level of effort made at communication, the quantity and quality of encouragement, the level of responsibility and the quality and the extent of professional training and information."²³ In some cases it seems that there is conflict between the Head and the Deputy Head as the Head thinks that he is responsible for putting his own stamp on the school. In this case, the role of the Deputy Head is non-existent as he considers himself rather as a teacher and the Head is unwilling to delegate any authority to the Deputy Head.²⁴ Theodorou

continues "The Deputy Head meets conflict in many cases. The most common is when teachers expect him to support their views in front of the Head while at the same time the Head expects the concurrent opinion of the Deputy although it is in opposition to the teachers' views." As Ribbins states, the man in the middle position- between headteacher and staff- was a major source of difficulty and dissatisfaction among his interviewees.²⁵ According to a Ribbins' interviewee "...the job was absolutely thankless, the worst job on earth. Once I realized that, It was inevitable that I would go for headship...I didn't like being in the position when I was the pig in the middle between the staff and the Head and didn't have ultimate responsibility or control over where or when things were going or how they were done."

Although it is not a good experience to be between the Head and the staff, only ten of the Heads that were interviewed and had a Deputy Head answered that their Deputy did not act as an intermediary. Twenty-two of them answered that their Deputy used to be an intermediary, six of them that this happened often and five answered rarely. It is important to say that in one school there was such an arrangement of rooms of Head and Deputy Head that in order to see the Head somebody needed to pass through the deputy's office. Lastly, a female Head who easily got nervous said, "when I am reaching my limitations, she (the Deputy) solves the problems."

In conclusion, it could be said that the lack of a certain legal framework for the Deputy Head's duties and responsibilities, the small decrease of teaching periods, the authoritative behaviour of certain Heads and the uncomfortable situation of being between the Head and the staff do not allow the Deputy Head to participate in school administration effectively. Thus, school management becomes one man's field.

8.8 Relations between Heads and teachers.

In order to study relations between Heads and teachers fourteen questions were asked. Head teacher relations are of central interest as far as the proper functioning of a school is concerned. The first four questions showed the effect of a head's behaviour as an advisor and mentor for teachers.

8.8.1 Non-official personal relations between Heads and teachers beyond those of the official kind.

Very often, within the closed society of a school, there are personal relations between teachers or between Heads and teachers. In a case where the Head is promoted from within the school it is obvious that this kind of relation is more expected. In answer to the question if they have personal relations with many teachers in their school, beyond the official role, 64.3% of Heads interviewed answered that they have good relations within and without school with almost all teachers. 14.3% of Heads replied that they keep contact outside school with some teachers and declared that they would like to have good relations with all teachers but there are problems of distance and lack of time. Heads in small schools, near the borders, stated that it is difficult to promote relations with teachers because they stay for a short time in the same school. Finally, 21.4% answered that they do not have relations outside the school with their teachers. It is not clear if Heads of this group do not want any relations with teachers or they avoid familiarity with their subordinates.

There are some that consider that relations between Heads and teachers often have, negative results in the functioning of a school. For instance Papaioanou²⁶ states that "In the course of his work, in applying educational politics, the Head uses personal relations within and outside the school. These relations can cause different reactions, which, in many cases, create dilemmas for the Head about the kind of decision which will be taken." Furthermore, Angela Spaulding²⁷ who deals with favouritism which is created within some schools in USA, states that " According to teachers, showing favouritism has negative consequences for teachers and teaching. Teachers feel that these people get special treatment. Teachers state that those who receive favoured status in their schools go on trips, teach fewer classes and others, get a bigger share of capital outlay than others, and the list goes on". Although it is difficult to have such an opinion from the side of the Head, it is obvious that Head teacher relations have their side effects.

8.8.2 How Head resolve conflict among individuals and groups of teachers in their schools.

One of the main duties of a Head is to have good personal and social relations with the personnel of his school. As examined in the previous paragraph, most Heads have good personal relations with their subordinates. In a case where the Head, who is responsible for the management of the school, does not estimate well how to manage these relations this can lead to inactivity, and his subordinates to a lack of concern and lack of motivation. This leads teachers to form a defensive group or factional reactions. However Karagiorgis²⁸ states that "If a person realizes and accepts the goals of the school, he becomes unconditionally assertive within the system and is motivated in the correct way, then this will help him to be productive and help him to develop professionally." On the other hand, Papaioanou²⁹ argues that relations among teachers of a certain school could affect the management of the school generally. If the Head takes any measures which are not so acceptable to one particular teacher, then a group of teachers may react against the Head. Karagiorgis completes by stating that "the Head is in the centre of this antagonism among teachers, because he is typically responsible for the functioning of the school and the behaviour of teachers within the school and especially as he is the person who makes the final decisions. In his effort to organize the personnel into a group with goals, coherence and an efficient communicative network in order to facilitate the functioning of the school, the Head has to face teachers as persons-individuals who are led by models and their expectations."

So, it is inevitable that conflicts will occur within Teacher Councils. In an answer to a relevant question, 28.5% of Heads responded that they never had to face conflict among teachers. Another 59% responded that they face the problem in a spirit of compromise. For instance one Head responded by stating: "I try to compromise through debate. If this is not possible, and this creates problem in the functioning of the school, I enforce a solution and I ask all to accept it." Another Head had a slightly different opinion. He said: "Usually I prevent the conflict from the beginning. In other cases I compromise

by having a personal conversation with each one of the teachers who created the conflict.” Finally, another Head suggests keeping a neutral position trying to find only what unites teachers. 12.5% of Heads answered that they face the problem by applying the law. It is difficult to detect which law they have applied in any given conflict among teachers.

Generally speaking, it does not seem that there are severe cases of conflict among teachers or groups of teachers and wherever they exist, they are faced easily.

8.8.3 Heads giving guidance to teachers in their classroom work.

In answer to the question if they think that giving guidance to teachers in classroom work is a key element in their post, 50% of the Heads interviewed responded positively. One stated: “I think that it is very important although I usually cannot manage to do it because of the lack of time.” 30.3% of interviewees do not think it is important to give guidance to teachers in their classroom work. Many of these underlined that this is the duty of School Advisers. 14.3% responded that only newly appointed teachers need help and the remaining 5.4% feel that only in certain cases should be given some kind of advice. Another important element of research is if teachers expect advice from Heads, with regard to their classroom work. 25% of Heads said “yes”, 30.4% said “no”, 21.4% said “sometimes” and 23.2% said “usually only the newly appointed.” It is a common occurrence that newly appointed teachers are not well qualified, especially in classroom management and in school managerial work, so they need help. Since Heads are not obliged to give help and teachers are free to accept or refuse any advice it is difficult for a Head to be a teacher’s mentor but is very significant for the successful functioning of the school and the improvement of teacher performance.

8.8.4 Ways of encouraging teachers to improve their performance, to enhance their morale and inspire them with enthusiasm for their job.

Teaching is difficult and needs a strong character plus enthusiasm for the job. As the State tends to be rather unsupportive, they need the assistance of the Head and mutual encouragement. Teachers often state that “they wish their

principals would positively reinforce their efforts on occasion.”³⁰ This, unfortunately, is not acceptable to a large number of Heads. Spaulding³¹ in her research found that “teachers state that supportive principals are rare” and continues that “the lack of support from their principals has negative effects for them both personally and professionally.” Participation of teachers in school affairs is a key element for success. Teachers should share ideas and plans about the improvement of the school with the Head, who must be the leader of the school. As Barbara Vann³² states “Encouraging anyone, especially teachers, to gain ownership of initiatives is always a stressful and testing time for leaders. It does seem to me that the key of success about this may be in broadening the base within the school, involving more people including a wider group of ‘stakeholders’ rather than associating the change only within the principal acting on Government edict.” Karagiorgis³³ gives an extensive analysis of personal relations among all engaged in a school system. He underlines that “ The problem of relations among the members of the system at all levels is one of the most formidable aspects of any Educational administration. These relations are basically defined by three factors, which any leader must keep in mind: the quality and the degree of encouragement, the kind and the extent of motivation and the degree of satisfaction, which every member of the system can achieve following his profession. Each worker, if examined according to the encouragement and motivation that he has and the fulfillment which he has from exercising his duties, is an entirely unique case. It must be understood that encouragement, motivation and personal satisfaction are not simple factors which affect a person’s job externally. In fact, they become conditions of life which permeate the personality of a person and characterize all his activities.”

Certainly most Heads search for effective ways to encourage teachers. Only 7.1% of interviewees said that they do not try to encourage their teachers. One Head explained she does not have the courage and high morale so, she cannot inspire them with enthusiasm for their jobs. She felt frustration in her job. Another 7.1% of Head did not give an answer and 14.4% stated that dialogue and discussion are effective ways of reinforcing a teacher. “There are no motives for my colleagues, neither material nor moral.” said one

particular Head and added that the only way to reinforce professionalism in teachers is through discussion, highlighting the humanitarian side of the teacher profession. It is clear that this was the idea of the majority, 37.5% of Heads who try to underline the positive sides of teaching and the offer to students and to the society in general. 23.2% of Heads replied that they try to encourage and reinforce their teachers using their personal example as a model. Finally, 10.7% of Heads tried to help teachers with their personal problems in order to create better conditions and a pleasant school environment, allowing better performance. An especially experienced Head said, “ This is a great challenge for a Head, to prompt his teachers. It is not always easy, but understanding their personal-family problems, understanding problems which they face within the classroom. I believe that they are introduced into an environment of mutual esteem, respect and confidence having as a result the increase of enthusiasm for their work within the classroom.”

As can be seen, the encouragement of teachers and their reinforcement are key points concerning all Heads. Only the way they face the problems differs slightly, although the direction is unique, the approach is common. In most cases, Heads try to substitute the State in its responsibility towards supporting teachers in their jobs. Heads are generally closer to teachers than the educational authorities, in a centralized educational system, and can understand their problems and feel their anxieties and share their problems.

8.8.5 Public expression of Heads' opinions concerning teachers and teacher appraisal.

As teacher appraisal has not existed in Greek schools for the last twenty years, it is important to see how Heads think that they can manage to express an opinion about their teachers. Two questions were addressed to interviewees. The first was “Do you think that the public expression of a positive or negative opinion acts as a motivator?”. 20 % replied “no” but the vast majority think that they must express their opinion publicly. 34.5% said “yes” and 40% insisted that only the expression of positive opinions helps teachers. A very experienced Head stated : “ It discourages the teacher if you

say that he is not working properly, or that he is not working. The teacher is then disappointed. I prefer to discuss negative opinions privately.” There is a common belief among Heads that it is not profitable for anybody to express negative opinions publicly and it is better to keep any problems within very limited boundaries.

It is not only the public expression of Heads’ opinions that puts pressure on teachers. As Spaulding³⁴ found “according to teachers, principals who micromanage make them nervous, incompetent and mistrusted and under constant observation.” She continues: “ According to teachers, it is not a fear of evaluation or criticism that makes them feel pressured. It is a mistrust of the principal’s intentions.” As teacher appraisal is a formal procedure, which has not existed in Greek schools for the last twenty years, as mentioned earlier, it was important to have an answer to the second question, which asked if Heads consider that teacher appraisal increases the quality of teaching. It must be underlined here that the inspection system, which existed in schools twenty years ago and has since been abolished, was extremely authoritative, bureaucratic and treated teachers according to their political beliefs. On the other hand, it is obvious that teachers and Head expect a teacher appraisal process but they are reserved about the kind, and the content of it. 7.1% of Heads replied that they do not think that teacher appraisal could improve performance. 3.6% said that maybe teacher appraisal would lead to a better quality of education. 12.5% argued that the main problem is not the teacher appraisal process but its content and practice. These are mainly older Heads who tasted the negative side of the inspection of schools during the decades of the sixties and early seventies. Finally, 76.8% insist that teacher appraisal is necessary for improvement of the quality of education. Many of them have reservations and the following quotations perhaps give a better view. One stated “ Of course, but with the essential prerequisite that it will be completely subjective!!!” and another said “Yes, what form will that appraisal take?”. Two other Heads consider that teacher appraisal is an urgent issue and said: “Yes, yes, yes, I think is crucial and must be enforced immediately.” Many Heads stressed that teacher appraisal should be linked with payment. “Unambiguously, teacher appraisal could help the improvement the quality of

education but this will happen only if it is linked in some way with payment.”, replied the Head of a large school in Athens. Another described his opinion in more details and said that “... a teacher who tells a lot of ‘anecdotes’ in the classroom should not be allowed to earn the same money as another who works really hard.” and another completed this idea stating that “the lack of any control in teaching environment creates laziness. Unfortunately, the human conscience is flexible.”

Possibly teacher appraisal, which is a formal and official expression of the Head’s opinion of a teacher, is more acceptable to teachers. It seems that almost all Heads agree that rules of appraisal should be clear and subjective and appraisal should be linked in some way with payment. Appraisal is an urgent issue for Greek education, but it is beyond the realms of this research.

8.8.6 Checking teachers work in the classroom.

Although there is no teacher appraisal system there are ways of checking the work that teachers do in the classroom. In an effort to investigate this, three questions were addressed to interviewees. The first, “Do you observe lessons?” It must be mentioned here that the law does not allow Heads to observe lessons. Only if there is a friendly agreement is it possible for a Head to observe lessons. Just 5.4% responded that they observe lessons and 16% that they very rarely do. One Head stated that he observes lessons rarely because he has no time to do this. Another Head responded that he observes classes “rarely and only when teachers agree”. 9% answered that they observe classes only if teachers invite them and lastly, 69.6% do not observe any lessons at all. Some added that observing lessons is against the law and others that they did not feel that teachers were willing to accept them.

The second question was: “How do you check that teachers follow the curriculum guidelines?”. It must be underlined here that there is a national curriculum and individual books for every individual subjects. The Ministry of Education distributes these books to students free of charge. So, “ the educational system does not allow the teacher to take any initiative. All their activities are under the head’s control and that of all superior authorities.” ³⁵

Thus, checking that teachers follow the curriculum guidelines becomes a routine job. 60% of Heads feel this way and state that they conduct a “typical check of the official books where the subject matters are registered.” 9% of Heads do not check at all if curriculum guidelines are being followed. One particular Head stated that “it is not such an important task for a Head”, while another Head underlined that in fact “I do not check the application of curriculum guidelines, because teachers are experienced and know what they have to do.” 16.5% cooperate well with teachers and organize them into groups of the same subject. Meetings of these groups help to focus on joint action and control over how the curriculum is followed. Lastly, 14.5% use a variety of methods to check teachers as far as curriculum is concerned. Some of these methods seem rather unorthodox, as Heads ask students or parents how things are going in the classroom. One Head said that teachers do not complete classroom record books properly, so she is obliged to use other methods of checking teachers. It is clear that this key element of control over teachers’ work becomes a routine and underestimated process. There is a type of independence among teachers, as will be seen, which often leads to extreme situations.

The third question was: “Do you think that teachers are independent in their work in the classroom?”. 9% answered “no” and 20% responded that teachers have relative independence in their work in the classroom. 71% of interviewees are of the opinion that teachers are totally independent and they should not have to account to anybody about their work in the classroom. Most of the Heads felt that this is an exaggeration and in many cases this causes problems in the quality of teaching. On the other hand, teachers are not only involved in teaching. They are members of a school and must work as members of a total team. “A basic characteristic of a school is the existence and function of classes as subgroups of an organization. Within classes a teacher has great independence and autonomy. The work of a teacher in his own microcosm results in the development of a sense of indifference for what is happening in the school as a total. This results in the belief that the Head is responsible for everything.”³⁶ Unfortunately, this is the case. Most teachers feel that their only responsibility is to teach their class.

On the other hand, as has been seen, Heads do accept that teachers are independent and they have no way of checking them. As teachers are overloaded with paperwork and other bureaucratic responsibilities, it seems that it is difficult for a school to be a total entity where each of its members has to play his own independent role and cooperation will produce fruitful results.

8.8.7 The control of teachers.

Lacking a teacher appraisal system, it is difficult to check what teachers are doing in their classrooms. So, a group of four questions was addressed to Heads in order to define more clearly the relations between Heads and teachers. The first question included a variety of aspects concerning teacher duties. Heads had to describe how they manage in cases where teachers come late to school or are absent without any reason or they do not fulfill their non-teaching duties or do not perform well or do not treat students properly. 6% of Heads were lucky because they had never experienced difficulties of this kind. 2% responded that they face such problems applying the rules but none of them agreed that this was an efficient method. The vast majority (85.7%) of Heads try to solve problems of this nature using various techniques of communication. They, usually, discuss the problem with teachers trying to find a solution acceptable to all sides. It is interesting to see how some Head responded for example, "I ask them not be late. If a teacher is good in his teaching I do not bother very much about one or two delays. If he is not a good teacher I am more strict." stated one Head. Many Heads try to show to their teachers the extent of the problem of unjustifiable absences. Some Heads argued that it is not profitable to discuss such problems during the Teachers Council. After discussing the problem with a certain teacher, and if there is no solution, they prefer to discuss it with superintendents and School Advisers.

The problem comes when a Head was originally a teacher in the school. It is difficult for him to change roles. Trying to define their role, Heads were asked if supporting teachers and controlling them at the same time created conflict for them. 26.8% responded "yes" and some of them stressed that this

happens because they come from the same school and it is expected. They do not think that this conflict creates great problems and it is something which they cope with easily. One Head stated that “two decades have passed without any control in schools. There is a kind of liberalization which creates problems in managing schools and causes conflict for the Head between support and control.” Many Heads, 73.2%, believe that there is no conflict at all, because “it is the role of a Head to support and control teachers” and “the role of a Head is the role of a co-ordinator” so, “teachers understand this dual role”. An experienced Head responded: “I could say that I must support teachers in their work. Control is something different, I do not think that there is any conflict in the role. A lack of legislation creates conflict, which should define mechanisms of support and control. Control mechanisms exist in theory but in practice they are not applied, so there is no conflict.

Thus, another question was addressed to Heads, if they think that the proper function of the school or good relations with teachers is more important. Of course, in saying ‘proper function of a school’ this cannot be seen as being subjective and sometimes Heads pretend that any decision they take is for the proper functioning of the school. Papaioanou³⁷ argues that the lack of permanence of teachers in the same school does not help in formatting a homogeneous group. The result of this is that Heads undertake responsibilities and act independently. There is, of course, the other side of the argument as Spaulding states that “teachers give example after example of situations where their principal makes decisions for them without ever consulting them.”³⁸ The vast majority of interviewees argue that both the proper function of the school and good relations with teachers, are linked. 32.2% responded that they are equivalent, 66% that the successful functioning of the school is slightly preferable and only 1.8% prefer good relations with teachers.

