

ORGANIZATIONAL DEFICIENCIES IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT: THE CASE OF GREEK PRIMARY SCHOOLS

ANNA SAITI

Abstract – *This paper first provides an overview of some of the key features of schooling in Greece, as well as some of the central reforms that have marked the development of education in the country. It is argued that despite remarkable progress, the formal school system in Greece still faces a major challenge: decentralisation. The details of the structure of the school administrative system are presented, and a critical analysis carried out through the use of the 'Organisation and Methods' (O and M) technique in order to investigate the efficiency of educational services in Greece. Two case studies are presented so as to illustrate the traditional and complicated administrative processes that currently prevail, most of which are of a routine nature and unnecessary. A case is made in favour of reform.*

Introduction: a brief review of Greek school education

Greece has a very long tradition in the field of education, initiated by the famous philosophical schools of the classical period. However, the Greek educational system is relatively new. Indeed, the process of developing the modern Greek educational system began after 1821 when Greece finally succeeded in gaining its independence. More particularly, the Act of 1834 was the first such Act passed after independence and by it, attendance at school was made compulsory for all children.

The Education Act of 1836 introduced three-year primary schools and four-year gymnasia. The main aim of the gymnasium was to prepare students for higher education. Until 1890 no changes were made to the basic structure and provision of the educational system in Greece. The Education Act of 1895, however, divided primary schools into three categories: the ordinary (four classes), the grammar (four classes) and the full-function (six classes). The Act of 1895 also brought some dramatic changes in the field of administration. In this Act provision for the permanent appointment of teachers was specified and the installment of headteachers in primary schools was determined.

The years 1909-1911 are of particular importance in the history of Greek education since a number of Education Acts have were implemented. It was in

1911 that the first major Education Act for the twentieth century was passed (Demaras, 1990). A grasp of this Act is crucial to an understanding of the Greek educational system in the first quarter of the twentieth century. It brought some improvements as far as centralisation was concerned and made some important changes (Evangelopoulos, 1987; Demaras, 1990) - the composition of the regional supervisory committee was limited to three members instead of five as had applied since 1895. A central supervisory committee were in Athens which consisted of five members, its duties being consultative, disciplinary and administrative.

In 1929 attendance at elementary and secondary education was extended to six years and the Hellenic school was abolished. Law 4653 in 1930 brought additional changes in educational policy. According to this new law the country had a general programme for education. Committees were separated according to their administrative and educational duties. Moreover, there was an attempt to bring about decentralisation in secondary education. 'It seems that these Laws of Educational Reforms brought dramatic changes to the spirit of the system that were expressed only in changes of external features' (Demaras, 1990).

In 1964 free education was finally established at all levels. All state education institutions operated with financial support from the government and every citizen had equal educational opportunities, irrespective of family background, racial origin and sex. According to Law 4379/64, compulsory education was extended to nine years and secondary education divided into self-contained (gymnasium) and independent (lyceum) units.

In the middle of the 1970's a new phase in the development of Greek education started. More particularly, from 1975 a number of legislative measures were taken, aiming to match the Greek education system more closely to the ever-growing cultural, scientific and technological demands of the country. The main topics of educational reforms (Laws: No.186/75, 309/76 and 576/77) which concerned the primary level of education were the following:

- the establishment of a Centre of Educational Studies and in-service training known as KEME;
- *demotike*¹ adopted as the official language of education;
- the function of a deputy headteacher established;
- technical and vocational education reorganised and expanded.

Under the socialist government (1981-89) a series of changes were effected, the most significant of which can be summarised as follows :

- the replacement of school inspectors by school counsellors and heads of the Bureau of Primary and Secondary Education (Law 1304/82);

- the establishment of education committees and councils at local and prefectural levels (Law 1566/85);
- the participation of local councillors and administrators in school committees (Law 1566/85);
- the selection and appointment of headteachers and deputy headteachers were put on a new basis.

After 1982, with the abolition of Inspectors, it seems that with the disconnection of the administrative from the scientific, there was less administrative work but this does not necessarily mean that with this particular policy there was an expansion of decentralised information about educational policy to the educational authorities (Zampeta, 1994: 218). The only decentralised decision that took place during this particular period was the partial allocation of some financial matters (only for functional expenditure and the expenditure for the maintenance of the school building) to local authorities (through Prefectural Authorities). The local authorities, with schools being the only exception, did not have the administrative power to participate in these decisions (Zampeta, 1994).