Lastly, the question of how teachers see their Heads, as a colleague or as a boss, was posed. Heads duly gave answers but, as Maratheftis states, “a head’s behaviour as a leader in the school is influenced by perceptions, desires and needs of personnel, students and other people involved in the life

of the school, such as are parents, members of the local community etc. Democratic supporters, as social psychology has proved, want a democratic leader and autocratic supporters prefer an authoritative leader.”³⁹ Maratheftis continues: “The fact that a Head is appointed by a superior Authority, gives him an exceptional position in the school team. He is in a higher position than others in the school and so has the advantage of exercising a greater influence over the school. The exact same position simultaneously has the disadvantage of obstructing all other members from accepting him as equal to them, a fact which is an obstacle to free communication among them.”

Generally speaking, Greek secondary Heads tend to be democratic. What applies in Greece does not apply in the USA where Spaulding ⁴⁰states that “only a select few would describe a present or past principal as being democratic with behaviours that resulted in positive consequences for teachers and teaching.” This happens possibly because Greek Heads do not have great power in a centralized education system, in comparison with the USA where “teachers saw the role and the person occupying the role of school principal as politically powerful.”⁴¹ Of course the answers to the last question belong rather to teachers than Heads, however, 73.2% of Heads feel that teachers see them as colleagues. They say, “I hope”, “I believe”, “I think” and other such expressions because they are not sure about teachers’ view. Some Heads responded that “they call me the boss but they interact as colleagues”. In fact, 10.7% of Heads think that teachers see them as a boss and 12.5% see them both colleagues and bosses. Lastly, 3.6% of Heads feel that teachers see them neither as a colleague nor as a boss.

8.9 Managerial duties of a Head.

There are processes, which many Heads consider as not important, however, are very important for the proper functioning of a school. Such processes are the distribution of non-teaching duties of teachers, the control of ancillary staff of a school and the decisions about financial affairs e.g. estimates of needs, decisions about spending, buying, etc.

The distribution of non-teaching duties, which are very important for the functioning of a school, especially in cases where there is no secretary in the school, takes places according to the law. Act 1566/1985 describes the process of entrusting of non-teaching duties to teachers. The Head proposes an allocation of duties and the Teacher Council decides about it. This happens, according to the 44% of responses of interviewees, in many cases. 5% responded that the Head decides alone about the allocation of non-teaching duties, although has not the right to do so. Lastly, the majority of Heads, 51%, before reaching in a Teachers Council decision, stated that try to discuss the subject with teachers and to allocate informally the non-teaching duties. After reaching an agreement with teachers, Heads take the assent of the Teachers Council. Although they seem to follow the same process, they deploy different kind of approach. Thus, one Head stated "They share responsibilities according to their speciality and their experience." and another Head goes by responding that " I work with the Deputy Head and we make a list of teachers and duties which I want to give them and ask their agreement." Most Heads try to give the most crucial responsibilities to the most able teachers. This is a good solution of the problem for a Head but it is not always acceptable by the teachers. It should be mentioned here that all teachers are paid the same salary according to the years of teaching and there is not any promotion according to qualifications or abilities. Thus, many teachers complain because being able to do their work well, they do not accept their colleagues, as not able teachers, to not undertake any non-teaching duty.

Another important managerial duty of a Head could be the control of ancillary staff of a school. Act 1566/85; paragraph 6 sets the rules for secretaries and attendants. Unfortunately as seen earlier only few schools have secretaries and attendants. Thus there are many schools in which there is no ancillary staff at all except cleaners. Also cleaners are fewer than schools need. It is difficult to run a school with teachers only and without any ancillary staff. Unfortunately, this is the case for many Greek secondary schools. On the other hand although secretaries' duties are fully described, there is a confusion between of what a secretary of a school should do what

they really do. This happens mainly due to heads' tolerance and heads' lack of expertise in managerial matters. Lainas⁴² concludes that the institution of secretaries of schools is rather failed. So, according to interviewees 26.7% of schools have not any ancillary staff except cleaners and it is the Head who gives directions and checks them. 6.7% of Heads responded that they share this responsibility with Deputy Heads and 66.6% stated that they undertake full responsibility of guiding and controlling the ancillary staff.

Third process in which Heads are involved is the making of decisions about financial affairs of a school. The whole funding process will be examined later. It is a centralized process and schools take money only for running costs. The decision for the money coming to school for this reason is made 40% by Heads, 23.3% by Heads after a proposal of the Teachers Council of independent teachers, 5% cooperate on this subject with Deputy Heads and lastly, 31.7% stated that they cooperate with School Committees. The structure and role of the School Committee will be discussed as follows.

8.10 Head and School Committee.

According to Act 1566/89, article 52, in every school there is a School Committee. Members of this committee are a representative of the municipality, a member of parents association, the Head of the school and lastly, a member of students union. Every School Committee is responsible for the allocation and the handling of money given to the school by the local authorities. It is also responsible to find resources to face all the functional needs of the certain school. The mayor decides about who will be the members of the School Committee and who will be its president. Usually president is the representative of the municipality and rarely is the Head of the school. In fact the Head takes care about paying and the other members of the School Committee just sign the appropriate papers. This restricts the head's authority and in some cases causes problems in the function of a school.

The first of two questions relevant to the relations between a Head and the School Committee was: "how essential and how effective is the role of the

School Committee?". Although 61.8% of Heads agree that the role of the School Committee is essential, only 22.5% characterize it as effective. 34.5% did not think that the role of the School Committee is essential and 3.7% keep reservations about its role. 63.6% believe that the role of School Committee is not effective and 10.9% have not a clear opinion on this matter. There are many Heads who agree that the role of the School Committee is essential but there is doubt if it is effective because many times its members do not show interest for the function of the school. There are many comments on the structure of the School Committee as is the fact that the Head is not usually the president of the Committee, the lack of interest about the school which is the common characteristic of most municipalities, etc. An experienced Head stated that "the structure of the School Committee, as it is now, acts as a brake because Heads and teachers know very well many school matters for which is needed to take the approval of people who are not informed how the school function. So, the Head does not have permission to deal even with small amounts of money. Some Heads complain because students are members of the School Committee and state that "it is a numerous committee. At least should not included students." A Head who is also a town councilor describes his experience as a president of many School Committees saying that " I discovered that their role is quaint".

Trying to find out more about the role of the School Committee Head were asked if the present position of the School Committee has weakened or strengthened the position of the Head with regard to financial affairs. 47% of Heads replied that they feel that the role of the School Committee weaken their role "because they cannot act immediately" or "because the Head cannot expend without the agreement of the School Committee even one thousand drachmas." Other Heads stated that their role is weakened because "the Head is only one among the members of the School Committee so he is usually a minority. Only in some cases Heads can manage to lead the School Committee." 28.8% believe that their position is strengthened because "it helps the Head to keep transparency in the handling of money". 3% stated that they cannot answer and 21.2% that

neither weakened nor strengthened their position. Thus, one Head stated that “she does not feel strengthened or weakened by the School Committee provided that there is money. The Head can do many things to make the school attractive for children. The School Committee does not give sufficient money, I must take money from the local society and especially from those who have much money and ‘thank God’ they give.”

It is obvious that it is not only the lack of money which is a strong restriction in the efficiency of Heads. The way in which the School Committee is structured and functions should be changed. School Committee should include fewer members coming from the school. However, the Head should have the permission to spend small amounts of money for the function of the school giving account a posteriori. A more flexible scheme is needed.

8.11 Role of Heads in planning.

Usually Heads do not plan their future work. One reason is that every Head or Deputy Head can move to another school because he wants it. Benhaim and Humphreys⁴³ state “...that ‘principal succession’ is not a simple event but a complex interactive process, based not only upon the characteristics of the new leader and the succession process, but also upon the social organisation of the school. As Saitis states “the ‘mobility’ of Heads in education can be caused mainly by two reasons: first to the right of every Head to move to another school (Presidential decree 50/1996) and second to the system of ‘tenure of office’ election of Heads (Act 2188/94). Although these are advantages for the Head, the ‘mobility’ acts restraining in the effective function of schools.”⁴⁴ On the other hand there is not any claim that moves the Head towards making plans for the school. Result of these is that 48.3% of interviewees responded that there is not at all any kind of planning in their school. So, Heads responded that “we cannot manage to have any kind of planning, I know that is negative” or “there is no way to plan for a longer period than the tenure of office is”. There are many other reasons for no planning which Heads state as “the staff continuously changes” or “we are not used to doing so” or “the main purpose is to follow the curriculum. There is no time for other thoughts”. 16.7% responded that there is a plan

for improvement of buildings and equipment. These plans come often from the local educational authorities or from the ministry of Education and Heads are called to implement them. Lastly, 35% stated that there is a kind of planning, mainly in cultural exchanges and European programs although, some stated that “there is a kind of planning but is difficult to keep it.”

As Heads have no plans for their schools, is difficult to ask about changes which they have introduced in their schools. Interviews showed that it was not clear what is ‘change’ or ‘innovation’ in a school. 9.8% stated that they consider the normal functioning of a school as ‘change’, while 11.5% replied that running cultural and environmental programs is an ‘innovation’. In fact these programs come from outside the school and the Head has only the responsibility for their implementation. 42.6% replied that they have introduced changes in their school but after a further discussion they were not able to describe what were these changes. “I do not know what happened in the past”, stated one Head. 6.6% insisted that they changed the school at all, but these changes were not visible. Only 29.5% answered that they have nothing changed in the school. “I am in a difficult position, no significant change has taken place” is the answer of one Head. Another Head stated that “there is no need for change in the school”. Many think that centralization of education causes problems in school planning and in introduction of changes and innovations. Such opinion has Papaioanou⁴⁵ who states that “ it is proved that decentralization is the main factor for innovation but is not the only situation under which appear innovations and changes”.

8.12 Heads and the Council of Teachers.

Act 1566/85 describes the role and responsibilities of the Head and the Teachers’ Council. According to article eleven, paragraph one the Teachers’ Council of each school has as members all the teachers and as president the Head. When the Teachers’ Council examines special matters concerning students, two members of the student union participate in it. Paragraph three states that “ the Teachers’ council is responsible for guiding the school to better application of educational politics and the better function

of the school. It is responsible for the running of curriculum and timetable, for the health and the protection of students, the cleanliness of the school and the organisation of school life. It puts on a scale the school needs and deals with the most urgent. It exploits opportunities for cooperation between teachers and society. It can decide the grouping of teachers according to their expertise, in order to achieve better co-ordination of teaching and the implementation of educational methods.” Paragraph four states that the way of functioning of Teachers’ Councils and other important aspects will be described in a presidential decree. Unfortunately, this presidential decree has not been published yet, having as a result, a confusion around the discrimination of Heads’ and Teachers’ Council’s responsibilities. According to Saitis et al.⁴⁶ this is the main reason creating problems between Head and teachers in school management. It is difficult to understand why such an important matter as the responsibilities of the Head and the Teachers’ Council, is still confusing. Saitis et al.⁴⁷ in their research state that “as far as the allocation of duties within a school is concerned, between the Head and the Teachers’ Council there is a convergence of views. Given that a) the publication of the ministerial decree, which is needed according to Act 1566/85, has no cost and b) the legislative gap creates clash of views in schools and decreases productivity, it begs the question why –fifteen years after Act 1566- there is no such decree.”

Papaioanou⁴⁸ states that “ All the members of a school have no other choice than to participate in the Teachers’ Council” and form the one side of school management. The Head is the other part of the school management “ the quality of which give: its initiative and unconditional acceptance of all teachers, the balanced achievement of the goals of the school and the satisfaction of personal needs, of healthy ambitions and expectations of all participants and the autonomous taking of decisions after acceptable process.”⁴⁹ If this does not happen and teachers feel on the opposite side this creates a different situation and “teachers feel that they have the power to sabotage principals preferred decision outcomes through partial compliance or non-compliance. According to teachers, principals do not give them enough credit to make good choices and are too afraid that their own

special interest would not be served.”⁵⁰ 34.4% of interviewees replied that they never faced any case where individuals or groups were trying to impose their opinion in staff meetings. One Head said: “I try to solve such problems before the staff meeting. I discuss with teachers privately until we reach an agreement.” 59% stated that they face such cases with discussion and they try to convince teachers about their decisions. In many cases the process they are following is not so straight. However, 6.6% of Heads answered that they try to face such problems by the law, but did not describe with which law and how.

According to Act 1566/85, article eleven, Head are responsible for the implementation of decisions of Teachers’ Council. Many think that Heads have the power of taking and implementing decisions. Theodorou⁵¹ states that “in the era of taking decisions the Head is the absolute owner and employing arbitrary behaviour he can use the right of veto”. Teachers underline that “they are amused by the behaviours of principals who try to make it look like they, themselves, are supportive of participatory making at their schools.”⁵² A question which studies Heads’ intentions about teachers’ participation in school management was the following: “Do you agree to implement certain decisions of the Teachers Council to which you personally do not really agree?”. 63.5% replied “yes” because “is according to the law” and “must implement all the decisions of the majority of the Teachers’ Council”. 25.4% feel that they must examine the content of a decision before accepting its implementation and 6.3% stated that they never had to face a decision of Teachers Council different to their own. A small minority (4.8%) think that the Head is responsible for the functioning of the school so, it is impossible to implement a decision, which is different to their own.

It seems to be clear that gaps in legislation referring to the role of the Head and the Teachers Council create problems in school management. It is true that there is an overlapping of Heads’ responsibilities with those of the Teachers Council, having as a result the low productivity, the ill function of the school and tension in personal relations between Heads and teachers. It is encouraging that in most cases there exists good cooperation among

school staff. However, in the cases where there is no common acceptance of decisions, the functioning of schools is not unhindered.

8.13 Heads and superintendents.

In order to study the relations between the Head and his Superintendents four questions were addressed to interviewees. First question was: "Are you involved in any decisions made by your local authority which affect your school?" Relations between a Head and his Director are of dual direction. One Head stated that "we often press our superintendents to take decisions which affect our school because we believe that we know better our school's problems but we have not the power to implement these decisions." And another Head replied that "I know 'my' school much better than any superidentent. My director knows it very well." So, 58.7% insisted that they influence their superintendents in their decisions affecting their schools. Many Heads, 11.1%, stated that they are rarely involved in any decisions made by their local authority, which affect their school and often these decisions are of no so much importance. 7.9% replied 'often' and 6.4% 'maybe'. 15.9% of Heads questioned, stated that they never had any influence on decisions of their superintendents.

The second question was asking Heads what their Director expects from them as Heads. As the structure of secondary education is centralized 78.7% replied that the only thing that a Director expects from Heads is to function properly in the school and not create any problems for him. So one Head stated that " he expects me to be a good Head, to make sure the school functions well not disturbing him asking help for the solution of any problems". 11.5% believe that their Director expects Heads not to disturb him and a Head underlined that "the Director expects me never to disturb him for any reason". 4.9% stated they do not know what their Director expects from them saying "maybe nothing, maybe everything" and only 4.9% answered that their Director expects cooperation for the implementation of decisions of the Ministry of Education.

It is under examination if Directors expect many things, which Heads do not know but usually they have a formal cooperation, which does not allow Head to take any initiative. "In a centralised educational system having an authoritative superintendent, the framework of freedom within which a Head can act is very limited. In this case the Head acts more like an appointed chief than an inspired leader. The opposite happens when the system is decentralised and Heads' superintendents have liberal views and they keep democratic processes. In that case, Heads' personality and philosophy have greater weight and will influence more the way in which he will govern the school".⁵³ School Advisers are responsible for visiting schools to guide teachers in their work. According to Act 1566/85 the Head must cooperate with School Advisers. There is no description of any kind of cooperation and there is not any procedure for doing this. However, School Advisers do not visit schools often and they do not have regular contacts with teachers and Heads. This is a great problem for Greek secondary education, which needs further research and discussion. In the question "What are your relations with School Advisers like?" 59% of interviewees answered that School Advisers do not visit schools so, they cannot speak about any kind of relations with them." It is my complaint, that School Advisers never visit our school. Only one School Adviser came to my school so far and he did not visit me" stated one Head and another added "they are welcome, we invite them but they never come." The Head of a small school said that "if we were for looking for them we should have very good relations but we never see them." 26.3% replied that their relations with School Advisers are 'good' and 13.1% 'excellent'. However, it is not clear if they responded freely and one particular Head underlined that "our relations are very good, because we never met". Most of Heads who replied that they have 'good' or 'excellent' relations with School Advisers are Heads of schools in suburban areas. 1.6% of Heads answered that they do not have good relations with School Advisers.

Since School advisers do not often visit schools and they have little cooperation with teachers and Heads it was difficult for interviewees to answer the question of "what do School Advisers expect from you as Head

of the school?" So, they replied in various ways. 32.3% replied that they do not know what School Advisers expect since they have never met them, 3.2% answered "nothing" and 6.5% "not to disturb them". These were the negative answers of Heads, but there are also positive answers as 30.5% explained that School Advisers expect cooperation, 9.7% think that School Advisers expect Heads to organise the running of schools properly and 11.2% gave various answers which were not so clear about their opinion on the question. Lastly, 6.5% did not give any answer at all. All the above show that in a centralised educational system nobody plays a major role except the Ministry of education. All others, teachers, Heads, directors and school advisers work under the decisions of the Ministry of Education and their relationships are dictated by the system. Since there is no room for innovations all the above work on a bureaucratic process and there are of course exceptions but they are just a few. In the Greek secondary education system the Head is not a leader, he is simply a cog in a wheel with a very limited role to play.

8.14 Head and people outside the school.

Heads always have contacts with people outside the school. As schools are vivid organisations within society, Heads have relations with many other people outside the school. An investigation of relations between Heads and parents, municipal authorities, church, trade union representatives, cultural societies etc was made. Interviewee outside cooperation is shown in the following table.

	Not at all	A little	Quite a lot	A lot
Municipal authorities	3.2%	21%	35.5%	40.3%
Trade union representatives	9.7%	45.2%	29%	16.1%
Church representatives	11.2%	63%	16.1%	9.7%
Other organizations	35.5%	35.5%	21%	8%

Table 7. Contacts of Heads.

Is obvious that Heads often have contact with municipal authorities. This is rather due to economic dependence of schools to municipal authorities than to a vital and true relation between school and local society. Generally, schools are isolated from society and this does not happen only in Greek secondary schools. As Mercer⁵⁴ states "There is an indication that professional isolation of secondary headteachers increased in terms of four groups with which the headteacher has traditionally had strong links: other headteachers, the local authority, boards of governors and teaching staff". This is also true in Greek secondary schools, there is a professional isolation of secondary Heads and as the above table shows there is also a social isolation. Searching this fact questions on what matters are common with people outside the school, interviewees replied that they communicate with people outside school only for official reasons. This shows that the boundaries of Heads' initiatives are very limited, so Heads deal mainly with paperwork than improving personal relations and creating occasions for novel actions.

Although there is a kind of isolation of Heads, 83.8% of interviewees replied that they do not believe that they are the sole representatives of their school in the local society. They believe that representatives of the school are also teachers, students and parents. Sometimes, they say, it is compulsory to represent their school but even in such cases they do not believe that they are the only representatives. However, 16.2% feel as the only representatives of their school, as being the only responsible for its function, and in many cases it was clear that some Heads behave like owners of the school.

An official link between schools and local society is the School Board. Article 51 of Act 1566/85 states that, in each school there is functioning a School Board, whose members are all the members of Teachers Council, i.e. the Head and all the teachers, all the members of governing body of Parents Association, a representative of municipal authority in the School Committee and three members of students union. The School Board is responsible for the normal functioning of the school using any appropriate means, the establishment of mutual contact between teachers and students' families as the sanitary arrangements of the school. President of the School Board is the

Head of the school. In Saitis⁵⁵ research, in primary schools, many aspects of the function of the School Board are examined. Saitis comes to the three following conclusions:

1. There is no provision for a presidential or ministerial decree, which should decide about the way of function of the School Board.
2. The making up of the School Board seems to create problems due to the great number of its members.
3. The School Board does not play any significant role in educational planning and process because its role is only in advisory level.

It is useful to see some of Saitis' research findings before looking at the answers of interviewees of the present research. So, in the question if the School Board is functioning properly 65% answered positively and 35% negatively. 41% of the representatives of the local society participate "a little" or "minimal" in the function of the School Board. One Head stated that " the various representatives not only do not offer any service but they are not even willing to come to the school to put some signs which is compulsory".

In the framework of the present research interviewees were asked if they feel that the function of the School board is sufficient and helps the Head in the management of the school. 30.6% replied that the function of the School Board is sufficient and helps the Head in the management of the school and 50% replied "no". 8.1% stated that the School Board is not necessary and 11.3% stated that School Board is useful only in very special cases as are crises in school functioning. In such cases the School Board helped the Head to compromise the differences which were between students and educational authorities. Heads think that the School Board " is not a flexible tool for school management because its members are very many and they change very often, having as result instability and no continuity in its decisions" Thus there is an agreement between the conclusions of this research and the Saitis' research that School Board "does not seem to meet the expectations of the Greek legislator, because the way it functions does not give the

opportunity to solve severe functional problems that face the schools of our Country".⁵⁶

During discussions with Heads, an effort was made to investigate the effects of social composition of the local society and especially that of parents on the job of a Head. Even though it is true that "...research studies have concluded that school-related factors explain a relatively small proportion of school achievement compared to social factors"⁵⁷, interviewees strongly link, either positively or negatively, the social composition of parents with their job as Head. So, 68.5% are convinced social composition of parents is often a restriction for heads' initiatives and puts limits in the way of the management of the school. 31.5% state that there is no relation between the social composition of parents and the management of their school.

8.15 Heads and Parents.

A great part of Heads' time is spend in communicating with parents. During the day parents come to school for various reasons. According to interviewees 19.4% of parents coming to school want to see only teachers and 4.8% only the Head. 56.4% of parents want to see both teachers and the Head and lastly, 19.4% want to see mainly teachers and occasionally the Head. So, one Head replied that "parents want to see teachers to ask about the performance of their children and only if they cannot meet any of them, then they ask the Head about the teacher". Another Head believes that "parents come to the head's office only for a formal visit and in fact they come to school to see teachers". It depends on what parents want to do in the school. The Head is responsible only for discipline matters of students while teachers are responsible for marks and many other things.

Parents often complain against teachers for their children's marks. In this case they visit the Head to express their complaints. In the question on how Heads deal with parent's complaints concerning teachers, 92% of interviewees stated that they try to discuss with parents about the problem. One Head stated: "I try to explain to the complaining parent two mistakes: firstly that often the picture which they have shaped about the teacher is not

the right one because they know only the one side of the problem and secondly that I have limited power of influence upon teachers". The role of the Head is to compromise disagreements within the school.⁵⁸ 8% of Heads replied that they never faced complaints against teachers. This is an exception as "many of the problems which bother the administration caused by disagreements between parents and other social groups and teachers. Their settlement takes always place with understanding of problems and tries to inform all parts for the problem. Sometimes parents create the problems in order to achieve their goals, which often are not very acceptable by the school".⁵⁹ So, many times parents complain against teachers while they are right but also they complain while teachers are not right. In this case 46.8% of interviewees replied that they defend teachers if they think that teachers are not right. They stated that they defend teachers while parents are present and after they discuss the problem privately with the teacher. 11.3% of interviewees stated that often defend teachers although they are not right and 19.3% stated that their attitude depends upon the case. On the other hand 22.6% of Heads answered that they never defend teachers when they are not right.

A slightly different issue in relations between Heads and parents is that of the Parents' Association. Act 1566/85, article fifty-three describes the rights and responsibilities of Parents' Association. In each school there is an independent Parents' Association whose role is to help school in its functioning. Unfortunately, Parents' Associations do not function properly although there are some exceptions. So, 82.8% of interviewees expect more involvement and help from Parents' Associations. They consider that Parents' Associations would help schools in financing, in cultural activities, in improvement of relations between school and society, etc. 9.4% of Heads asked need help only in financial affairs of the school and 7.8% of interviewees declared that there is not any Parents' Association in their school. One Head described clearly what he expects from the Parents' Association of his school. He stated: "I would like them to help in

1. Information of parents about how difficult teachers' jobs are and cooperation in solving problems.
2. To get in touch with students in order to create a better environment of cooperation.
3. Help, not only financial, but also in solving functional problems.
4. Not to interfere in exclusively educational matters.

Concluding, it could be said that Heads are not satisfied by parents' participation in school functioning, as they do not help the Head in school administration.

8.16 Head's opinion of his duties.

It is very important to see how Heads consider their job. As Heads have various specialization, age and attitudes about education it needs extensive research to explore their opinion of their duties. However, it is not clear which are their duties as there is no legislation giving a concrete framework within which a Head should act. As Saitis⁶⁰ states " The first contradiction comes from the lack of job description of executives i.e. content, responsibilities, working conditions and of the clear specification (job specification) of special abilities, qualifications, requirements and duties which every post demands."

23% of interviewees have exercise at other managerial duties before becoming Head. Many of them stated that they had a managerial post during their military service, some took experience as trade union representatives and a few worked in companies before being teachers. 38.5% did not have any managerial experience before being Heads, percentage which is lower that the 48% which Saitis⁶¹ mentions for primary Heads, and affects straight the efficient administration of schools. Lastly, 38.5% of interviewees replied that they were Deputy Heads before being Heads and this was a good experience and introduction to their jobs as Heads. This is an international practice having many friends and many opponents. As Ribbins⁶² states "several of the Heads in our studies have good memories, as Deputy, of their

headteachers and the part which they played in preparing them for headship” but he continues that other Heads think that “Deputy headship often appears to be neither intrinsically satisfying, nor an adequate preparation for headship, since the aspiring Deputy rarely has the opportunity to make the type of decision which will face him after promotion”.

As many think that Deputy headship is necessary training for Heads a broad discussion and research has been made on this subject. For example Gross and Harriot⁶³ have concluded that “some school systems promote individuals to the principalship only after they have served an apprenticeship as an assistant or vice principal apparently, in the belief that it is valuable training” but Ribbins⁶⁴ findings suggest that they should not. However, he continues, “curiously and despite such evidence, it seems that a belief in deputy headship as an effective preparation for headship is now even more strongly entrenched than it was... were undertaking their research.” Thus, in this research, of the Head interviewed, 38.5% had been Deputy. This does not mean that they always felt supported or prepared for headship by their headteachers. Many times Heads had learnt as Deputy Heads from the example of their headteachers had more to do with “how not to do” than “how to do” headship. Ribbins writes that a teacher stated: “I have worked with seven headteachers, and you do learn. I remember one of them saying to me ‘well, you will go elsewhere and you would not make these same mistakes but remember you will make your own! I always remember that. And I can think of the people that I have worked with from whom I learned a great deal about what to do and what not to do, in the certain knowledge that you are going to make your own mistakes.”

One other problem is, as some secondary schools have more than one Deputy Head there are practical difficulties. Not all can achieve headship. Lastly, many secondary schools do not have a Deputy, so there is nobody to be trained for headship.

There is no formal training for headship for Greek secondary Heads as only 5% of interviewees answered that they had attended seminars or lessons on school management. 95% stated that they learnt about headship by

experience. Parry Michael and Raymond Long⁶⁵ are among those who have argued that learning informally from senior colleagues and “profiting by experience” (i.e. learning by mistakes) are no longer adequate forms of initial or in-service training for Heads. The existence of inherent talents and abilities is not enough for a leader. It is necessary to have training and improvement of these abilities through studies. The leader not only “is born” but could “become”. So, what Saitis⁶⁶ states is of high priority. “Emphasis should be given in further training of civil servants and of executives of education. Two should be at least the basic goals of educational program: the advancement of their abilities and the change of bureaucratic outlook.” Unfortunately, “the training of Heads was many times planned but never took place.”⁶⁷ On the other hand “recipe-style knowledge gleaned from textbooks, which assumes that it can be applied in a rationalistic, even mechanistic way, is of rather help and effective practitioners are those who are able to reflect critically and constructively on their practical experience: hence, their professional education and training should be designed to help them to engage in reflection on their practice”.⁶⁸ And Bolam continues: “there has been a rich development in theory both about management and about organisations. However, these micro-politics, symbols and competing rationalities, though yielding improved ways of understanding organisations and indeed could inhibit the headteachers’ capacity to act. They add interest to training programs and probably fascinate more participants than they repel, but this relationship to practice is complex, some would say dubious, and others would say non existent.” Mentoring of new Headteachers was the focus of a national pilot scheme in England and Wales. According to the evaluation report⁶⁹, based on a sample of 303 mentors and 238 new Headteachers, 66 percent of new Headteachers respondents and 73 percent of mentors said that the mentoring process had been either successful or very successful. “In summary, these problems demonstrate that there are, indeed, severe limitations to the present state of our theoretical knowledge, a conclusion supported by the critical accounts of preparation programs for the principals of U.S. schools.”⁷⁰

Concluding, it could be said that the vast majority of Heads of Greek secondary schools did not learn to exercise their duties as Heads. Although it is a risk to depend upon theory of management in order to train Heads, some kind of training for all Heads, new and old needs to be offered. It is usual for Heads to learn watching their Heads during their career as teachers but it could not substitute any formal education. Mentoring could help new Heads in their job and cooperation between Heads could keep them in action improving their performance.

The second question addressed to interviewees was about their opinion of what are the main characteristics of a successful Head. Before studying their answers it is useful to see what others think on the subject. "Taking in account that State's prosperity depends mainly upon the quality of its executives, the appointment and advancement of the most able officials and their use in positions according to their knowledge, is the basis for the handling of people in state administration."⁷¹ Papanikolaou⁷² goes further saying, "the school is the productive unit of education. So, the role of the Head, because the work is collective, needs at least over moderate abilities. In this case what will happen with lists, years of service, seniority, etc. and above all with people's ambition?only who meets the requirements of the job must be Head and if he does not meet these requirements then must be removed soon." But the main problem is which is the process of promoting a teacher to be Head. Many believe that the present situation in Greek education about teacher promotion to Head is not objective and usually does not lead to the right result. Zavlanos⁷³ states that " the judgement of the committee for the promotion for Head is based only in subjective appraisal and not in objective criteria. The making up of the committee only by elective representatives of teachers union and not by specialists in administration and management of education, I think that further decreases the ability of the committee for objective judgement."

Furthermore, there is no agreement on which abilities are necessary for a Head. Act 1566, article eleven, paragraph one describes Heads duties as: organizational, co-ordinating, administrative and educational without any

discrimination.⁷⁴ This implements some qualifications for the Head but as it is not clear which should be these qualifications, an extensive discussion has taken place. Saitis⁷⁵ states that “for the success in the lower levels of hierarchy the most important ability is the professional, but for the higher levels of hierarchy is the ability to perceive. However, the ability to cooperate is of equal importance in all levels of hierarchy.”

Zavlanos⁷⁶ goes further saying that “in personal characteristics is included that the person who administers must be responsible, honest, flexible, to have self-control, ability to perceive, to develop personal relations, to take initiatives, to create motivation, to have creativity. In the region of administrative abilities the person must be able to plan, to organize, to foresee, to manage, to judge, to communicate and keep the control. So he needs to have:

1. Technical expertise,
2. Human qualities
3. Mental abilities.

Bolam⁷⁷ says that, “Headteachers are now required to have strategic leadership, planning, marketing, evaluation and development skills, to focus much more directly than hitherto on student learning and assessment; to operate as a quasi chief executive in relation to school governors; to work collaboratively with parents and the community; to work productively with external inspectors; to cooperate as well as compete with Heads in neighbouring schools.”

A closed question was addressed to interviewees asking what are, according to their opinion, the main characteristics of a successful Head and they were asked to fill in the following table (completing in the order 1,2,3,4):

	Order (1,2,3,4)
Personal ability	
Ability to cooperate	
Ability to perceive	
Other	

Coding the answers of interviewees we have the following table.

	First choice	Second choice	Third choice	Fourth choice
Professional ability	10.2%	37.3%	52.5%	
Ability to cooperate	50.8%	28.8%	18.6%	1.8%
Ability to perceive	36.8%	33.4%	26.3%	3.5%
other	5.4%		2.6%	92%

It is clear that interviewees consider the ability to cooperate as the most important aspect of school management and the ability to perceive and the professional ability follows this. As 'other', Heads say the 'knowledge of legislation', 'personality', 'love for the school', etc. The high percentage of interviewees who consider professional ability as their third choice should be underlined.

It should be said that it is difficult to describe characteristics of a successful Head since there is no agreement about these either in bibliographies or in interviewee answers. There is an open era for further discussion, hence, it is difficult to decide which should be the criteria for promotion of a teacher to Head. However, it is necessary for the existence of an objective selection procedure taking into account the recent research on the subject and including in the selection committee experts in school management.

A third area which the present research tried to investigate was about the special role of a Head as teacher and as administrator. The question was: "Would you describe yourself as a teacher or as a managerial executive?" 32.8% answered that they consider themselves as teachers. They stated that they are still teachers having the responsibility of managing the school. These agree with Alamanis⁷⁸ who writes that "the main goal, which an educationist must achieve, is the transfer of knowledge to students, while the goal of school management becomes secondary, without losing in importance". So, it is reasonable that 24.6% of interviewees replied that they see themselves both as teachers and as administrators. Hence, his job is very difficult because he undertakes a lot of responsibilities. He must act as a link between school and education authorities and at the same time he must be a teacher. 42.8% of interviewees answered that they are "managers". They said that having just a few hours per week to teach and all the other time they are dealing with the management of the school, has as result to consider themselves as managerial executives of a special kind. Maratheftis⁷⁹ underlines that "the Head of a school is very different than any manager of a company. For the last one is important to achieve the goals of the company which are the increase of production and of profit, and does not care very much about personal relations between the personnel of the company. On the contrary, the Head of a school, in order to achieve his goals, must give special importance in personal relations."

So, the role of a Head should be considered as a role including and combining the role of a teacher and a manager.

Investigating which are the main elements that satisfy Heads in their jobs, the study of Peter Ribbins⁸⁰ research is useful. Answers of his interviewees are quoted here. They stated: "I really love the job of Headship. I love coming to the school. I love dealing with the personnel side. I like dealing with my staff. I like feel I am helpful and I like to feel my school is achieving for the girls. I love the job. I really do" is the side of positive answers. On the side of negative answers should be quoted that "... suggesting that, whatever its merits, the job does not carry a high social status, others argue that the job is much harder

than it used to be. ...so many people have said to me in the past 'Oh, you are only a school Head, why don't you do something else?'" Greek Heads' responses were similar to these. 42.6% stated that running the school properly is a satisfaction for the Head. 26.3% are satisfied only because they have the opportunity to develop interpersonal relations with students, parents and staff. 9.8% believe that they help to improve the quality of the school and this is what pleases them, while another 9.8% are not pleased by the achievements of students. 1.6% stated that they feel that they offer good services to the society and lastly, 9.9% do not feel any satisfaction being Head. Although there are many Heads who see their job as difficult, most of them find a kind of satisfaction.

The third issue of this part of the research was about independence of the school. The question was: "Do you think that greater independence should be given to schools? In this case who should have more power: the Head, the Teachers Council or the representatives of the local community (parents, municipal authorities, etc.)? 72.2% of interviewees stated that a greater independence should be given to schools. Although many think that Act 1566 gives authority to the Head⁸¹ the lack of ministerial decrees which would arrange the duties of the Head and of the Teachers Council do not allow the school to be independent. It is not meant that Heads should be the only power within schools. It is far away from Greek case what Spaulding⁸² says. She stated that "...the authority of the school principal is in unremitting danger from teachers, students, parents and the school board. Thus, the members of these groups (i.e. teachers, students, parents and board members), since they threaten the principals authority are to some extent the natural enemies of the principal who represents and lives by authority." Greek secondary school Heads work closely with teachers, students and parents. 14.7% of interviewees feel that they have enough independence and they do not need more and 13.1% they did not have any opinion on this question.

Next question was if they have noticed any change in the role of the Head during the last decade. The literature search suggests that teachers and Heads believe that "the job of being a headteacher and managing a school in

England and Wales has changed dramatically in the past decade.”⁸³ Bolam stated also that “Corroboration for this conclusion is provided by a unique longitudinal study of cohort of British headteacher over a 10-year period: in 1988, 80 percent of the sample of 188 Head said their role was very different from when they had started in 1982; by 1993, 90 percent said their role had continued to change significantly over the previous five years.”