With the change of government on 10th April 1990 a new effort was launched for educational reform. This lasted until September of 1993 (the party of New Democracy was in power). Among the most significant changes introduced in the administrative system of primary and secondary education were:

- the establishment of new criteria for the selection and appointment of School Counsellors (Law 1966/91), replacing those laid down by Law 1304/82;
- the introduction of a national system of vocational training and instruction;
- regulations concerning the selection, appointment and tenure of the principals of school units and educational districts (Law 2043/92).

Finally in 1994, the permanent appointment of top officials of the Directorates of Education was abolished because permanent tenure led to slackness (Law 2188/94, article 3) while three years later the Education Act of 1997 brought some dramatic changes (Law 2525/97) such as the establishment of new Lyceum, and the abolition of *epetirida*² and so on.

In conclusion, it could be said that educational reforms have been a major goal of public policy in Greece during the last twenty years. Today, thirty years after the passing of a number of educational acts, the main concern of the government continues to be the introduction of new changes for further improvement of the Greek educational system. It is true that the educational system needs changes because it is not static. But it is equally true that frequent changes (without a well defined educational policy) in fact prevent the modernisation of the educational

system. Education seems to be a force that can contribute to general social reform. Educational reform from the point of social welfare is often seen as a necessary process in the development of education.

Statement of the problem

From the above analysis, and taking into account the problems the Greek education system had to overcome, progress has been remarkable. One of the problems, especially during the first years of its composition, was that it was highly centralised. The central government, through the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs (MNERA), held all the functions and exercised total control over educational policy. In other words the system was over-centralised. There is some evidence that educational provision was not expanding rapidly enough and that the rate of illiteracy among the majority of pupils was accelerating, especially in the early years. It is clear that the educational reforms during the post World War II era have brought substantial institutional changes to all levels of education. The main objective of the present system is to fill in the gaps.

With regard to educational administration we can observe that since 1975, Greek governments have tried with various legislative regulations to form an educational hierarchy willing to obey their orders. On the other hand, fundamental problems such as the devolution of power from the MNERA to Prefectural Educational Authorities (PEAs)³ and the institutions of higher education, and the simplification of bureaucratic procedures in the field of educational administration, have never been considered by Greek reformers. One reason for this may be that education in Greece is mainly a public service and its administrative structure and function constitute part of the system of public administration. All educational reforms that took place over the years occurred with changes of government. This is a fact which makes us support the idea that each government follows its educational policy and does not contribute objectively to the effective development of the educational system.

The purpose of this study is to present the existing situation of management in Greek primary schools and to underline the need for reforms in the field of school administration.

Current school administrative scene

At present, the structure of the school administrative system consists of three levels: the national level (MNERA), the prefectural level (PEAs) and the school level.

The functions of the Greek primary schools are affected by their administrative structure and their relationship with the upper levels, especially the MNERA. For this reason, it is necessary to digress briefly on the structure and the extent to which this limits school administrative functions.

Within the framework laid down in the Education Act No 1566/85, the school administration consists of the Headteacher, the Deputy Headteacher and the Teachers' Council.

The Headteacher is mainly responsible for the smooth functioning of the school, the co-ordination of school life, and the observance of laws, circulars and official orders. They are also responsible for the implementation of the Teachers' Council resolutions. Headteachers also take part in the evaluation of school teachers' work and co-operate with the school advisers (Law No 1566/85).

Among the duties of the headteacher, the following are the most important ones, according to circulars No 25124 and 52091/1978:

- to be responsible for the supervision and general direction of the school, of which they are the main representatives;
- to stay at school during working hours and supervise its normal functioning except if they are obliged to be absent for official reasons. In the latter case they are to be substituted for by the deputy head;
- to co-operate harmoniously with all teaching staff since the work of instruction is based upon good co-operation. There can be co-operation if there is respect for teachers, justice in work assignments and real interest in the solution of both official and personal problems;
- to deal with the pupils' problems properly;
- to inform parents and guardians regularly about the pupils' studies and behaviour, and about the school records of achievement.