9.7% of interviewees replied just “yes, it has changed” and 29% answered that “the role of the Head has changed for the worse.” 42% of interviewees do not see any change and 8% are not sure. 11.3% believe that the role of the Head today is better than it was some years ago. An experienced Head underlines, that the role of the Head needs change but he underlines that we should avoid coming back to the “old time authoritative” Head. Many Heads said that the Head of Greek secondary schools of today is “something between Head and caretaker”.

In the question if a Head can change the school 96.7% answered “yes” and only 3.3% replied “no”. It is believed that a Head should try to change school. Vann⁸⁴ states: “I think that it is part of the principal’s job to manage change. Schools are dynamic and change is a fact of life” and she continues: “Most people who work in school will be felt succession will occur and the effects of the new headteacher on the school will be felt in its structure, social interactions and performance. ...if the headteacher is successful then his ability to have a positive impact upon the school and its performance is substantially enhanced.” Only when a Head is accepted by the staff and the students can change gradually develop within the school.⁸⁵ Many interviewees responded that Heads need more power in order to be able to effect change within schools.

The last question was if they have any further comments to make. Some interviewees responded and we quote some of these answers. One young Head states:” I would like a Head who would have training on his role, a severe help by administration executives, a special payment comparing with teachers. With all these parameters the role of the Head could be upgraded and the Head could define the image of the school. According to present

situation I do not think that heads' role can offer many things to the school". Many Heads underline, that low salaries is a main problem for Head since heads' payment is not a motivation for the job. One very successful Head replied: "Although the job is challenging, I ask myself if I will apply again for the post of the Head. It needs much work, payment is very low and the responsibility is great. I do not know if my superidentents recognize my work but the staff, the students and the parents appreciate it very much. This is the only satisfaction from my job." Many other Heads give priority in the lack of ancillary personnel and they insist that "today Heads are caretakers, cleaners, accountants, secretaries etc., but they are neither teachers nor managers of the school."

It is true that today many able teachers and Deputy Heads do not like to undertake headships. This does not seem very strange since it does not happen only in Greek schools. As Ribbins quotes "Others suggest that good Deputies are becoming more reluctant to consider headship" and "There is definitely a group of Deputies who have seen the reality of being Head and have decided not to take on the headship role."

Hence, it is urgent for the State to review the role of a secondary school Head in order to invite better Heads to undertake the management of schools.

8.17 Conclusions.

Sixty-two interviews were conducted in order to investigate the role of the secondary school Head at the present time. This research is helped to a limited extent by research made in Greece, because there is no such extensive research on this field. Only state schools were studied since 93.1% of upper secondary and 92% of lower high schools are state schools and private schools function under the same legislation and they have the same administrative structure as state schools. The size of Greek secondary schools is mainly small. Female teachers outnumber males in secondary schools but they make up only the 16.3% of Heads while the vast majority, 83.7% are men. Only one out of four secondary schools have a secretary. The Statistical Service of the Ministry of Education does not have information

and statistics concerning Heads since they are not interested so much in Heads' roles. Studying Heads' time allocation it was found that secondary Heads deal much more with the supervision of the school and they have contact with teachers and students. In practice many Heads do not teach at all. It became clear that secondary Heads do not have as much time as they would like to deal with the management side of the post and waste a lot of time on trivial and non-productive tasks. The lack of ancillary staff affects the functioning of the school as the role of the Head, instead of being the governor of the school, becomes the supervisor of school buildings.

Regarding the relations between Heads and Deputy Heads, one crucial point emerged showing that it is not clear what exactly the role of the Deputy Head is and what exactly are his duties. The fact is that the main responsibility for the school remains with the Head. On the other hand, it is difficult to say that Deputy Heads are fully prepared to undertake their post. It could be said that the lack of a certain legal framework for Deputy Heads' duties and responsibilities, the small decrease in teaching periods, the authoritative behaviour of certain Heads and the uncomfortable situation of being between the Head and the staff do not allow the Deputy Head to practice effectively within school administration.

Most of the Heads interviewed answered that they have good relations with almost all teachers within and without the school. It does not seem that there are serious cases of conflict among teachers or groups of teachers and wherever they actually do exist, they are faced easily. Heads usually do not give any guidance to teachers as far as their classroom work is concerned. Heads should give help especially to newly appointed teachers who are not well qualified, in the areas of classroom management and school managerial work. Since they are not obliged to give help and teachers are free to accept or refuse any advice, it is difficult for a Head to be a teacher's mentor although it is pertinent to the successful functioning of the school and the improvement of teacher performance. Although Heads do not guide teachers, they encourage and help in their development. In most cases, Heads try to substitute for the State in its responsibility towards supporting teachers. Head,

in a centralized educational system, are generally closer to teachers than the educational authorities and can understand their problems and feel their anxieties and share their problems to a greater extent than the relevant authorities.

As far as teacher appraisal is concerned, teachers expect it after a twenty-year absence. It seems that almost all Heads agree that rules of appraisal should be clear and objective and appraisal should be linked to payment in some form. They see appraisal as an urgent issue for the Greek educational system. On the other hand Heads accept that teachers are independent that have no way of appraising them. As Heads are overloaded with paperwork and other bureaucratic responsibilities, it seems that it is difficult for a school to be a total entity where each of its members has his own role to play and cooperation will produce fruitful results. As secondary Heads have no great power within the school because of the centralized educational system, there are cases where a democratic way of running a school does not necessarily lead to good results.

Heads undertake secretarial and ancillary work since few schools have secretaries and attendants. Problems are also created by the fact that although secretaries' duties are fully described; there is confusion between what secretaries should do and what they actually do. It is not only the lack of money, which is a strong restriction to efficiency, but also the way in which the School Committee is structured and its function also needs to be changed. Thus, Heads tend not to have plans for their schools resulting in false expectations of change. It seems to be clear that gaps in legislation referring to the role of the Head and the Teachers Council create problems in school management. The overlap of responsibilities results in low productivity, the malfunction of the school and tension between Head and teachers. Under these conditions Directors do not expect a dynamic, creative approach from Heads and do not allow them to take any initiative. In a centralised system, nobody plays a major role except the Ministry of Education. All others, teachers, Heads, directors and school advisers, work under decisions made

by the Ministry of Education. Since there is no room for innovation, the Head is not a leader; he is simply a cog in the wheel of the educational system.

Heads are not satisfied by parents' participation in the functioning of the school, as they do not help the Head in school administration, but rather hinder the decision-making process.

The vast majority of Heads do not learn to exercise their duties. They need help and training in order to exercise these duties and improve their performance. This can only happen within a framework for the development of the role of secondary Heads resulting in the attraction of better-qualified, more capable and better-motivated Heads to undertake the management of schools.

-
- ¹ Zavlanos M., *Analysis and perceptions of leadership behavior of Greek secondary school administrators*, Vanderbilt University, Ph.D. 1981.
- ² Saitis Ch. Et al. Redefinition of the role of leadership in modern school. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*. Vol. 7 Jan. 1997, pp. 87-108.
- ³ Saitis et al, *ibid*.
- ⁴ Hall V. et al., *Headteachers at Work*, Open University Press, 1986.
- ⁵ Saitis Ch. et al., *ibid*.
- ⁶ Saitis Ch. et. al., *ibid*.
- ⁷ Hughes M., *Secondary School Administration, A management approach*. Pergamon Press, 1974, p.4.
- ⁸ Hall V.et. al., *ibid*, p. 11.
- ⁹ Saitis Ch. et. al., *ibid*.
- ¹⁰ Presidential decree 249/86, article 3, par.3.
- ¹¹ Theodorou Mich. Some thoughts about the role of Deputy Head in schools, *Nea Paedia*,vol.16,1981,pp. 51-57.
- ¹² Saitis Ch., The institution of deputy Head as a basis for the development of leading staff in education. *Diokitiki Enimerosi*, vol.11, May 1998, pp39-59.
- ¹³ Theodorou Mich., *ibid*.
- ¹⁴ Saitis Ch., *ibid*.
- ¹⁵ Ribbins Peter, Heads on Deputy Headship, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3), 1997, pp295-308.
- ¹⁶ Ribbins Peter, *ibid*.
- ¹⁷ Lainas Ath. Organization and functioning of evening schools, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 8, May 1997, pp. 83-95.
- ¹⁸ Saitis Ch., *ibid*.
- ¹⁹ Alamanis Ath. Greek school and bureaucratic system, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7,Jan. 1997, pp. 67-86.
- ²⁰ Theodorou Mich., *ibid*.
- ²¹ Ribbins Peter, *ibid*.
- ²² Ribbins Peter, *ibid*.
- ²³ Karagiorgis A., Educational management. *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp 21-26.
- ²⁴ Theodorou Mich.,*ibid*.
- ²⁵ Ribbins Peter, *ibid*.
- ²⁶ Papaioannou A., Interpersonal factors which affect school administration, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 27-31.
- ²⁷ Spaulding A., Life and schools, school leadership and management, vol. 17, no 1, pp. 39-55, 1997.
- ²⁸ Karagiorgis A., *ibid*.
- ²⁹ Papaioanou A., *ibid*.
- ³⁰ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ³¹ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ³² Vann B., Micropolitics in the United Kingdom: can a principal ever be expected to be 'one of us'?, *School leadership and Management*, vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 201-204, 1999.
- ³³ Karagiorgis A., *ibid*.
- ³⁴ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ³⁵ Michopoulos A., Strategy of organizational change in the element "work" of Greek school organization. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 14, May 1999, pp. 63-68.
- ³⁶ Theodorou M., *ibid*.
- ³⁷ Papaioanou A., *ibid*.
- ³⁸ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ³⁹ Maratheftis M., The Head of a school and his role, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 45-50.
- ⁴⁰ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ⁴¹ Spaulding A., *ibid*.
- ⁴² Lainas A., Managerial support of schools, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 3, Sept. 1995, pp. 49-63.
- ⁴³ Bantam Y., Humphreys K., Gaining Entry: challenges for the novice headteacher, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 17, no 1, pp 81-94, 1997.
- ⁴⁴ Saiti A., The role of organs of public participation in education. The case of School Council, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*,vol. 14, May 1999, pp. 40-52.
- ⁴⁵ Papaioannou M., Conception and application of an innovation in a school through a decentralized model of administration, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 14, May 1999, pp. 87-95.

- ⁴⁶ Saitis Ch., Sourtzi E., Tourtouni G., Legislative gaps-ambiguities and their implications on the functioning of schools, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 4, January 1996, pp. 87-108.
- ⁴⁷ Saitis Ch., Fegari M., Voulgari D., Redefinition of the role of Headship in modern schools, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7, January 1997.
- ⁴⁸ Papaioanou A., *ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ Karagiorgis A., *ibid.*
- ⁵⁰ Spaulding A., Life in schools, *School Leadership and Management*, vol.17, no. 1, pp. 39-55, 1997.
- ⁵¹ Theodorou M., *ibid.*
- ⁵² Spaulding A., *ibid.*
- ⁵³ Maratheftis M., The Head of a school and his role, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 45-50.
- ⁵⁴ Mercer D., Can They Walk on Water? Professional isolation and the secondary headmaster, *School Organisation*, vol. 16, no 2, pp 105-178, 1996.
- ⁵⁵ Saiti A., The role of organs of public participation in education. The case of School Council. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 14, May 1999, pp. 40-52.
- ⁵⁶ Saiti A., *ibid.*
- ⁵⁷ Bolam Ray, Management Development for Headteachers, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol.25 (3), pp. 265-283, 1997.
- ⁵⁸ Balaskas K., The educational role of the Head of a school, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 40, 1986, pp. 92-94.
- ⁵⁹ Papaioannou A., *ibid.*
- ⁶⁰ Saitis Ch., Thoughts for the development of leader executives in education, *Dimosios Tomeas*, vol. 127, February 1997, pp. 33-38.
- ⁶¹ Saitis Ch., Fegari M., Voulgari D., *ibid.*
- ⁶² Ribbins P., *ibid.*
- ⁶³ Gross N., Herriot R., *Staff Leadership in Public Schools*. New York, Wiley, 1965.
- ⁶⁴ Ribbins P., *ibid.*
- ⁶⁵ *Secondary School Administration*, Ed. M. Hughes, Pergamon Press, p.5.
- ⁶⁶ Saitis Ch., Thoughts about the effective function of support service of Education, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 3, September 1995, pp. 40-48.
- ⁶⁷ Andreou A., The training of executives of Education, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 8, May 1997, pp. 96-104.
- ⁶⁸ Bolam Ray, Management development for Headteachers, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3) 1997, pp. 265-283.
- ⁶⁹ Bolam Ray, *ibid.*
- ⁷⁰ Bolam Ray, *ibid.*
- ⁷¹ Saitis Ch., Thoughts concerning the effective function of support service of Education, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 3, September 1995, pp. 40-48,
- ⁷² Papanikolaou K., Educational Management, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 18-20.
- ⁷³ Zavlanos M., A sketch of a program for education of Head, School Advisers and School Directors, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 34, 1985, pp. 60-67.
- ⁷⁴ Balaskas K., *ibid.*
- ⁷⁵ Saitis Ch., , Thoughts for the development of leader executives in education, *Dimosios Tomaeas*, vol. 127, February 1997, pp. 33-38.
- ⁷⁶ Zavlanos M., *ibid.*
- ⁷⁷ Bolam R., *ibid.*
- ⁷⁸ Alamanis Ath., Greek school and bureaucratic system, *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7, Jan. 1997, pp. 67-86.
- ⁷⁹ Maratheftis M., The Head of a school and his role, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981.
- ⁸⁰ Ribbins P., *ibid.*
- ⁸¹ Balaskas K., *ibid.*
- ⁸² Spaulding A., *ibid.*
- ⁸³ Bolam R., *ibid.*
- ⁸⁴ Vann B., Micropolitics in the United Kingdom: can a principal ever be expected to be "one of us"?, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 19, no 2, pp. 201-204, 1999.
- ⁸⁵ Maratheftis M., *ibid.*

CHAPTER IX

Additional study on Heads situation at present day.

9.1 Initial studies and in-service training of Heads.

Research on the role of headteachers within Modern Greek Secondary education has shown that heads face many problems within the framework of their duties. Teaching in a school or managing a school is becoming more and more difficult. Mapstone¹, commenting on this matter, states that:

“Teachers continue nationally to be faced with declining roles, deteriorating working conditions, and school closures and contraction.

It has also been a period when education has been subject to intense and often adverse criticism. It is not surprising that the commonly held view is that teachers are suffering from low morale, diminished self esteem, and increasing stress.”

The above mentioned problems are generally met in most countries and it could be said that teachers' declining roles are not in agreement with their educational roles. Extensive research is needed in order to study reasons for this situation. However, the latter can only be briefly touched upon herein. According to Hoyle² there are two ways to explain the present situation in schools. “One form of explanation is historical. The present structure of schools is thus because it has certain historical antecedents. Whether such an explanation can have practical implications depends, of course, on one's

theory of history, and only if one adopts an historicist view which sees any current phenomenon as part of the working out of some teleological purpose can one link the explanation to practice. And even then one can either accept the present situation as a manifestation of historical inevitability, or one gives inevitability a helping hand. Another form of explanation is functionalist. One form of functionalist explanation is that schools display loose coupling because that system is what works, that it is the best form of organization for achieving the purpose of schools. This form of functionalism obviously has a conservative cast to it. A more radical form of functionalist explanation is that schools are structured as they are because this is functional for achieving the ends of schooling which has been determined by ruling groups.”

Whichever the way of explaining the present situation in schools it is useful to examine secondary school teacher training in school management. There is an effort across Europe towards teacher training in school management but its content and extent vary. Educational systems vary with cultural and historical differences, different attitudes concerning education all create a unique educational framework for each country, according to which educational management system is in force. As Sayer³ states:

“It is partly because of these differences and dilemmas that there is such a variety of management training for schools across Europe. In some countries it is systematic and reinforces the present system. In others it is non-existent. In others again, it is borrowed from other cultures, whether from the different educational cultures of other countries or from the different management cultures of other enterprises. In some countries, the focus is on intending heads, in others on existing heads.”

In the case of the Greek System secondary teacher training in school management is generally non-existent. In some cases in the past seminars of short duration would take place for new some heads. Although primary teachers have a course in school management during their initial studies, secondary teachers do not have such an opportunity. The teaching profession includes teaching and management tasks and only the proportion between them increases or decreases as a teacher goes towards headship. As it is impossible to separate strictly teaching tasks from strictly organizing tasks, training in both sectors is needed. Fons van Wieringen⁴ describes this problem as follows:

“Within schools you cannot make a division between strictly teaching tasks and strictly organizing management tasks. There is a very wide area in between in which many teachers fulfill coordinating tasks as well as their teaching tasks at the same time.

Such a fluid transition between educational tasks and organizational tasks means a strict dualistic interpretation of school organization in terms of an educational (teaching) zone and a management zone is inadequate. School managers (leaders) have a managing role and a professional role.”

It is true that in some countries there has been a great effort to train people, within schools, in school management to employ people with management skills and experience. Results in school functioning under managers were no much better than they were under professional teachers. Thus, there is a trend towards training of professional teachers in school management. On the other hand, Eva Balazs⁵ commenting on school management states:

“It is interesting to find that school management which was considered a very attractive and stable profession, something to hold on to, no longer seems to have the appeal it used to.”

This means that fewer people outside education would like to take a managerial post in secondary school and fewer teachers would like to undertake the difficult post of headteacher.

Although, a divergence of European educational systems is given, it could be a common core in school management training courses. This problem needs extensive study and R. Bolam⁶ gives his thoughts on it:

“It follows from all this that there is considerable variation in the content of school management training programs, depending on the circumstances in each country. Nevertheless, there would probably be some general agreement that a common core of technical knowledge and skills should ideally be addressed, even though this might not always be achieved in practice. This core would probably be agreed to include such topics as the legal and professional framework of school management, and key management tasks like strategic planning, including overall policy and aims, and the school’s development plan; communication and decision-making structures and roles, including team building and development; the curriculum, teaching methods, testing and examinations; student learning, organisation and counseling; staff organisation, appraisal and development, including non-teaching staff, equal opportunities and industrial relations; the management of financial and material resources; external relations, including working with parents, governors, the local education authority and marketing the school; monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness; the management of change and development; and self-development as a manager.”

However, certain subjects in the above mentioned common core (such as curriculum or educational policy) might not be so useful to a Greek secondary headteacher, as Greek Secondary Education is strictly centralised, it should be included in a program of management training in order to give a more complete view of school management.