The Deputy Head substitutes for the headteacher when he or she is absent. If there is more than one deputy in a school the substitute is appointed by the headteacher. The deputy head helps the headteacher in the performance of his or her duties and he or she is responsible for the administrative work in the school. From the managerial point of view the post of deputy head is very important because the teachers who hold this post:

- help headteachers to carry out their difficult work;
- have a rich and varied set of opportunities to learn the job of being a headteacher.

'Deputies and heads should always be in constant communication and deputies should always be willing to take over headship responsibilities' (Mason, 1989:

41). Southworth (1990) suggests that in schools where the deputy head participated in decision-making, higher effectiveness in teacher communication and fewer critical complaints were recorded than in schools where the deputy head was less directly involved. In Greece, however, the institution of deputy head seems to be, to some extent, an isolated position, in the sense that the holders of deputy headship posts are in charge only during the head's absence. Some Greek heads seem not to show confidence and trust in their deputies. The role of the deputy is sometimes seen as a 'threat' to the authority of the headteacher, thus, heads are not always keen to allow deputies to have sufficient training and develop skills (Saitis, 1998).

The Teachers' Council consists of all the teachers, and the headteacher is their president. The Teachers' Council meets after it has been invited to by the president at the beginning of the school year and at the end of each term. It also meets whenever the president (headteacher) feels it to be necessary. The meetings take place within working hours but not during teaching hours.

The Teachers' Council deals with improving the implementation of educational policy and with the better functioning of the school. It is responsible for the fulfilment of the school schedule and its detailed programme, the pupils' health and protection, and the organisation of school life. It estimates school needs and deals with their resolution. It develops possibilities for co-operation between members of the teaching staff and members of the public who are to be given information about the school.

From the above description it is evident that the Education Act of 1985 describes the duties of the administrative structures of schools in only a general way, leaving the special duties of the Teachers' Council imprecise. These duties were left to be defined by a ministerial decision that would oblige headteachers to apply decisions of the Teachers' Council. Although fourteen years have passed since the Education Act, the ministerial decision has still not been made. Thus, today the organisational structure of the school is characterised by legislative imprecision as far as its functions are concerned. The effect of this imprecision is that it sometimes causes opposition and conflict among the teaching staff, which militates against the school fulfilling its objectives. Recent studies (Saitis *et al.*, 1996) suggest that 58% of conflicts which take place in primary schools are the result of legislative imprecision.

In practice, however, the control of MNERA over a school's educational activities, compromises its autonomy of government and administration. It is also evident that many trivial administrative activities absorb too much time from the staff work of MNERA officers.

The main concern of this section is the analysis of administrative activities between the central services of MNERA and the primary schools. These activities

belong to the following categories: financial (e.g. payment of teaching staff); and pupils's affairs (e.g. text books).

Discussions with appropriate employees of the above Ministry and the Prefectural Education Authorities (PEAs) suggest that the procedures in respect of the issues cited need improvement because only in this way will the Greek PEAs and schools escape from 'bureaucratic disease' and become more effective. The schools of elementary and secondary levels of education are public organisations and cost large amounts of money, so their efficiency, as well as that of the PEAs, is at a premium. Although in public services it is almost impossible to define and to measure efficiency, nevertheless a school institution is efficient when it facilitates the accomplishment of such objectives as more and better provision of knowledge to pupils with a minimum of undesirable financial consequences.

Broadly speaking, Greek public administration needs better management because it is inefficient, inflexible and excessively centralised. Indeed, the role of the Greek civil service has been passive rather than active (Spanou, 1996 and Macrydimitris, 1990). The nature of modern society has changed in several respects but civil service attitudes and expressions have not changed accordingly. A modern society needs a contemporary administrative system, to correspond to current public needs. Management in the civil service, therefore, should, according to the likes of Garrett (1980), act as an instrument to:

- formulate policy under political direction;
- establish how to achieve aims;
- make the arrangements necessary for achievement;
- get the parts working together;
- assess how well the operation is doing and identify modifications needed.

The following section is designed to provide some examples and analysis of the relationship between the MNERA and PEAs, and to establish why effective management is needed for the central and the prefectural levels of educational services.