Secondary teacher training in school management is something non-existent in Greek education. Greek secondary heads usually undertake their post without any preparation at all. This practice leads to low levels of management in most schools, creating difficulties in applying any change and reform, and underestimation of the role of schools within society. On the other hand, simultaneously, many developing European countries are trying to reach full development in this field. One example is Hungary, where “school management training is traditionally well-developed, despite the fact that there were no legal regulations that would make it compulsory for school heads to take part in management training. The 1991/92 study showed that two thirds of school heads had taken part in one or another sort of management training and could thus be considered as ‘trained managers’.”⁷ The majority of Hungarian heads considered university undergraduate training to be completely insufficient for managerial training and had taken managerial qualifications attending courses in management. Sayer⁸ ends by stating that:

“ We might all agree that a special kind of preparation and training for headship is necessary if other teachers are kept away from management, as they have been in many countries. But if we want to move to a more collegiate form of management, we have to be cautious about emphasizing training and

qualifications for headship. Perhaps preparation for headship would be more appropriate for all concerned.”

The above view is necessary, because learning informally from senior colleagues and ‘profiting by experience’ (i.e. learning by making mistakes) are no longer adequate forms of initial or in-service training for Headmasters.⁹

The succession of Heads is not a simple event but a complex interactive process, based not only upon the characteristics of the new leader and the succession process, but also upon the social organisation of the school. “Most people who work in schools assume that succession will occur and the effects of the new teacher on the school will be felt in its structure, social interaction and performance”¹⁰ Thus, headteacher preparation is a crucial point in his selection for a post and should involve long and complete training. “It is generally recognized that educational management, is a very different activity from industrial management as those who manage educational institutions are not balancing massive budgets or deploying huge physical resources, or constantly negotiating with trade unions in pursuit of well-defined goals. As institutions of cultural transmission the management of schools is, or ought to be, of a different order.

...All this means that we should not assume that the major task involved in training managers is transmitting business skills or even the skills of managing and motivating people.”¹¹

Thus, the training of headteachers should be one of the major factors in their selection for headship. Various processes of appointing a Head are in use in

various European countries. Bolam¹² describes the variety of these different processes as follows:

“For instance, in the UK Headteachers are appointed by school governors after a process of advertising in the national press, they usually have extensive practical experience as deputy heads and earn a salary which can be as much as four times that of a newly qualified teacher. In Spain, headteachers are civil servants, they are normally elected by the teachers in a school from within their own rank and they receive only a nominal increase in salary for taking on this position. In Switzerland, the role simply does not exist and school management is the responsibility of elected community representatives. In Norway, the school leader may be responsible for several schools over a wide area. The USA is unusual in that principals are normally required to have completed an accredited preparatory university program and, once appointed, are mainly administrators who do little, if any, teaching at all. In some countries, union and political affiliations can significantly influence appointments to the job of headteacher; the key management and supervisory role is often that of an inspector and headteachers have only subsidiary functions; the school may be run on a shift system; the teachers may have several other jobs; and headteachers may be subject to overpowering local political pressures.”

Greek headteachers are civil servants, as are all teachers in state schools, and are elected for a period of four years. From the beginning of the Modern Greek State, only Greek language teachers could be headteachers. After 1939 it was possible to become a headteacher having other specialities such as mathematics, science and theology. At those times an army officer was a member of the council which elected heads.¹³ After the Second World War there were no significant changes in the election of headteachers and school inspectors played a key role in the whole process of promotion of teachers for

headteacher positions. In order for a teacher to become a headteacher an experience of twelve years in teaching is needed. The electing board of headteachers takes into account: a) the pedagogical and professional ability of the candidate, b) his official status and teaching experience and c) his ability in school management. It is broadly accepted that the above mentioned process does not guarantee meritocracy in the selection of heads. On the contrary, the selection of heads is controlled by the Ministry of Education and the political party in power at any given time exercises its influence in selection boards. It is commonly accepted that this is the main problem in school management and in improvement within the educational system.

9.2 The payment of Headteachers.

Looking through the responsibilities of the central Education Authorities it should be mentioned that the problems within the educational system are not only educational but also economic. Every educational system requires money in order to function properly and each item of expenditure has its own economic result.

Before the Second World War Greece was spending about 8% of its National Income on Education. The above percentage did not increase after the War, but instead followed a downward trend. There was a severe decrease in spending money, as a percentage of the total expenditure for Education after 1966.¹⁴ The following table gives an idea of expenditure on education as a percentage of the Gross National Product for 1955-1973. The situation has

not changed since then and it should be mentioned that until 1973 educational expenditure included priests' salaries.

Year	Percentage
1955	1,9
1958	2,0
1961	2,1
1965	2,3
1967	2,0
1969	1,9
1970	2,2
1971	1,8
1973	2,0

Table 8 Percentage of GNP spending on Education from 1955 until 1973.

Comparing figures it can be seen that after 1965 percentages of GNP spending on Education decreased, although the number of students between 1965 and 1973 increased by 167%. It is obvious that the quality of Education was lower and unfortunately this situation has existed since then.

It should be underlined that in 1963 expenditure on Education, including priests' salaries, was lower than expenditure on the police force. In fact expenditure on the police force was 107% and for National Defense 175% of that spent on Education in 1963. The situation changed and in 1973 expenditure on the police force was 52% and on National Defense 175% of the expenditure on Education. It is true that Greece requires a high level of expenditure on National Defense while all other European countries spend more on Education rather than on Defense. It is a matter of the priorities each government sets, and it seems that Greek governments, throughout the years, have not given high priority to Education. The per capita expenses on Education in Greece were and remain less than similar expenses in most developed countries.

The above figures give only a vague picture of the financing of Greek Education. It is well known that inflow methods do not give exact information about the quality of Education.¹⁵ It should be mentioned here that the above data is used because it is easier to understand and compare it. Internationally the main portion of expenses includes teachers' salaries. The lower percentage of expenditure on salaries, the better for the educational system. It is clear that remain many questions concerning economics of Greek Education i.e. concerning the return for money spent.

9.3 Teachers' salaries

Teachers' salaries have always been, since the establishment of the Modern Greek State, a main issue. Due to the different qualifications teachers had at that time, they were divided into three categories. The Royal decree of 31-12-1836, which included many aspects concerning secondary education, determined secondary school teachers' salaries. According to the decree, teachers' salaries in "Greek Schools", so called the lower secondary schools, where for the first class teachers 120 drachmas per month, for second class teachers 150 drachmas per month and for third class teachers 180 drachmas per month. These salaries were increased every five years by 20 per cent with an upper limit of 250 drachmas per month. Upper secondary school teachers earned 200 drachmas per month with an upper limit of 300 drachmas. It should be mentioned here that salaries at that time, compared with salaries in other public services, were high considering that there was an extremely great shortage of money in a State which was in the process of being established. The shortage of well-qualified teachers at that time has been underlined in earlier chapters. Teachers at that time were mainly graduates from European Universities and were paid well¹⁶ or were under-qualified and they worked in rural schools and received much lower salaries.

The study of teachers' salaries during the 180 years of the Modern Greek State is very important and is probably linked with the evolution of education and society and needs special research.

During the last two centuries the increase in educational services for which the state has paid, has been phenomenal. Especially after the Second World War, the increase of expenditure on education was rapid. Thus, there were increasing problems with funding and financing in the large, expensive public sector and especially in state secondary schools. The greater part of expenditure included teachers' salaries which during the period under examination, were low. This is the reason why teachers in state schools were allowed to work simultaneously in private schools, according to Act 4379 of 1964, until the seventies. Nowadays this kind of supplementary teaching or any other kind of job is forbidden for state schoolteachers. In studying the last fifty years of the evolution of teachers' salaries we can observe three main periods. The first period is 1951-1967, when Act 1811 of 1951 was in force and concerned everything to do with teachers' salaries. The following table shows those relevant salaries.

Scale	Salary in drachmas
Inspector	9500
Upper secondary school Head	9000
Lower Secondary School Head	8250
Deputy Head	7150

Scale one	5750
Scale two	4000
Scale three	3250

Table 9 Teachers' salaries according the Act 1811 of 1951.

It can be seen from the above table that increases in teachers' salaries from one scale to another were between 5.5% for inspectors and 43% for scale one staff. To these amounts should be added allowances which increased teachers' salaries compared with other civil servants by about twenty percent. Another set of increases was those concerning seniority, which were between 10%-26%. Moreover, there were additional allowances and payments for overtime work, thus the salary system for secondary teachers was rather complex and its study, though possibly useful, is beyond the realms of the present research. The only comment that should be added here is that the basic salary of a Head was three times the basic salary of a newly-appointed teacher and the final salary of a Head was more than three times the salary of a new teacher.

Civil service salaries in Greece are generally very low, especially for those who are newly appointed. Makridimitris¹⁷ states that:

"Civil servants' salaries (especially those who are over-qualified and well educated professionals) are extremely low, much lower than the salaries for

respective jobs in the private section. This happens in a great number of civil service sectors. “

Another important aspect concerning headteachers' salaries is the comparison of their salaries with those of other groups such as military officers, police officers and other civil servants. On the whole, the difference between headteachers' salaries and other groups is now greater than it was many years ago. Another important comparison is between teachers' salaries and salaries in other professions requiring the same qualifications. “A global study on teachers by the ILO (1991) revealed that in the early 1980s teacher salaries in Africa, Asia and Latin America were on average half those of professionals requiring comparable training.”¹⁸ That was the result of various factors, such as, for example, the fact that teachers form one of the largest single professional groups in each country and their salaries constitute the largest expense in education budgets- approximately 50% of recurrent expenditure in Africa, 80% in Asia and 95% in Latin America. Another reason, causing low salaries for teachers, is that “many governments may hire more teachers as a public employment scheme or as an effort to lower student/teacher ratios. This hiring of extra staff can easily turn into overstaffing. Given public financing constraints, the only way this can be done is by offering lower teacher salaries.”¹⁹

One important factor, which may perhaps help explain wage differentials between teachers and other equally qualified groups, is the hours worked. It has been established worldwide that teachers work fewer hours per week than any other professionals do. Another factor is that teachers' unions are

not very strong and strikes are not very important to governments and their economic policies. Psacharopoulos et. al. made an important comment on countries which have suffered from high inflation. They stated that:

“The fact that teachers’ relative earnings have declined in those countries suffering high inflation may be a sign that teachers do not benefit from cost of living adjustments comparable to those of other professions.”

Up to this point Greece had suffered for a long time with high inflation and this had had results on teachers’ salaries. Low earnings for teachers had led highly qualified people out of the teaching profession. This went against the quality of education.²⁰ Theobald and Gritz in their study²¹ “The Effects of School District Spending Priorities on the Exit Paths of Beginning Teachers Leaving the District” found in the USA that:

1. Raising teacher salaries in all districts substantially reduces the number of beginning teachers who choose to leave the public school system from their first teaching position and increases the likelihood of newly-appointed teachers transferring to another school district within the first ten years.
2. Male newly-appointed teachers are more likely to leave the public school system when teacher salaries are lower and go to other school districts.
3. Newly-appointed teachers are more likely to leave their initial position and stop teaching in the public school system when expenditures for specialist staff involved in teaching activities are increased. The level of teacher salaries in a state influences the length of time beginning teachers work in a state school system.

In all levels of education, from nursery to university teachers have never been satisfied with their salaries.²² Women are less dissatisfied than men. There have been discussions about salary structures and their effectiveness in the

quality of education.²³ Some introduce a restructuring of pay for heads and deputy heads and for teachers according to their performance²⁴ or are against a unified salary system.²⁵

9. 4 Female headteachers.

It has been seen that female education has been the main concern of the Modern Greek State. This was expressed by the law of 1834 when primary education became compulsory for boys and girls. In fact, education was a privilege more for boys, as at the end of 19th century girls constituted no more than 15.54% of the total number of pupils. From the beginning of the New Greek State efforts were made to establish schools for girls. During 1830 the first secondary school for girls was established on the island of Siros.²⁶ On 31st of December 1836, in a royal decree a paragraph concerning private education was introduced for the first time. Due to this article, *Filekpedeftiki Eteria*, a society for girls' education, tried to establish schools in Athens and other places in Greece. During that period schools were divided into two cycles, one being an eight-year lower cycle and the other a four-year upper cycle leading to the teaching profession. Most of the female teachers at that time had studied at "Arsakio" the school of *Filekpedeftiki Eteria* and many had higher studies from university after 1890. The teaching profession was the first job where women were actually paid and the educational reform of 1929 helped in increasing the number of female teachers. So female teachers made up about 40% of the teachers in state schools. The percentage of female teachers was double in private schools.

The following table indicates percentages of female teachers in secondary education in Europe and Worldwide:

	1990	1996
Europe	62.6%	65.44%
World	44.8%	47.7%

Table 10: Percentages of female teachers in secondary education in Europe and Worldwide.

Percentages of female teachers in Greek secondary education are shown in the following table:

	2000-2001
Lower secondary schools	64.7%
Upper secondary schools	49.8%
Technical and vocational secondary schools	45%

Table11 Percentages of female teachers in Greek secondary education.

All the above mentioned data shows that secondary teaching is rapidly becoming a more female profession. This is happening due to the educational system, which accepts boys and girls on equal terms, and to Greek families which spend money on the education of their children regardless of their sex.

Research concerning the increase of the number of females within the teaching profession has resulted in the minimization of the status of teaching profession.²⁷ It is worth mentioning here that the minimization of status of the teaching profession formed opposition within teachers union.²⁸ Consequently, the salaries of male and female teachers were not made equal until 1975.²⁹ This was the case worldwide until recently. In Switzerland a Court decided in 1977 that male and female teachers should be paid the same salary levels.³⁰ In the USA "...it has been reported that female school superintendents were similar to their male counterparts in the way they perceived their work. However, the women had to overcome subtle forms of discrimination".³¹ This happens generally although in many cases, such as in Hungary, female heads within the same school type are usually more highly qualified than their male counterparts.³² Coleman, in an effort to explain, this phenomenon stated that:

"One very practical reason why the stereotype of the male secondary Head is extensive is the fact that the overwhelming number of secondary heads are, in fact, male. This makes it particularly difficult for women to overcome the stereotype, and would appear to require them to surpass the standard that might be expected of male candidates."³³

Female heads have different styles of management compared to male heads. Although it is not always true, the female style of school management is more free from the more formal images associated with male leaders. Coleman in her extensive research concluded that:

“A stereotype exists of a tough, possibly aggressive, leader, who is preoccupied with tasks rather than relationships. In contrast, the female manager in education has tended to be identified with the ‘softer’ aspects of management, for example, those aspects related with pastoral work or the management of people.

...some of the male heads emphasized collegial relations and participatory forms of management in schools while some of the female heads were inclined towards hierarchy and authority in management. Significant differences in styles of leadership are not difficult to demonstrate in general ... although the clear linkage of style with gender is more problematic.”³⁴

Another researcher of female school management, J. Goodman expressed the following views:

“The development of bureaucratic forms of management and an associated model of masculinity defined in terms of the rational, unemotional, logical and authoritative aspects of human behaviour, had constructed administration as a ‘masculine enterprise’ in opposition to the ‘feminine’ enterprise of teaching.”³⁵

During the nineteenth century women did not have the right to run their own businesses and all their activities were restricted to their homes. Some philanthropic women ran schools for working-class children in their homes, remaining in complete control of their school, financing it, running it and

teaching in it. This activity characterised, to a great extent, the female educational management style. "Like secretarial, office-work or nursing, teaching has promised more to the women entering it than it has actually given them, in terms of status, financial rewards and career prospects..."³⁶

Ball continued saying that:

"Women teachers may validly be regarded as a distinct interest group within the school if only because the overall pattern of their career development is so clearly different from that of men teachers.

If we consider the modal location of men and women teachers, we observe that men and women typically teach different subjects to different groups of children, hold responsibilities for different functions within schools, and generally have different chances for rewards within the system."³⁷

Gender differences in teaching in schools create gender differences in school principalship. M. Kruger carried out extensive research on the subject and states that:

"It was not until the seventies that the gender variable came to be included in school management research. The lack of research-based knowledge necessarily results in an international public debate that is mainly based on prejudices and stereotypes with regard to characteristics and qualities of female as well as male principals"³⁸

Research results demonstrate that the "gender" variable has significant effects on leadership performance. Differences in leadership between men and women are determined by gender in combination with school culture.

"The results indicate that at the moment, the situation is still such that in order

to become effective managers women must redefine either their female role or their leadership role. Male teachers perceive the school environment as more positive under a male principal than under a female principal. Female teachers do not differ in this respect, although they are more positive under a female principal than their male colleagues. Female students experience the school culture more positively in schools managed by men than in schools managed by women".³⁹

It is true that women heads are more interested in instructional tasks than men. On the other hand, men spend more time than women on administrative tasks and on external contacts. In solving conflicts women seem to compete less than men while women experience the power of their position to a smaller extent than men. Data shows that the percentage of female school heads is very low in most countries. Even though the majority of teachers in schools in many countries are female, only a small percentage of these are heads. For secondary Education in the USA the Digest of Education Statistics reports that 12% of secondary Head positions have been taken by women in recent years. In European secondary education, the general percentage is about 20%, while the percentage in the Netherlands is even not higher than 7%.⁴⁰ In Greece, although female secondary teachers constitute about 60%, female heads constitute only 20%. In the United Kingdom, female secondary teachers constitute 44% while female secondary school heads are constitute 16.5%.⁴¹

If one was to view the whole situation of women in Greece one would notice that women are 52.3% of the Greek population while only 6.3% of the

members of the Greek parliament are women. Additionally, only 10.6% of managers in the civil service are women.⁴² The percentage of female heads of Local Education Authorities in Greece is even lower and is no more than 3.03%. Many believe that this situation is the result of discrimination against women, as male teachers tend to put barriers to women's careers.⁴³ Hall believes that:

"They were women who had broken through the 'glass ceiling' to become successful leaders in schools. They had circumvented the barriers that traditionally stand in the way of women seeking career advancement in organizations.

They combined entrepreneurial characteristics with a value framework (particularly about relating to people) and a repertoire of behaviours that differed from those often associated in other research with men as managers.