Examination of how the work is organised

In order to investigate the efficiency of educational services in Greece, the technique of 'Organisation and Methods', better known as 'O and M', is utilised in the present study. According to Oliver (1975: 8) the term O and M is defined as 'management service, the object of which is to increase the administrative efficiency of an organisation by improving procedures, methods and systems communications and controls and organisation structure'. Anderson (1980: 1)

defined the term as 'a specialist function which attempts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of clerical procedures and the control of operations within a business'. The main aim of O and M is by objective investigations to devise the most effective means of shaping and improving the organisation and conduct of business with a view to increasing productivity (Shaw, 1984; Kontis, 1993).

Using the management technique O and M, the primary purpose of the present study is to consider the administration of the Greek educational system in order to see whether this system is effective or in need of reform. The technique does not include some particular aspects of efficiency such as problems relating to staff selection or the training of middle and junior managers in human relationships. The emphasis is upon analysing existing procedures and developing more efficient ones.

Following the technique O and M, the first task to be done is to embark on a critical examination of the system. Satisfactory answers are required to each of the questions included in Table 1.

TABLE 1: The O and M technique – what should be asked during the critical examination of the Greek educational system.

Question	Answer
1. What is done?	Action
2. Where is it done?	Place
3. Why is it done?	Purpose
4. When is it done?	Sequence
5. Who is it done by?	Person
6. How is it done? Or how else could be done?	Means, significance

A satisfactory answer to question six leads to consideration of alternatives which might also be acceptable and finally to a decision as to which, if any, of the alternatives should apply. The analysis of the questions needs complete data and information related to the procedure of administrative work in the MNERA and other agencies. This was obtained: first, by studying the laws, presidential decrees, ministerial decisions, documents and reports relative to the organisation and functions of the two administrative levels; second, by discussions with teaching and administrative staff of the PEAs and the staff of

the MNERA.⁴ The discussions consisted of questions about the existing procedures of administrative activities, descriptions of these activities and calculations of the time needed and the number of employees at each managerial level. Finally, statistical information provided by the National Statistical Service of Greece and the MNERA was analysed. Having all the necessary data and information we move to an examination of how work is organised and carried out in the MNERA and PEAs. More particularly, activities which are carried out in the sector of organisation will be examined.

The concern of this section is a critical examination of some of the administrative aspects which compose the relationship between the MNERA and PEAs. Specifically the examples which follow are designed to show the existing managerial situation in the field of educational administration in the MNERA and PEAs.

Example One: Late pupil enrolment

Suppose that a parent, who lives in a village of the prefecture Aetolias and Akarnanias, wishes to enrol his or her child in the primary school of his or her village, on 20 June. It is known that enrolment of pupils in the primary schools of the country, normally take place from the first until the fifteenth of June (Presidential Decree No 497/81). After that, late enrolment demands the approval of the appropriate Head of the Education Office. More particularly the following procedures are observed:

Stage One: Activities within the school

1. parents' application with all certificates which are relevant;
2. registration / headteacher informed;
3. appropriate teacher draws up a document for the Education Office / Head's signature;
4. typing of documents and sending them to the appropriate Education Office.

Stage Two: Activities within the Education Office

1. registration / Head of Education Office informed;
2. head of relevant department informed;
3. appropriate clerk checks file / draws up a document for approval;
4. Head of Education Office's signature;
5. typing of document of decision / sending it to school.

Stage Three: Activities within the primary school

1. registration / Headteacher informed;
2. appropriate teacher draws up a notification document of Head's decision to parent;
3. headteacher's signature / sends it to parent concerned;
4. appropriate teacher registers the pupil in the school record.

Critical analysis of the above stages

From Stage One to Stage Three, thirteen bureaucratic activities intervene which involve approximately fifteen employees who take a processing time of at least eight days. The calculation of the time spent and the workload is based on personal discussion with headteachers and Heads of the Education Offices of the Prefectures of Aetolias and Akarnanias.⁵ The figures given are approximate and apply to 'normal' conditions.

After that the question arises: is this procedure necessary? If yes, why? If not, how can it be shortened? In the opinion of the researcher such a procedure is not necessary because primary education is compulsory, and all late enrolments are approved by the Heads of Education Offices. This is an expression of the over-strong bureaucracy of the Greek administrative system rather than an effective control on school management. Furthermore this kind of control may be interpreted as an example of the limited authority of the Greek headteacher. Head of Education Office approval ought to be abolished because his or her interference not only restricts school efficiency but also encourages the development of more complicated bureaucratic procedures. In other words, the approval of late enrolments should be done by the appropriate headteacher. In this way the above procedure would be shorter and the headteacher become responsible for his or her own activities. In addition the headteacher knows and understands the problems of the local families better than the Head of the Education Office.