...and the belief was confirmed, that the art of headship (particularly as a moral art) has its roots in childhood and educational and career experiences that cannot be divorced from an individual's gender identity, whether man or women."⁴⁴

Searching for causes of underrepresentation of women at senior levels in teaching, one finds various reasons. For instance, Ball states that:

Saiti, in her extensive research on the subject, agrees with Ball and adds that "Various theories have been put forward, usually by male commentators, to

account for the underrepresentation of women at senior levels in teaching. Two are most often quoted and both are inherently sexist. One attributes the relative lack of promotion among women to a low 'promotion orientation'. This is the view that women are less committed than men to the idea of teaching as a career. In other words, they are less interested in 'getting on'; they see teaching as a convenient means of providing a subsidiary income and a job that can be easily accommodated to the demands of family duties. The second relates to the 'break' career experienced by married women who leave teaching for a period to raise children."⁴⁵

Saiti, in her extensive research on the subject, agrees with Ball and adds that unmarried female teachers or female teachers not having children tend to avoid taking on the responsibility of headship more than married women teachers with children. Many female teachers do not accept managerial work and they believe that managerial work is only for men. Finally, Saiti concluded that the low percentage of female headteachers in Greek schools is due entirely to their own choices.

It is clear therefore, that teacher's role in society is declining. This is common for all educational systems. Teacher training varies from one country to another with teacher training in school management especially being somewhat different. It is an accepted fact that only professionals can lead schools to progress, while professionals in school management can be selected from within school and not outside. As European countries come closer it is useful to have a common core in training in school management in

all countries. This is rather difficult due to existing varieties in teacher and Head status and appointment procedures.

The limited funds spent on public education has led to a decrease in the quality of education. There are differences in teacher and Head salaries from one European country to another and scales between newly-appointed teachers and heads vary considerably. It is common knowledge that teachers' salaries, compared to those of equally qualified people in other sectors, follow society's view that teachers earn lower salaries. This has resulted in many well-qualified teachers leaving the teaching profession. On the other hand, the area of secondary teaching is rapidly becoming a more female area but the percentage of women heads is still low although their qualifications are high and leadership performance is usually successful.

-
- ¹ Mapstone R., *Staff management and the school principal* in Local Management of Schools edited by Ernie Cave and Cyril Wilkinson, 1990 p.98
- ² Hoyle E., *The management of schools: theory and practice* in World Yearbook of Education 1986 edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page 1986.
- ³ Sayer J., *Training for school management in Europe* in Training for Educational Management in Europe edited by Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann, 1999, p.27.
- ⁴ Fons van Wieringen, *Training for Educational Management in Europe*, Waxmann, 1999, p.3.
- ⁵ Balazs E., *Institution-level Educational Management in Hungarian Public Education* in Research on Educational Management in Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1999.
- ⁶ Bolam R., *European problems and trends in Educational Management and Research* in Educational Management across Europe edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993 p.19
- ⁷ Balazs E., *ibid.*
- ⁸ Sayer E., *ibid.*, p.24.
- ⁹ Hughes M., ed. *Secondary School Administration. A Management Approach*, Pergamon Press 1974, p.5.
- ¹⁰ Benaim Y., Humphreys K., Gaining Entry: challenges for the novice headteacher, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 17, no 1, pp. 81-94, 1997.
- ¹¹ Hoyle E., *ibid.*
- ¹² Bolam R., *ibid.* p.10.
- ¹³ Mavroskoufis D., The matter of evaluation of heads' selection: Historical dimension and present situation, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 87, 1998, pp. 143-159.
- ¹⁴ Kokkotas P., The role of Education in the economic development of Greece. Toundas, Athens 1978.
- ¹⁵ Psacharopoulos G., *Economics of Education*, Papazisis, Athens 1999.
- ¹⁶ Hermes o Logios, January 1816.
- ¹⁷ Makridimitris A., *Administration and Society*, Themelio, Athens, 1999, p. 269
- ¹⁸ Psacharopoulos G., Valenzuela J. and Arends M. Teacher salaries in Latin America. A review, *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 401-406, 1996.
- ¹⁹ Psacharopoulos et.al. *ibid.*
- ²⁰ Papas G. and Psacharopoulos G., Teachers' Employment Conditions in Greece: Findings of a Survey. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*. 13(2) October 1995: 243-249.
- ²¹ Theobald N., Gritz M., The Effects of School District Spending Priorities on the Exit Paths of Beginning Teachers Leaving the District., *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 15, No1, pp. 11-22, 1996.
- ²² Oshagbemi T., Correlates of pay satisfaction in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14/1,2000, pp 31-39.
- ²³ Tomlison H., Proposals for Performance Related Pay for Teachers in English Schools. *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 20 No3, pp. 281-298, 2000.
- ²⁴ Lankford H. and Wyckoff J., The Changing Structure of Teacher Compensation, 1970-94. *Economics of Education Review*, vol.16, No4, pp.371-384, 1997.
- ²⁵ Southwick L., Gill I., Unified Salary Schedule and Student SAT Scores: Adverse Effects of Adverse Selection in the Market for Secondary School Teachers. *Economics of Education Review*, vol.16, No2, pp.143-153,1997.
- ²⁶ Atsave P., *Education in schools of "Filekpedeftiki Eteria"* in Filekpedeftiki Eteria, Arsakia Tositsia Schools, Athens 1996.
- ²⁷ Vassilou-Papageorgiou B., Womankind in teaching profession, The Greek case. *Ta Ekpedeftika*, vol. 33, 1994.
- ²⁸ Newspaper "To VIMA" 2-10-1976.
- ²⁹ Avdi-Kalkani Iris, Female Greek professionals, Papazisis, 1978, p.22.
- ³⁰ Voutiras S., Women in paid work, Papazisis, 1981, p.66.
- ³¹ Willower D. *Organisation Theory and the management of schools* in World Yearbook of Education 1986 edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page 1986, p.34.
- ³² Balazs Eva, *ibid.*
- ³³ Coleman M., The Management Style of Female Headteachers, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol.24(2),1996, PP 163-174.
- ³⁴ Coleman M., *ibid.*
- ³⁵ Goodman J., A Question of Management Style: women school governors 1800-1862, *Gender and Education*, vol. 9, pp. 149-160, 1997.
- ³⁶ Ball S., The micropolitics of the school; towards a theory of school organisation. Methuen 1987, p 191.
- ³⁷ Ball S., *ibid.*
- ³⁸ Kruger M., Gender differences in school principalship: prejudices and facts in Research on Educational Management in Europe: Raymond Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
- ³⁹ Kruger M., *ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ Kruger M., *ibid.*
- ⁴¹ DES, *Statistics in Education*, London, HMSO, 1979.

⁴² Saiti A., Women teachers and school administration in Greece, *Ta Ekpedefitika*, vol. 57-58, July-Dec. 2000.

⁴³ Ball S., *ibid*, p. 194

⁴⁴ Hall V., Dusting Off the Phoenix. Gender and Educational Leadership Revisited, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3), 1997, pp. 309-324.

⁴⁵ Ball S., *ibid*. p. 192.

Chapter X

Conclusions.

As can be seen, there has been no significant change in the role of the Head of secondary schools from 1836 to the present day. For more than one hundred and sixty years the framework has remained unchanged and the Head has not been fully prepared to tackle the problems of the school. As Saitis and others state: "the lack of a clear determination of the duties of a head and his responsibilities do not enable him to face all the problems of the school successfully. Thus, a head's role is limited to very narrow traditional boundaries, which in effect means processing of bureaucratic matters".¹

Kazamias² describes the structure of the Greek educational system as follows: "The educational system, as a mechanism of the Greek State, is strictly linked with bureaucracy and centralized institutions. So, it is itself centralized, absolutely controlled and having a bureaucratic and hierarchical structure. The hierarchical politico-ideological system of control within Greek education, at all levels, is called "educational bureaucracy" and its result is hyper-centralization, a great number of civil servants, despotism, formalism and ineffectiveness which frustrate all efforts towards educational reform."

At the top of the bureaucratic system of control the Minister of Education and the members of the central administration of education stand. Below the minister and the central organ of authority there are other hierarchies (directions and divisions) which end at the level of schools (heads and deputy heads). Each link in the chain of authority and government is connected with the application of certain decisions within the framework of its duties. As observed in a current study, "essential decisions related to goals, procedures

and methods for the achievement of pedagogical and educational procedure are taken by those who are at the top of the hierarchy”, which, in effect, means the minister and the central services.

The explanation for this situation should be given within the framework of a broad consideration of the politics of the Modern Greek State. “ It should be sought within interpretive forms which examine the educational system as a complex state institution of government, exertion of authority and social control and as a basic mechanism of production and reproduction of knowledge.”³ The Greek Educational system, as a state institution and as an ideological mechanism, historically formed a strong link with the formation of the Modern Greek state, as also happened to the educational systems of other European countries⁴. As described earlier, the Greek State was organized in a centralized way retaining the power of local authorities, which had existed before the Greek Revolution, during the Turkish occupation. In the process of modernizing of the state, local authorities lost power and centralization became more powerful, having a strong influence on the structure of the Greek educational system. On the other hand, the relation between patronage and citizen, state and bureaucracy, which was linked to the intervention of political parties between citizen and state, had a great influence on the Greek educational system. Reforms in Education were “mainly about the technocratic modernization of school mechanisms, the extension of educational supply and the reforming of the structure of the educational system, always within the boundaries of the centralized hierarchical power of the state.”⁵ This involved, as a result, a great amount of legislation concerning the inspection and central control of schools during the

whole period of the evolution of the Modern Greek State and poor legislation concerning the function, administration and management of schools. The effort towards decentralization which was made during the decade of 1980's did not change the structure of the organization of education significantly and some academics conclude⁶ that the structure became even more centralized.

In inspecting closer educational management and the role of the Head during the evolution of the Modern Greek State, the following points should be mentioned:

1. School Councils, at the beginning, were powerful, as also happened during the Turkish occupation, but as time passed their strength waned and in fact their role became 'typical'. All the activities which had been important in the management of schools passed to the Ministry of Education, so there is the impression that each school is managed by the Minister of Education personally.
2. During the first steps of the Modern Greek State the power and the prestige of the Head of Secondary schools were much greater than those. This had as a result the payment for Heads being much greater than of that for teachers but nowadays the difference between the salary of a Head and a teacher is minimal.
3. The effort towards decentralization which was made during the eighties did not change school management, as the way of thinking at that time remained stable and the influence of petty politics transferred from the Ministry of Education to the local educational authorities.
4. In abolishing teacher appraisal the Head in fact diminished his status. Although Greek society has taken great steps towards progress and the

Greek state has entered into European Union and is among the developed countries of the world, the Greek administrative system has not improved satisfactorily yet.

The political undermining of the Administration is one of the main problems of the administrative system. Other problems include the malfunction of state services and the low level of qualified personnel and management methods. The above mentioned problems are exacerbated by the absence of any well-organised training of personnel and the lack of any objective appraisal. There is an obvious need for reform of the Greek administrative system. There have been efforts towards decentralisation of the system without any results. The cooperation within the European Union has not affected the Greek administrative system particularly and improvements have been made in some special cases only. The political stability of the last few decades will possibly help in improving the situation.

The influence and control of political parties over education, the lack of well-educated personnel in administration, the low level of allowances for Heads and other administrative personnel, the frequent changes in legislation and policy, the lack of any kind of appraisal system and the malfunction of the teachers' union are the main constraints in the development of school policy and are not suitable foundations for improvement of Greek education generally.

The system of administration was the main tool for the imposition of the ideology of the State, of power and authority and of the organization of production and reproduction of the system.

The concentration of too many duties within the Ministry of Education does not free personnel and forces for planning financial aid or resources. The personal influence and control of the Minister of Education in all educational authorities do not allow continuity in educational policy.

The study of different educational systems is important, not only in the present context but also in the context of their evolution and history. This does not mean that a carbon copy of any educational system is suggested, but could help in various ways.

The role of headteachers is central to the successful functioning of a school and affects the level of secondary education. Heads do not have the same job description as managers in business because the nature of schools is completely different from that of other organizations. Schools are becoming more complex, more competitive organizations, so they need better trained heads in all components of their job; the managerial, the professional and the educational. The election of heads mainly by seniority and the centralized Greek Educational System restrict improvement within schools.

Teacher appraisal and changes in educational management are urgent issues concerning secondary education. It is time for the Greek Educational Authorities to abandon the more conservative path and follow great and well-prepared steps towards a level of education that meets European standards.

Most Heads do not have as much time as they would like to deal with the managerial side of the post as they waste a lot of time on trivial and non-productive tasks. The lack of ancillary staff negatively affects the functioning of the school, as the role of a Head, instead of that of a governor of the school, becomes a supervisor of school buildings.

The lack of legal job descriptions for both Heads and Deputy Heads, the authoritative behaviour of certain Heads and the uncomfortable situation of being between the Head and the staff do not allow the Deputy Head to practice effectively within school administration and to act in unison with the Head.

Relations between Heads and Teachers are usually good but Heads tend not to give any guidance to teachers as far as their classroom work is concerned. Heads are overloaded with paperwork and other bureaucratic responsibilities, so it is difficult for them to act collectively with teachers. The School Committee does not usually help Heads in their efforts to run schools and planning is unknown to Greek Heads. Directors of Education do not expect any dynamic, creative approach from Heads and do not allow them to take any initiative. There is no room for innovation as the Head is not a leader; he is simply a cog in the wheel of the educational system.

Heads are not satisfied by parents' participation in the functioning of schools, as they do not help the Head in school administration but rather hinder the decision-making process. The vast majority of Heads do not actively learn to exercise their duties effectively. They need help and training in order to exercise these duties and improve their performance. This can only happen within a framework of development of the role of secondary Heads resulting in the attraction of better-qualified, more capable and better-motivated Heads to undertake the management of schools.

As the role of teachers is declining, it is an accepted fact that only professionals can lead schools towards progress, while professionals in

school management need to be selected from within schools and not from without.

The limited funds spent on public education have led to a decrease in the quality of education. Teachers' salaries are lower than those of equally qualified professionals in other sectors. Thus, many well-qualified teachers leave the teaching profession.

The area of secondary teaching is rapidly becoming a more female-dominated area but the percentage of women Heads is still low although their qualifications are high and their leadership performance still are of a high standard.

Taking into account the above mentioned conclusions, certain recommendations follow concerning the better management of Greek secondary schools and the improvement of their performance generally through changes in the role of Headteachers.

Certain proposals following the above conclusion need to be put forward. It is certainly time for change in the status of Headteachers as a central point of change within secondary school management with a view to a more decentralized system. Specific areas of planning must be moved from the Ministry of Education to local education authorities and to schools themselves. Political patronage must be limited as much as possible and well-prepared and stable long lasting reforms within educational administration are required at this stage.

Legislation concerning the functioning of schools must be completed and guidelines for the running of schools must be made clearer. Authority must be given to Heads in order to control school activities and Heads' allowances

must be increased considerably. The legal status of Heads must be improved and selection of Heads must be more objective and based on meritocracy and training in educational management. These prerequisites will give back to Heads a certain level of prestige, which until the present day, was lacking in the system.

Different educational systems need to be exploited, studying them in detail, in order to enrich the knowledge and experience of planners of the Greek educational administrative system. A great deal of bureaucratic and non-productive paperwork should be done by secretaries and ancillary staff as Heads need that time to focus on their main duties. Improved organisation of Heads, Deputy Heads and Teachers undertaking managerial work will lead to better teamwork within schools. School Committees, School Boards and Parents' Unions must come under new improved legislation in order to help Heads effectively in exercising their duties in running schools. Appraisal systems must be returned to schools and Heads should play a central role in the whole process. Last but not least, the role of female Heads must be studied thoroughly and their contribution upgraded.

¹ Saitis Ch., Tsiamasi F., Chatzi M., The Head of a school, Manager-Leader or a traditional bureaucrat?, *Nea Paedia*, vol. 83, 1997, pp. 66-77.

² Kazamias A., *The curse of Sisyphus*, in *Greek Education: Perspectives of Reconstruction and Modernization*, Athens 1995, p.49.

³ Kazamias A., Kassotakis M., *Educational Manifesto*, in «Greek Education», Athens 1995, p.15.

⁴ Green, A., *Education and State Formation*, Martin's Press, New York, 1990.

⁵ Kazamias, A., Kassotakis M., *ibid*, p.17.

⁶ Sotiropoulos D., «State bureaucracy and populism: The PASOK case, 1981-1989», *Sighrona Themata*, 1993, 49 pp.15-19.

Methodological appendix

In this appendix methods used in the research carried out in the present thesis will be described. The first part of the thesis, involves research on the historical evolution of Greek education, focused on the evolution of the role of Head during the development of the Modern Greek State.

The first problem faced while researching this historical review was the division of the whole time period from 1821 until the present day into smaller periods. There are various views on the subject and the partition which the distinguished Greek historian Vakalopoulos followed was adopted because this serves mainly the historian studying the evolution of education. According to the partitions adopted in this research, there are clear and distinctive educational periods helping in the systematic study of the history of Greek education.

There were, of course, difficulties in accessing and organising the historical sources. It must be underlined here that the Greek library system is underdeveloped and often great efforts are needed in order to reach sources concerning the 19th century. For example, all the legislation housed in the Parliament Library is where we started searching. Unfortunately, the earthquake of 1999 destroyed part of this library, which remained closed for more than one year. We then approached the National Library of Greece, but at that time all the old legislation had been removed from the library for storage on microfiche. The last resort was the Benakios Library, where finally the study of legislation was completed. Thus, systematic research of legislation concerning education from 1821 until the present day was carried out. Unfortunately, this was not the case with the State General Archives and

the newspapers of the 19th century. Various problems did not allow a systematic study of the massive amount of material which belongs to many different libraries throughout the country. Only the central offices of the General Archives in Athens and their local offices in Messologi, 300 kilometers away were visited and material studied. The Gennadius Library in Athens, where there are many important sources for that period, was closed for restoration for more than one year, thus the research there was limited and various bibliographical gaps are evident due to this problem. Some other libraries, for example the Library of the Education Department of the University of Athens, were visited for the study of recent developments in education. There are bibliographical guides that led easily to the sources available but there is a clear need for a better-organised guide for education libraries in Greece, in order to help future researchers to overcome similar problems.

For the second part of the thesis a plan of research was prepared. It was decided to conduct interviews with selected Heads in order to investigate the present situation. Interviews were the preferred method as face to face contact gives a more vital and open record of views. There are, however, advantages and disadvantages to the method chosen, which will be discussed later. Sixty-one complete interviews were conducted. One particular interview remained incomplete as the Head did not give answers to all questions and the interview was stopped at one point while another Head, after giving her the questions, refused to answer any of them.

An effort was made to cover all kinds of schools all over Greece. Unfortunately, it was very difficult and very expensive to visit the islands and

to move from one to another on a daily basis. Thus, it was decided to visit Thrace, where there was a chance to visit suburban and rural areas. Finally, 52.7% of schools visited were schools in urban areas, 21.8% in suburban areas and 25.5% in rural areas. Some of the schools were technical and vocational schools but most were schools of general education. Two particular schools located in the area of Athens, combined both general and music education. The percentage of female Heads was 16.3%, which is not far from the average percentage of female Heads throughout the country. The size of schools was representative. The selection of schools was made at random and none of the Heads was known to the interviewer as the selection was made by school and not by the Head.

In order to keep the same structure in all interviews a questionnaire was compiled in two parts. The first part involved multiple choice questions with the expectation of a certain form of answer. In this case, all alternatives were included so a simple tick could indicate the choice. The other part, the most extensive part of the questionnaire, involved open-ended questions, in order to gain more personal information. Many questions were collected from previous established questionnaires and sometimes changed according to the researcher's views or constructed according to his views and experience. Some questions were taken from the three previous pieces of research on the Head of Greek schools, those of Zavlanos, Lainas and Saitis as described in chapter VIII. Only a few questions from Zavlanos' questionnaire, a questionnaire and not an interview, were adapted to the interviews of the present research, as Zavlanos' research is strictly quantitative and because his main interest was not the role of headteachers but "analysis and

perceptions of leadership behaviour of secondary school administrators” and his questions were addressed to teachers and not to Heads. Lainas’ research under the title “Administrative Organization of Primary schools in Greece with Special Reference to the Role of the Head” is closer to the present research, although it is specifically for the Primary Head and is based only on two interviews. Thus, its validity and reliability are very limited. Finally, Saitis’ research although completed in more depth, is somewhat narrow concerning only heads’ time allocation. Thus, the decision was made to plan a more in depth questionnaire in order to cover a broader area of the subject. The effort was not to take quantitative results but to use percentages in order to support results while at the same time completing with qualitative results often using quotations from interviewees in order to refine and strengthen answers. Following the above process, an extensive questionnaire was created. Two copies of this were produced and given to two very experienced Heads. They tried to answer all the questions included in the questionnaire and made comments on each question. Following that, both Heads sat down with the researcher and discussed each question thoroughly. Many questions were rejected and the final questionnaire was prepared by the researcher as follows.

QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

Male

Female

Years of service

Years of service as a Head

Years of continuous service in the same school

Postgraduate studies MA/Msc. Ph.D.

Location of School urban area
 suburban area
 rural area

Total number of students in school:

Total number of teachers in school:

Allocation of time

1. How much time do you devote to the following tasks every week?

	A lot	A little	Too little	Non
Teaching				
Paperwork				
Supervision of the school				
Contact with municipality				
Contact with teachers				
Contact with Educational Authority				
Contact with parents				
Dealing with student problems				
Communicating with other schools				
Communicating with associations				
Communicating with School Advisers				

2. Relations between head and students.

2.1 How often do students need to see the Head? a lot
 a little
 not at all

and for what purpose?

2.2 How many students from those not belonging to your class do you know personally?

3.Head and Deputy Head.

3.1 Have you delegated your Deputy Head any specific duties beyond those prescribed by law?

3.2 Does your Deputy act as mediator between you and teachers?

4. Head and teachers.

4.1 Do you have personal relations with many teachers in your school, beyond the typical official ones?

4.2 How do you resolve conflict among individuals and groups of teachers in your school?

4.3 Do you think it is a key element to give guidance to teachers in their classroom work?

4.4 Do your teachers expect advice from you as a Head with regard to their classroom work?

4.5 How do you try to encourage teachers to improve their performance, to enhance their morale and inspire them with enthusiasm for their job?

4.6 Do you think that the public expression of a positive or negative opinion acts as a motivator?

4.7 Do you think that teacher appraisal could lead to a better quality teaching?

4.8 Do you ever conduct teacher observations?

4.9 How do you check that teachers follow the curriculum guidelines?

4.10 Do you think that teachers are independent in their work in the classroom?

4.11 How do you deal with teachers who come late to school or are absent or do not fulfill their non-teaching duties or do not perform well or do not treat pupils properly?

4.12 Do you see any conflict in your role, in supporting teachers and controlling them at the same time?

4.13 As a Head do you think the proper function of the school is of more importance than good relations with teachers?

4.14 Do the teachers of your school see you as a colleague or as a boss?

5. Head and other duties.

5.1 How is the distribution of non-teaching duties made?

5.2 Who controls the ancillary personnel of your school?

5.3 Who makes decisions about financial affairs e.g. estimates the needs, decides about spending, buying, etc.?

6. Head and school committee.

6.1 How essential and how effective is the role of the school committee?

6.2 Has the present situation concerning School Committees weakened or strengthened the position of the Head with regard to financial affairs?

7. Head and the planning of schoolwork.

7.1 Is there any kind of planning or any procedure of setting priorities in your school?

7.2 Have you introduced any major changes to your school operation in contrast with the situation before your arrival?

8. Head and the Council of Teachers.

8.1 How do you cope with groups or individuals trying to impose their opinion in staff meetings?

8.2 Do you accept implementation of decisions of the Council of Teachers to which you don't agree?

9. Head and superintendents.

9.1 Are you involved in any decisions made by your Local authority affecting your school?

9.2 What does your Director expect from you as Head?

9.3 What are your relations with School Advisers?

9.4 What do School Advisers expect from you as Head of the school?

10. Head and people outside the school.

10.1 With whom do you cooperate?

	little	often	very often
municipal authorities			
trade union representatives			
church representatives			
other organizations			

and concerning what matters?

10.2 Do you feel that you are the only representative of your school in society?

10.3 Do you feel that the function of the School Board is sufficient and helps the Head in the management of the School?

10.4 What is the effect of the social composition of parents on your job as a Head?

11. Head and parents.

11.1 When parents come to school do they want to see teachers or the Head?

11.2 How do you deal with parents complaining about teachers?

11.3 Do you defend teachers even if you think that they are in the wrong?

11.4 What do you expect from the parents' council?

12. Head's opinion concerning duties.

12.1 How did you learn to exercise your duties as Head? Have you exercised other managerial duties before?

12.2 What are, according to your opinion, the main characteristics of a successful head (complete the order 1,2,3,4)?

Professional ability

Ability to cooperate

Ability of perception

Others

12.3 Would you describe yourself rather as a teacher or as a managerial executive?

12.4 Which are the main elements that give satisfaction in your job as a Head?

12.5 Do you think that greater independence must be given to schools? In this case, who must have more power: the Head, the Council of Teachers or the representatives of the local community (parents, municipal authorities, etc.)?

12.6 Have you noticed any change in the role of the Head during the last decade?

12.7 Have you anything else to add concerning the role of the Head?

After completing the final questionnaire, arrangements were made to carry out interviews. After the decision of which schools should be included in the research, telephone calls were made to Heads and finally sixty-two visits took place. Much travelling was needed and usually involved an interview each day and about three interviews per week. Following extensive time consumption the interviews resulted in sixty-two tapes, as every interview was recorded, although some Heads preferred to answer certain questions in written form.

Some questions needed a scaled response and a ranking response and this helped in decreasing the time of the interview and increasing the depth of research.

The researcher then set about transcribing tapes and transferring answers on to paper. Questionnaire-sheets were used where the answers were transferred in written form by the researcher. One problem was how to include complete answers as sometimes the oral answers were very extensive and often one answer included a whole discussion with the interviewee.

After the collection of all written answers to questionnaires a quantitative processing of the closed questions was carried out. Questions needed a scaled response or a ranking response followed. The next step was the very careful study of all responses to each question. After the study of all responses to a certain question, an effort to group them was made.

It is useful to describe here how the reports of two specific questions were written. First example the answer to question 4.5 of the questionnaire, which is given in paragraph 8.8.4.

The question "How do you try to encourage teachers to improve their performance, to enhance their morale and inspire them with enthusiasm for their job?" Answers were grouped in two stages. At the first stage answers were grouped into eight. Groups of those who did not give any answer, those who stated that dialogue and discussion are effective in encouraging a teacher, those who replied that they try to encourage and reinforce their teachers using their personal example as a model and those who tried to help teachers with their personal problems in order to create better conditions and a pleasant school environment were formed easily.

Another group, those who did not try to encourage teachers at all was formed but there were two answers with similar content . These two answers embodied this group giving the full answer of one of the interviewers in order to complete the description of the specific group.

Similarly, there were two overlapping groups, one of which underlined the positive aspects of teaching and the other those who believe in offering to students and to society in general. It was very difficult to divide these two groups in one under the title: "Heads who try to underline the positive aspects of teaching and offer to students and society in general."

A second example of grouping and organising the answer to a question is that of question 10.3. Do you feel that the function of the School Board is sufficient and helps the Head in the management of the school? In this case the answers were divergent and ten groups were formed. This did not give a clear answer to the question, which is not of particular interest to the present research. It was simply an additional helpful question. All answers here again studied carefully and finally four main groups were formed as described in paragraph 8.14. This strengthened the answer and, in order to have a more in-depth look at this question, a discussion of Saitis' findings after extensive research on the role of the School Board was effected. Thus, each answer has its own process but it is no use to continue with this matter since all now remains in researcher's files and in his mind giving him experience, with the final outcome, after a long process, being exhibited in chapter VIII.

The final grouping was the last stage. It must be underlined here that there were questions whose answers could not be grouped in any way so these questions were rejected.

The collection of quotations from certain answers followed because some of them were candidates supporting the qualitative response. The refinement of the answer was made and comparisons with the same or similar questions of other pieces of research were attempted. Only in some cases, where stated in chapter VIII, were comparisons made and in most cases led towards the strengthening of the results of the present research.

Results of research carried out in other countries were used in some cases as problems faced in school administration are common and some situations were exactly the same. In chapter VIII there are cases where other research findings help the discussion of the results of the present research.

After some experimental interviews, the interviewer gained experience and it became easy to put the interviewee at ease and obtain full cooperation. It is useful to describe the process of interviews. All interviews took place within schools and more precisely in Heads' offices. Each interview lasted about one hour. The whole preparation and travel within the area of Athens took about three hours. It is difficult to gauge the time spent in Thrace due to the need for extensive travel arrangements.

Recording was helpful because the oral answers were easier for interviewees and in many cases the interviewer presented additional answers. Interviews took place in Heads' offices, which are not always peaceful places. In many cases, there were interruptions by telephone calls, students, teachers, parents, etc. In a few cases we were not disturbed or interrupted at all. All Heads were very friendly and in some cases interviewees tended to answer as they thought fitting to the interview situation rather than openly and honestly. Additional questions helped to overcome this problem.

It was clear to all interviewees that answers and discussion during the interview were fully confidential and access to the tapes would not be made available. They were convinced of the usefulness of the research and they participated voluntarily. Some interviewees asked to have copies of the results of the research when published and the researcher promised to send a

summary of the research report when ready. The researcher succeeded in remaining independent throughout all interviews and in leaving the interviewee to express his own views freely. Nothing untoward occurred and all interviews were completed with a friendly discussion on the problems of school administration and the interviewer expressed his thanks to each Head for his contribution to the present research.

As can be seen from the whole process of the present research, an effort was made to gain reliable results of a reliable piece of research. Sixty-two interviews seem to have been adequate to obtain a clear picture of the results. There had been a plan, discussed earlier, to have a representative sample of Heads, something which was actually achieved to a high degree. Thus, the careful formulation of questions so also render the meaning crystal clear, the experience of interviewer of the subject, and careful sampling were some of the advantages of the research that increased validity. At the end of the procedure of interviews, the researcher had the sense that he had recorded answers which were a result of free, genuine expression of interviewee feelings and thoughts.

The great number of questions, careful sampling, sufficient number of interviews, the broad geographical spread of the sample all aid in giving validity and reliability to the present research. It is a much more in-depth and broader piece of research compared with all previous pieces of research on the role of Headteachers in the Greek secondary education. The results of qualitative research, supported by quotations of interviewee answers and results of other pieces of research can be generalised to a great extent. Some questions, of course, were put the into questionnaire only to support the whole research project and the in-depth investigation of these special problems. For example, question 6.1 "How essential and how effective is the role of the school committee?" Is not there to clear all the problems related to the school committee. Deeper and more specialised research on the special aspects of school administration are needed but they belong to a future research. The second part of the present thesis, it is believed, gives a more clear, stable and valid picture of the problems, than any other previous research carried out and this could be viewed as a basis for more specific research in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. IN ENGLISH

Books

1. Balazs, E., *Institution-level Educational Management in Hugarian Public Education in Research on Educational Management in Europe* edited by Raymon Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
2. Ball, S., *The micro-politics of the school: towards a theory of school organisation*, Methuen 1987.
3. Berg, G., *Steering, school leadership and the invisible contract in Research on Educational Management in Europe* edited by Raymond Bolam anf Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
4. Bolam, R., *European problems and trends in Educational management and Research in Educational management across Europe* edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993.
5. DES, *Statistics in Education*, London, HMSO, 1979.
6. Eriksson, B., *Autonomy and school-based management in Training for Educational Management in Europe* edited by Fons van Wieringen.
7. Gennadius J., *A sketch of history of Education in Greece*. World Federation of Education,Edinburgh 1925.
8. Green A., *Education and State Formation*, Martin's Press, New York, 1990.
9. Gronn, P., *Politics, power and the management of schools in World Yearbook of Education 1986* edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page 1986.
10. Gross N., Harriot R., *Staff Leadership in Public Schools*, New York, Wiley, 1965.
11. Hall V. et. al., *Headteachers at Work*, Open University Press, 1986.

12. Hansen Borkur F., Johannsson O., *Management Emphasis of Basic School Headteachers in Iceland in Research on Educational Management in Europe*, edited by Raymon Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
13. Hoyle, E., *The management of schools: theory and practice in World Yearbook of Education 1986* edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page 1986.
14. Hughes, M., *Secondary School Administration. A Management Approach*. Pergamon Press 1974.
15. Karstanje, P., *Developments in school management from a European perspective in Research on Educational Management in Europe* edited by Raymon Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
16. Kruger M., *Gender differences in school principalship: prejudices and facts in Research on Educational Management in Europe*: R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1999.
17. MaLaffitte, R., *A responsive approach to effective management development in european schools in Education management across Europe* edited by R. Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, 1993.
18. Mapstone, R., *Staff management and the school principal in Local Management of Schools* edited by Ernie Cave and Cyril Wilkinson, 1990.
19. McClearly, L.E and Thomson, S.D. *The Senior High School Principalship*, volume III, *The Summary Report*. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
20. Peters, K., Slegers, P. and Bergen, T., *The task perception and the task orientation of Dutch principals: results of a preliminary study in Research*

on Educational Management in Europe Edited by Raymond Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.

21. Ribbins P., *Managing Secondary Schools after the Act: Participation and Partnership?* In *The Changing Secondary School* edited by Roy Lowe, The Falmer Press.
22. Sayer, J., *Training for school management in Europe* in *Training for Educational Management in Europe* edited by Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann, 1999.
23. Wieringen, Fons van, *Social context of Educational Management* in *Research on Educational Management in Europe* edited by Raymond Bolam and Fons van Wieringen, Waxmann 1999.
24. Wieringen, Fons van, *Training for Educational Management in Europe*, Waxmann, 1999.
25. Willower, D., *Organization theory and the management of schools* in *World Yearbook of Education 1986* edited by Eric Hoyle and Agnes McMahon, Kogan Page 1986.

Articles

1. Bemaim Y., Humphreys K., "Gaining Entry: challenges for the novice headteacher", *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 17 No 1, pp. 81-94, 1997.
2. Bolam R., Management Development for Headteachers, *Educational management and Administration*, vol. 25(3), 1997, pp 265-283.

3. Bottery, M., "Global Forces, National Mediations and Management of Educational Institutions", *Educational management and Administration*, vol. 27(3), pp. 299-312, 1999.
4. Coleman M., The Management Style of Female Headteachers, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol 24(2), 1996, pp. 163-174.
5. Goodman J., A Question of Management Style: women school governors 1800-1862, *Gender and Education*, vol.9, pp. 149-160, 1997.
6. Hall V., Dusting Off the Phoenix, Gender and Educational Leadership Revisited, *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3), 1997, pp.309-324.
7. Hart, A.W., "Education Leadership", *Educational Management and Administration*, Vol 27(3), pp. 323-334, 1999.
8. Lang, D., "a New Theory of Leadership", *Educational Management and Administration*, vol27(2), pp. 167-181, 1999.
9. Lankford H., Wyckoff J., The Changing Structure of Teacher Compensation, 1970-94, *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 16, No 4, pp. 371-384, 1997.
10. Mercer D., Can They Walk on Water? Professional isolation and the secondary headmaster, *School Organisation*, vol. 16, no 2, pp. 105-178, 1996.
11. Oshagbemi T., Correlates of pay satisfaction in higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14/1, 2000, pp. 31-39.

12. Papas G. and Psacharopoulos G., Teachers' Employment Conditions in Greece: Findings of a Survey. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 13(2) October 1995, pp. 243-249.
13. Psacharopoulos G., Valenzuela J. and Arends M., Teacher salaries in Latin America, A review. *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 15, No 4, pp. 401-406, 1996.
14. Ribbins, P. "Heads on Deputy Headship", *Educational Management and Administration*, vol. 25(3), 1997, pp. 295-308.
15. Riley K., Docking J and Rowles D., "Can Local Education Authorities Make a Difference?", *Educational Management and Administration*, vol 27(1), pp 29-44, 1999.
16. Southwick L., Gill I., Unified Salary schedule and Student SAT Scores: Adverse Effects of Adverse Selection in the Market for Secondary School Teachers, *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 16, No 2, pp. 143-153, 1997.
17. Spaulding A., Life in schools, *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 17, no 1, pp. 39-55, 1997.
18. Theobald N., Gritz M., The Effects of School District Spending Priorities on the Exit Paths of Beginning Teachers Leaving the District, *Economics of Education Review*, vol. 15, No 1, pp. 11-22, 1996.
19. Tomlison H., Proposals for Performance Related Pay for Teachers in English Schools. *School Leadership and Management*, vol. 20, No 3, pp.291-298, 2000.

20. Vann, B. "Micropolitics in the United Kingdom: can a principal ever be expected to be 'one of us'?", *School leadership and Management*, vol. 19, No 2, pp. 201-204, 1999.

Unpublished theses

1. Zavlanos, M. *Analysis and perceptions of leadership behaviour of Greek secondary school administrators*, Vanderbilt University, Ph.D. thesis, 1981.
2. Lainas A., *Administrative organisation of primary schools in Greece with special reference to the role of the head*, Msc dissertation, University of Reading 1986.
3. Lainas A., *Central-Local relations and the role of the director of education, a study in Greece and England*, Ph.D. thesis, Institute of Education, London, 1989.