Example Two: Appointing school cleaners

According to Act No 1892 / 90 article 113 and No 1894 / 90 article 5, the cleaning of primary and secondary schools is arranged by contracts. Cleaners are hired for the school year by the Head of each Education Office. The annual expenditure for the cleaning of schools is determined by ministerial decision from the Ministry of Education and Finance. This requires the following activities:

Stage One: Activities within the MNERA

1. each August the Division responsible for the administrative affairs of primary and secondary education draws up a document for the appointing of school cleaners;
2. typing of document / seeing by all departments and Divisions / Minister's signature;
3. returning of document to the relevant clerk;
4. sending the document to Cabinet council.

Stage Two: Activities within the Secretary's Office of Cabinet

1. registration;
2. the appropriate clerk proposes to the council of Ministers the recruitment of cleaners;
3. meeting of the appropriate Cabinet committee / discussion / decision;
4. writing / typing of the minutes / checking of typing;
5. ratification of minutes by the Ministers;
6. appropriate clerk / drawing up a document of approval;
7. seeing by all departments / secretary's signature;
8. typing of document / registration;
9. sending it to the MNERA.

Stage Three: Activities within the MNERA

1. registration;
2. director of the appropriate Division informed / head of appropriate department informed;
3. appropriate clerk / drawing up a document for all Divisions of primary and secondary education of the country;
4. seeing by all departments / Director's signature;
5. typing of document / checking of typing;
6. sending it to all Prefectural Educational Authorities.

Stage Four: Activities within the PEAs

1. registration / head informed;
2. appropriate clerk / drawing up a document for all headteachers of its educational area;
3. typing of document / head's signature;
4. sending it to schools.

Stage Five: Activities within the school

1. registration / headteacher informed;
2. appropriate teacher / drawing up a document announcing school cleaners' vacancies;
3. head's signature / announcement of the vacancy (or vacancies) to the local daily press according to the order of law;
4. the application forms of the candidates along with all the necessary papers for their evaluation are submitted to the Secretariat of the school Committee within fifteen days from the day of announcement in the local daily press;
5. meeting of school committee / discussion / voting / candidate who has gathered the majority of total votes is elected to the vacancy;
6. writing / typing of the minutes / ratification of minutes;
7. appropriate teacher / drawing up a document of proposal to Head of Education Office for the elected candidate;
8. headteacher's signature / register of the school;
9. sending it to appropriate Education Office.

Stage Six: Activities within the Education Office

1. registration / head informed;
2. appropriate clerk / study of file / drawing up a document-contract;
3. head's signature / sending it to appropriate school.

Stage Seven: Activities within the school

1. registration / headteacher informed;
2. appropriate teacher notifies the School Committee and the appointed candidate (school cleaner) about the document.

Critical analysis of the above stages

The procedure outlined above is not necessary because in practical terms: (a) the Cabinet is making a decision about the total number of school cleaners, without investigating the real needs of the Greek schools, (b) the PEAs appoint all the elected candidates and that creates unnecessary bureaucratic procedure, and (c) finally it is against the economic development of the country in the sense that it occupies administrative employees in day to day routine matters. Therefore, it is evident that the Greek administrative system cannot function while exhibiting traditional and complicated administrative procedures (since even the appointment of school cleaners for the educational sector requires Cabinet approval). It is worth emphasizing that there is a demand for organisational

effectiveness and better organisational performance. An alternative way to do it is by decision issued by the appropriate headteacher or the president of the corresponding school committee. In this way the above procedure for appointing school cleaners would be shorter and the school management responsible for its activities.

From the analysis of the above examples we may conclude the following:

- The role of the headteacher is neglected by the state in the sense that a head does not have the necessary authority and managerial training to control internal school organisation and to manage school affairs effectively.
- The Greek primary (and secondary) schools operate without enjoying any type of administrative independence because all school issues demand 'ministerial' or 'prefectural' approval. The school authorities are thus controlled and influenced by the MNERA and PEAs while the relationship between MNERA and schools could be characterised as excessive concern with day-to-day activity and with routine matters.
- The responsibility for the complicated procedures of school affairs lies with the conventional Greek legislator who insists upon traditional methods of working and wider issues in education suffer from the obfuscation of tradition. This results in the absence of a systematic analysis of school issues from both educational and managerial points of view. There is no clear definition of areas of responsibility and authority between the MNERA and PEAs and the latter does not have the power to manage school issues. This legislative dichotomy implies that the Greek PEAs do not function as self administrating organisations.