II. IN GREEK

Newspapers and periodicals

1. *Πρωινός Ταχυδρόμος (Proinos Tachidromos - Morning Messenger)*, 1865.
2. *Ελληνικά Χρονικά (Ellinika chronika -Greek Chronicles)*, 1824.
3. *Εφημερίς των Αθηνών (Ephimeris ton Athinon -The Athens Newspaper)*, 1824-1826.
4. *Γενική Εφημερίς (Geniki Ephimeris -General Newspaper)*, 1830- 1831.
5. *Ερμής ο Λόγιος (Hermes o Logios - Hermes the Scholar)*, 1816.

Archives

1. Αρχεία της Ελληνικής Παλιγγενεσίας (Archives of the Greek Regeneration)
2. Φύλλα της Εφημερίδας της Κυβερνήσεως (Files of the Official Gazette of the Greek State-FOG), 1823-2001.
3. Γενικά Αρχεία του Κράτους (General Archives of the State -GAS), 1823-1831.
4. Χειρόγραφα της Βιβλιοθήκης της Βουλής (Manuscripts of the Library of the Parliament.)

Books

Notice: Entries without details of publishers/date of publication are due to lack of specific information available.

1. Andreou A., Parakonstantinou G., *Εξουσία και Οργάνωση-Διοίκηση του Εκπαιδευτικού συστήματος (The authority and Organisation-Administration of Educational system)*, Nea Sinora, Athens 1994.
2. Atsave P., *Education in "Philekpedeftiki Eteria" schools, Arsakia-Tositsia schools*, Athens 1996.
3. Avdi-Kalkani I., *Επαγγελματικά εργαζόμενη Ελληνίδα (Female Greek professionals)*, Papazisis 1978.
4. Bouzakis, S. *Νεοελληνική Εκπαίδευση 1821-1985 (Modern Greek Education 1821-1985)*, Gutenberg, Athens 1996.

5. Charalambidis, Th. *Οι κυριώτεροι σταθμοί της εκπαιδευτικής πολιτικής της Ελλάδος (1821-1971) The main milestones in Educational Politics in Greece*, Athens 1971.
6. Chatzistefanidis, Th. *Ιστορία της νεοελληνικής Εκπαίδευσης 1821-1986 (The History of Modern Greek Education 1821-1986)*, Papadimas 1986.
7. Chatzopoulos, K. *Ελληνικά σχολεία στην περίοδο της Οθωμανικής κυριαρχίας 1453-1821 (Greek schools during the period of the Ottoman occupation, 1453-1821)*, Vantias, Thessaloniki 1991.
8. Daskalakis, A. *Κείμενα-Πηγές της ιστορίας της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης (Texts – sources of the history of the Greek Revolution)*, Athens 1966.
9. Delmouzos, A. *Το κρυφό σχολειό (The secret school)*, Athens 1950.
10. Dimaras, A. *Νεοελληνική Εκπαίδευση, Ιστορικών Σχεδιάσμα (Modern Greek Education, A brief History)*, Athens 1965.
11. Dimaras, A. *Η μεταρρύθμιση που δεν έγινε (The reform that never happened)*, Hermes, Athens 1988.
12. Dimaras, K. *Καποδίστριας-Μουστοξύδης-Κουτλουμουσιάνος (Karodistriasis-Moustoxidis-Koutloumousianos)*, Venice, 1962.
13. Dragoumis, K. *Δικαιοσύνη, Παιδεία και Εκκλησία στην Ελλάδα, 1821-1831 (Justice, Education and the Church in Greece, 1821-1831)*, Athens 1873.
14. Dragoumis, N. *Historical memoirs*, Athens 1925.
15. Eleftheroudakis Encyclopaedia, *Administration in Greece*, vol. 5, Eleftheroudakis, Athens 1965.

16. Evagelopoulos, S. *Ιστορία της Νεοελληνικής Εκπαίδευσης (The History of Modern Greek Education)*, Danias, Athens 1989.
17. Filias, B. *Κοινωνία και Εξουσία στην Ελλάδα (Society and power in Greece)*, Sinchrona keimena , Athens, 1975.
18. Flogaitis S., *Το Ελληνικό Διοικητικό Σύστημα (The Greek Administrative System)*, Sakkoulas, Athens 1987.
19. Fragoudaki, A. *Educational reform and liberal intellectuals*, Kedros, Athens 1977.
20. Goudas, M. *Βίοι Παράλληλοι (των επί της αναγεννήσεως της Ελλάδος διαπρεψάντων ανδρών) (Parallel Lives)*, Philadelphus, Athens, 1874.
21. Imvrioti, R. *Revival of Education in "Educational Reform"* Ed. EDA, Athens 1966.
22. Isigonis, A. *Ιστορία της Εκπαίδευσης (The History of Education)*, Athens 1974.
23. Kapodistrias, J. *Γράμματα (Letters)*, Athens 1841.
24. Kazamias A., *Η κατάρα του Σίσυφου στο: Ελληνική Εκπαίδευση, Προοπτικές Ανασυγκρότησης και Εκσυγχρονισμού (The curse of Sisyphus in Greek Education: Perspectives of Reconstruction and Modernization)*, Sirios, Athens 1995, p.49.
25. Kazamias A., Kassotakis M., *Εκπαιδευτικό μανιφέστο, στο: Ελληνική Εκπαίδευση, προοπτικές ανασυγκρότησης και εκσυγχρονισμού. (The Educational Manifesto in Greek Education)*, Sirios, Athens, p.15.

26. Kiriazopoulou-Valinaki, P. *Νηπιαγωγική, "Nipiagogiki"*, Athens
27. Kokotas, P. *Ο ρόλος της παιδείας στην οικονομική ανάπτυξη της Ελλάδος (The role of Education in the economic development of Greece)*, Toundas, Athens 1978.
28. Koukou, E. *Ο Καποδίστριας και η Παιδεία (1827-1832), Β' τα Εκπαιδευτικά Ιδρύματα της Αίγινας (Kapodistrias and Education (1827-1832), vol.2, Scholastic foundations in Aegina)*, Athens 1992.
29. Lazaridis, A. *Attempts at organization within Education (1821-1833)*, Athens 1973.
30. Lefas, Ch. *Ιστορία της Εκπαιδύσεως (The history of Education)*, Organisation of Publications of School Books, Athens 1942.
31. Makridimitris A., *Διοίκηση και Κοινωνία (Administration and Society)*, Themelio, Athens, 1999.
32. Makridimitris A., *Ο Μεγάλος Ασθενής, "The Great Patient"*, Papazisis, 1999.
33. Makridimitris A., Michalopoulos N.,(editors), *Εκθέσεις εμπειρογνομόνων για τη δημόσια διοίκηση 1950-1998 (Expert reports on Public Administration 1950-1998)*, Papazisis, Athens 2000.
34. Mamoukas, A. *The revival of Greece*, Piraeus, 1839.
35. Moskof, K. *Η Εθνική και κοινωνική συνείδηση στην Ελλάδα 1830-1909 (National and social consciousness in Greece 1830-1909)*, Athens 1974.

36. Papandreou, G. *Democracy and Popular Education, "The Anniversary of Primary Education"*, 1932.
37. Papanikolaou, L. *Η κοινωνική Ιστορία της Ελληνικής Επανάστασης του 19^{ου} αιώνα (The social history of the Greek Revolution of 19th century)*. Sinchroni Epochi, Athens 1991.
38. Paparigopoulos, K. *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους (The History of the Greek Nation)*, vol. 6.
39. Pirgiotakis, G. *Προβλήματα στην Ιστορία της Εκπαιδεύσεως των Διδασκάλων στα πρώτα πενήντα χρόνια μετά την απελευθέρωση 1828-1878 (Problems in the history of teacher training the first fifty years after the liberation 1828-1878)*, Christianakis, Athens 1981.
40. Psacharopoulos G., *Οικονομική της Εκπαίδευσης, (Economics of Education)*, Papazisis, Athens 1999.
41. Sakellariou, Ch. *Education during the Resistance*, Athens 1979.
42. Sourmelis, D. *Ιστορία των Αθηνών, (The history of Athens)*.
43. Soutzos, M. *Rapport sur l' instruction publique adresse le 14 Janvier 1828 a S.Ex. Jean Capodistrias, president*, in Letters to J. Kapodistrias, Athens 1841.
44. Sperantzas, Th. *Calendar of the Society of Cycladic studies*.
45. Statistical calendar of Greece, National Statistical Service of Greece, Athens, 1933.

46. Svoronos, N. *Επισκόπηση της Νεοελληνικής Ιστορίας (Review of Modern Greek History)*, Athens 1977.
47. Tsoukalas, K. *Εξάρτηση και Αναπαραγωγή, Ο κοινωνικός ρόλος των Εκπαιδευτικών μηχανισμών στην Ελλάδα 1830-1922 (Dependence and Reproduction. The role of educational mechanisms in Greece 1830-1922)*, Themelio 1977.
48. Vakalopoulos A., *Έλληνες σπουδαστές στα 1821 (Greek students in 1821)*, Eteria Makedonikon Spoudon, Thessaloniki 1978.
49. Vakalopoulos, A. *Νέα Ελληνική Ιστορία 1204-1985 (Modern Greek History 1204-1985)*, Vanias, Thessaloniki 1992.
50. Vasdravellis, I. *Η Ελληνική Επανάσταση του 1821 και τα συμφέροντα των μεγάλων δυνάμεων (The Greek revolution of 1821 and the focus of great powers)*. Thessaloniki 1975.
51. Vournas, T. *Ιστορία της Νεώτερης Ελλάδος (The History of Modern Greece)*, Athens.
52. Voutiras S., *Η γυναίκα στη μισθωτή εργασία (Women in paid employment)*, Papazisis, 1981.
53. Zacharopoulos, N. *Η Παιδεία στην Τουρκοκρατία (Education under the Turkish occupation)*, Pournaras, Thessaloniki 1994

Articles

1. Alamanis, A. Ελληνικό σχολείο και γραφειοκρατικό σύστημα (Greek schools and the bureaucratic system), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.7, January 1997, pp. 67-86.
2. Alamanis Th., Ο θεσμός του Γραμματέα των σχολείων και η προσφορά του στη λειτουργία των σχολικών μονάδων (The establishment of Secretarial positions within schools and their contribution to the running of schools), *Diavazo*, 334, 1994, pp. 25-33.
3. Alexiadis A., Peristeras B., Η αποδοτικότητα-αποτελεσματικότητα στη δημόσια διοίκηση (Efficiency-productivity in the state administration), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7, January 1997, pp. 25-38.
4. Andreou A., Η επιμόρφωση των στελεχών της Εκπαίδευσης (The training of executives within education), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 8, May 1997, pp. 96-104.
5. Balaskas K., Ο παιδαγωγικός ρόλος του Διευθυντή σχολικής μονάδας (The educational role of Heads of schools), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 40, 1986, pp. 92-94.
6. Dimaras, A. Η Εκπαίδευση κατά την Επανάσταση (Education during the struggle), *Nea Estia*, vol. 88(1043), Christmas 1970, pp. 51-58..
7. Iordanidis G., Σχολεία και Βιομηχανικοί ή Εμπορικοί οργανισμοί: ομοιότητες και διαφορές (Schools and industrial or commercial organisations: similarities and differences), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 85, 1998, pp. 130-136.

8. Iordanidis G., Διοικητική προσέγγιση σε οργανισμούς και σχολεία (Managerial approach to organisations and schools), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 11, 1998, pp. 84-94.
9. Karagiorgis, A. Εκπαιδευτική Διοίκηση, οριοθέτηση βασικών εννοιών (Educational management.), *Nea Paedia*, vol16, 1981, pp. 21-26.
10. Kothali E., Η συνεργασία Διευθυντών Σχολείων και Σχολικών Συμβούλων (Cooperation of headteachers with school advisers), *Logos kai Praxi*, vol. 31, 1987, pp. 75-79.
11. Lainas, A. Η Διοικητική υποστήριξη των σχολικών μονάδων (Managerial support of schools), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.3 September 1995, pp. 49-63.
12. Lainas, A. Οργάνωση και λειτουργία των Εσπερινών σχολείων: επισημάνσεις και προτάσεις (Organization and functioning of evening schools), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.8, May 1997, pp. 83-95.
13. Makridimitris A., Administration and local authority in the provinces, *Review of Public Law and Administrative Law*, vol. 156.
14. Maratheftis, M. Ο Διευθυντής του σχολείου και ο ρόλος του (The Head of a school and his role), *Nea Paedia*, vol.16, 1981, pp. 45-50.
15. Mavroskoufis D., Το ζήτημα της αξιολόγησης και της επιλογής των διευθυντών των σχολείων: Ιστορική διάσταση και σημερινή συγκυρία. (The issue of evaluation in selection of Heads: Historical dimension and present situation), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 87, 1998, pp. 143-159.
16. Mestheneos B., Σκέψεις για την εφαρμογή των ιεραρχικών σχέσεων στην Ελληνική Δημόσια Διοίκηση (Thoughts on the application of hierarchical

- relations in Greek Public Administration), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 2, May 1995, pp. 35-38.
17. Michoroulios, A. Στρατηγική οργανωτικής αλλαγής στο στοιχείο “εργασία” της ελληνικής σχολικής οργάνωσης (Strategy of organizational change in the aspect of “work” within Greek school organizations), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.14, May 1999, pp. 63-68.
18. Paraiοannου, A. Διαπροσωπικοί παράγοντες που επηρεάζουν τη διοίκηση του σχολείου (Interpersonal factors which affect school administration), *Nea Paedia*, vol.16, 1981, pp. 27-31.
19. Paraiοannου, M. Σύλληψη και εφαρμογή καινοτομίας στη σχολική μονάδα μέσω ενός αποκεντρωτικού μοντέλου διοίκησης (Conception and application of innovation in schools through a decentralized model of administration). *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.14, May 1999, pp. 69-82.
20. Paranikolaou K., Εκπαιδευτική Διοίκηση (Educational Management), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 16, 1981, pp. 18-20.
21. Pasiardis P., Μοντέλα διοίκησης της Εκπαίδευσης: Μια κριτική παρουσία (Models of educational Management, A critical approach), *Paedagogiki Epitheorisi*, 18, 1993, pp. 5-29.
22. Saiti, A. Ο ρόλος των οργάνων λαϊκής συμμετοχής στην εκπαίδευση. Η περίπτωση του σχολικού συμβουλίου (The role of organs of public participation in education. The case of School Councils.) *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.14, May 1999, pp. 40-52.
23. Saiti A., Γυναίκες εκπαιδευτικοί και σχολική Διοίκηση στην Ελλάδα (Women teachers and school administration in Greece), *Ta Ekpedeftika*, vol. 57-58, July-December 2000, pp. 150-163.

24. Saitis Ch., Σκέψεις για την αποτελεσματική λειτουργία των υπηρεσιών στήριξης της Εκπαίδευσης (Thoughts concerning the effective function of support services within Education), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 3, September 1995, pp. 40-48.
25. Saitis Ch., Σκέψεις για την ανάπτυξη ηγετικών στελεχών στην εκπαίδευση (Thoughts on the development of leader executives in education), *Dimosios Tomeas*, vol. 127, February 1997, pp. 33-38.
26. Saitis Ch., Tsiamasi F., Chatzi M., Ο Διευθυντής του σχολείου, manager-ηγέτης ή παραδοσιακός γραφειοκράτης; (The Head of a school, Manager-Leader or traditional bureaucrat?), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 83, 1997, pp. 66-77.
27. Saitis, Ch. Ο θεσμός του υποδιευθυντή σχολείου ως βάση για την ανάπτυξη ηγετικών στελεχών στην εκπαίδευση (The institution of Deputy Head positions as a basis for the development of leading staff in education), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.11, May 1998, pp. 39-59.
28. Saitis, Ch., Fegari, M., Voulgari, D. Επαναπροσδιορισμός του ρόλου της ηγεσίας στο σύγχρονο σχολείο (Redefinition of the role of Headship in modern schools). *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 7, January 1997, pp. 87-108.
29. Saitis Ch., Management ολικής ποιότητας: μια νέα μεθοδολογία για τον εκσυγχρονισμό του συστήματος της διοίκησης της Εκπαίδευσης (Management of total quality: a new methodology for the modernization of the system of Education), *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol. 9, 1997, pp. 21-51.
30. Saitis, Ch., Sourtzi, E., Tourtouni, G. Νομοθετικά κενά-ασάφειες και επιπτώσεις τους στη λειτουργία των σχολικών μονάδων (Legislative gaps/ambiguities and their implications for the functioning of schools.) *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, vol.14, January 1996, pp. 87-95.

31. Sotiropoulos D., State bureaucracy and populism: The PASOK case, 1981-1989, *Sichrona Themata*, 1993, pp. 15-19.
32. Theodorou, M. Μερικές σκέψεις για το ρόλο του βοηθού Διευθυντή στα σχολεία (Thoughts on the Role of Deputy Head in schools), *Nea Paedia*, vol.16, 1981, pp. 51-57.
33. Trilianos A., Η άσκηση της εξουσίας και ο Διευθυντής του σχολείου (Exercise of authority and Heads), *Logos kai praxi*, 1987, pp. 27-34.
34. Vassilou- Papageorgiou B., Το γυναικείο φύλο στο διδασκαλικό επάγγελμα. Η Ελληνική περίπτωση. (Women in the teaching profession, The Greek case). *Ta Ekpedeftika*, vol. 33, 1994, pp. 52-62.
35. Vegleris F., Η Εθνική ανάγκη της Διοικητικής Μεταρρυθμίσεως (The National Need for Administrative Reform), *Nea Ikonomia*, February 1965, pp. 105-112.
36. Zavianos M., Σχέδιο προγράμματος εκπαίδευσης των διευθυντών, σχολικών συμβούλων και προϊσταμένων των σχολείων (A planned program for education of Heads, School Advisers and School Directors), *Nea Paedia*, vol. 34, 1985, pp. 60-67.

Pamphlets

1. Περί της εν Δημητσάνη Ελληνικής Σχολής (The school of Dimitsana), A. Koromilas (publisher), Athens, 1847.
2. Περί της εν Βυτίνη Ελληνικής Σχολής και των πρώτων αυτής διδασκάλων (The school of Vitina and its first teachers), Nafplio 1858.