School administration in the reform process

The above examples are not exceptional within the Greek administrative system. Recent studies suggest that the striking features of the educational administrative system (Saitis, 1996; Makrydimitris, 1996; Kaltsogia-Tournaviti, 1995) are its centralisation, complexity and traditional methods of work. Under these conditions it is questionable if the school institutions can carry out their functions adequately.

Because of negative pressures in the school administrative system, the Greek government should examine systematically the machinery of its various administrative levels to ensure that decision-making processes become more effective.

The first reform must be in the devolution of power from the central administration of MNERA to PEAs and school institutions. Within the field of primary schools the term 'devolution' means that decisions about most school

problems and affairs should be taken by the headteacher or teachers' council or immediate management of the schools. To do this the schools should have their charters to function as self-governing public organisations while supervision by MNERA should be confined to evaluation and control of legal matters. The day to day administrative control of MNERA over the PEAs and school activities is a strong bureaucratic expression rather than a fundamental constitutional supervision because from the above examples it is evident that the MNERA does not approve the legality of school or PEA activities, but simply carries them out. So, by a clearly defined devolution of power, school management can be delegated as an efficient provider of public services in clearly defined ways. Routine, loss of time and bureaucratic activity would be cut down and the physical inability of central administration to deal with detailed problems throughout all the schools would be overcome.

To give the Greek school real power over its own affairs, it is necessary for parliament to pass an Education Act which would include a definition of what exactly the authority of primary schools is, because authority is the basis for accountability. Accountability here means that the school government concerned shall render an account of its actions to the state and if this authority is dissatisfied, it should take the necessary steps to put matters right. The Education Act would also generate an effective control system. A clarification of methods of controlling school activities, through for example inspectors, with the authority to scrutinise all administrative and financial activities at the end of the school year, would be a useful instrument of protection from the abuse of authority in schools.

Furthermore, the plethora of educational laws related to school affairs should be replaced by a new education act introducing simpler administrative procedures and better methods of working. In other words, the codification of school legislation is an essential prerequisite for raising the efficiency of school management by reducing the amount of bureaucratic activities in order that teachers and civil servants will not have to spend time on day-to-day routine matters.

Thirdly, the reform should provide stable and clearly defined criteria for a legal framework concerning the way top executives in education are selected. This framework should be the result of an extensive objective analysis. It should be taken into consideration, however, that the lack of political consensus in educational matters not only means strong reactions when decisions are applied but also explains why the educational laws in Greece are always replaced whenever a new government is in power.

Finally, necessary guidelines should be provided so that efficient teachers obtain the post of headteacher, teachers who would communicate with and

understand the people involved in education and who could motivate staff in order to establish an effective school environment. These guidelines should be the source of inspiration and encouragement to the members of the school organisation; they should also create the appropriate atmosphere for works. They should be the 'value-chain', meaning that the attitude of 'school people'(teachers, headteachers etc.) correlates highly with school efficiency (Ulrich, 1997).

Summary

In this study we have considered the management of Greek primary schools. More particularly we have examined the administrative system relating to Greek educational authorities, at central and prefectural level. Our aim has been to illustrate a current of thought opposed to the modernisation of the educational administrative system in a period in which governments are increasingly faced with the necessity of adapting their systems to new conditions, demands and opportunities.

The Greek primary (and secondary) schools operate without enjoying any type of administrative independence because all school issues demand 'ministerial' or 'prefectural' approval. The school authorities are thus controlled and influenced by the MNERA and PEAs while the relationship between MNERA and schools could be characterised as excessive concern with day to day activity and with routine matters.

The responsibility for the complicated procedures of school affairs lies with the conventional Greek legislator who insists upon traditional methods of working and wider issues in education suffer from the obfuscation of tradition. This results in the absence of a systematic analysis of school issues from both educational and managerial points of view.

In the Greek administrative system the majority of bureaucratic activities are of a routine nature and unnecessary. This implies that more time is spent on 'doing' and less on 'managing'. One can conclude, in general, that the state fails to delegate sufficient authority so as to enable the prefectural authorities to fulfil their responsibilities. A consistent theme for a competitive future is building and operating organisations (e.g. school organisations and so on) that will be more effectively responsive. Responsiveness includes innovation, faster decision making, and effective linking with staff, organisations and pupils.

Notes

¹ *Demotike* is the living language of the Greek people. The spoken language 'demotike' is considerably different from the ancient Greek (*katharevousa*). For further details about *demotike* and *katharevousa* see Papanoutsos (1978) and Pagkakis (1988).

² *Epetirida* is the procedure for recruitment of teachers for primary and secondary education with preference given to seniority.

³ As far as the Greek educational system is concerned, with the term Local Education Authorities we always mean the Prefectural Education Authorities.

⁴ Interviewing Heads of the Education Offices and Directorates of Primary Education was the method chosen for the selection of data for the calculation of the bureaucratic activities, time spent and use of the work force. The interview schedule can be found in the appendix. It must be noted that the Greek public primary schools function as public services and follow the same administrative procedures.

⁵ Interviewing headteachers of primary education was the method chosen for the selection of data for the calculation of the bureaucratic activities, the time spent and the use of the work force.

Anna Saiti is a lecturer at the Harokopeio. She is the author of the book 'Education and Economic Development', and has written several articles on different aspects of the Greek economy and education. Her e-mail address is: asaiti@hua.gr

References

- Anderson, R.G. (1980) *Organization and Methods*. Plymouth: Macdonald & Evans Ltd.
- Demaras, A. (1990) *The Reform that has not been Carried Out* Athens: Nea Elliniki Vivliothiki. [in Greek]
- Evangelopoulos, S. (1987) *The History of the new Greek Education*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Garrett, J. (1980) *Managing the Civil Service*. London.
- Kaltsougia-Tournaviti, N. (1995) 'Modernisation of the Greek public administration'. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, Vol. 1, January, pp.31-45. [in Greek]
- Kazamias, A.M. (1967) 'Plays and policies for educational reform in Greece', *Comparative Education Review*, 332-333.
- Kontis, Th. and Madas, N. (1993) *Applied Organisation and Administration*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Lefas, C. (1942) *The History of Education*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Macrydimitris, A. (1990), 'The characteristics of the Greek administration crisis'. *Dimosios Tomeas*, Vol. 53, 29-44. [in Greek]
- Macrydimitris, A. (1996) 'Public administration and restructure at the beginning of the 21st century'. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, No. 4, 7-13. [in Greek]
- Mason, A. (1989) 'The headteacher's role in the development of staff.' In I. Craig (ed.) *Primary School Management in Action*. Longman.
- Oliver, S. (1975) *O and M for First-line Managers*. London: Arnold.

- Pagakakis, G. (1988) *Introduction to Public Administration*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Papakonstantinou, G. and Andreou, A. (1994) *Power and Organisation-Administration of the Educational System*. Athens. [in Greek]
- Papanoutsos, E.P. (1978) 'Educational demoticism'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 22(1), 46-50.
- Saitis, C., Darra, M. and Psarri, K. (1996) 'Disfunctioning of school units'. *Nea Paidia*, Summer, 126-142. [in Greek]
- Saitis, C., Sourtzis, E. and Tourtounis, G. (1996) 'Lack of legal clarity and its effect on the functioning of school units'. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, No 4, January, 87-95. [in Greek]
- Saitis, C. (1998) 'The deputy head of a school as a basis for the development of leadership in education'. *Dioikitiki Enimerosi*, Vol. 11, 39-59. [in Greek]
- Shaw, J. (1984) *Administration in Business*. Plymouth: Macdonald and Evans.
- Southworth, G. (1990) 'Leadership, headship and effective schools'. *School Organisation*, Vol. 10(1), 3-16.
- Spanou K. (1996), *The Problem of Public Administration: A First Approach*. Athens: IOBE.
- Ulrich, D. (1997) *Human Resource Champions : The Next Agenda for Adding Value and delivering Results*. Harvard: Harvard Business Press.
- Zambeta, E. (1994) *Educational Policy in Primary Education 1974-1989*. Themelio: Athens. [in Greek]