

In-Service Training and its Role in the Administrative Selection Process of School Principals



Giavrimis, P.¹, Sikioti, F.², Eletherakis Th.³

¹University of the Aegean, Lofos Panepistimiou, Mytilene, Greece

^{2,3}University of Crete, Rethymno Campus, Greece

ABSTRACT: In the Greek literature there is a debate on the development, management, organization and effectiveness of the school units and which is the role of the school principals in these processes. Two concepts in Greece have been involved in this debate in the last decades related to the above-mentioned functions of school development: evaluation and training. The goal of this research was to investigate the views of the principals of school units in the prefecture of Rethymno (Crete, Greece) regarding their training needs and the role of these training during their in-service administrative selection process. 53 primary and secondary education school principals of Rethymnon prefecture participated in this survey. The questionnaire was used as a research tool for data collection. The research highlighted the needs and characteristics of their training and that their training should be taken into account in their in-service selection process.

KEYWORDS: Training, evaluation, administrative selection process, evaluation criteria

I. INTRODUCTION

In the postmodern era, the concept of efficiency has occupied not only the field of the division of labour and considerations on the development of a society but also national educational systems in a global context of homogenisation of educational policies. Educational outcomes in nation-states are not entrenched in their space, but are internationalized and are compared to each other, producing global rankings and conditions of competition, influencing, or transforming professional, pedagogical and social practices, in the public discourse of states and the implementation of educational decisions (Giavrimis, 2013). In this context, the effectiveness of the school units and their management, organization and development are among the modern educational precepts. The role of the school principal is part of the discourse of the changes that have taken place in the last decades. Questions are raised about the readiness of school principals to meet the needs of their role and the adequacy of their initial education or training (Peraki, 2008: 37). In this context, teacher training is considered one of the main determinants of the professional competence and autonomy of educational staff, complementing or renewing their initial training. (Bagakis, 2005). Therefore, crucial to the effective functioning of school principals is their continuous training in the challenging and dynamic conditions of globalised educational systems. School principals in the Greek education system rely on their experience to manage their schools, as there is no centralised design of training programs that would help them to cope more effectively with their role (Chatzigiannis, Limaraki, Chlapanis, 2012: 1). Thus, there are perceptions that managing a school unit is an innate talent, although most experts agree that skills and competencies can be developed through training and education in an appropriate educational environment (Papastamatis, 2008: 254). What we nowadays call "lifelong learning" is a reality that indicates the necessity of continuous training (Stamelos et al., 2015) for both school principals and all educational staff.

II. THE TRAINING OF EDUCATION SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND THE EUROPEAN AND GREEK EDUCATIONAL POLICY

A. The concept of training

Further education is "a continuous and recurrent process, systematically organised, which goes hand in hand with the professional and personal development of the teacher" (Karras, & Economidis, 2015: 120). While, according to Chatzipanagiotou (2001), in-service training is defined as an institutionalized or non-institutionalized function, which consists of "organized procedures" in order to "supplement and renew the initial education and training of the teacher", so that during the years of service he/she is able to "improve the knowledge, skills and attitudes relevant to his/her instructional work on the one hand, and to develop himself/herself as an individual on the other hand". The term "training" is generally used to define the set of activities and processes associated with the conception, design, and implementation of specific programs. These have as their primary purpose the enrichment, improvement, upgrading and further development of the academic-theoretical or practical, professional, and

In-Service Training and its Role in the Administrative Selection Process of School Principals

personal interests, knowledge, and skills of teachers during their tenure (Mavrogiorgos, 1983. Giavrimis et. al., 2011). Training "contributes to the improvement of teachers' professional practice" and the development of a quality education (Sakkoulis, Asimaki, & Vergidis, 2017: 108).

In the Greek and international literature, training processes add capital to the primary education of teachers or provide practical or complementary support to incomplete or insufficient knowledge capital, enabling the teacher to cope with the increasing needs in a dynamically changing school context (Chatzidimou, & Taratorori, 2003). Formal training refers to targeted training in supporting teachers as professionals based on their needs. Improving the quality of education "depends primarily on strengthening teachers' personalities as professionals, i.e., their ability to reflect on who they are and what they do as teachers, and secondarily on what techniques they apply in instruction" (Salteris, 2010: 7-13). If one tried to classify training needs, the categories would be four: general training needs, training needs arising from the innovation, educational changes and reforms, specific training needs of school units concerning local socio-cultural characteristics and training and development needs of teachers and educational staff (Katsarou, & Dedouli, 2008: 74 & 83-84).

Training is the solution to facilitate the school principals in their difficult task. Through training, the principals will be able to expand his/her knowledge in the management of the school unit, organize their educational work, evaluate their results, but also to motivate their human resources, develop their communication skills and to be able to manage crises and conflicts as best as possible (Dulkeridou, 2015: 85).

(Size 10 & Normal)An easy way to comply with the conference paper formatting requirements is to use this document as a template and simply type your text into it.

B. Training in European countries

The European Union has made training a priority to strengthen the competencies of teachers and educational staff, as it is considered a factor in ensuring their quality and professionalism and a key to the development and success of all sectors of education (Chatzigiannis, Limaraki, & Chlapanis, 2012). In EU countries, as a criterion for evaluation and in-service selection process regarding administrative positions of responsibility, candidates for school principals must have undergone specific training for that. In many cases, this training must have been received before taking up their duties. In some other countries, the training is undertaken after taking up the post. For example, in France, Spain and the French-speaking community in Belgium specific training takes place before their appointment, while in the Czech Republic it takes place after that. The duration of training varies from 100 hours to one year (Eurydice, 2009: 190).

According to Andreou (2005: 313-314), structured training programs for education principals are absent in the Greek educational system. There are no such training courses in the University Institutions, nor any similar actions for prospective or current school principals by the Ministry or other official agencies. As a result, school principals rely on their experience, their previous mentoring with other education officials and the collective experience they have acquired over the years of working in the school environment. Some school principals lack administrative knowledge and experience in a position of responsibility (Chatzigiannis, Limaraki, & Chlapanis, 2012: 2). One of these cases is newly appointed teachers who have no training and take on administrative duties.

Historically, we find that until the end of the 1990s, no serious training effort for school principals took place, but only a few small, fragmentary training meetings. In the 1990s-2000s, with the approval of the Ministry of Research, Education and Religious Affairs, 40-hour programs for school principals were implemented. The providers of these programs were, in addition to the Ministry, the Regional Educational Centre (PEK) and the Vocational and Technical Teacher Training Academy (SELETE). In 2010, the 2nd Operational Program was designed for Education and Initial Vocational Training Operational Programme (EPEAEK) and co-funded by the EU, included the training of school principals among its immediate priorities. In Law 3848/2010 (par.9, Article 11) referred that "the administrative and managerial competence certificates required for the promotion of school principals in primary and secondary education are obtained after successful completion of a special program at the National Centre for Public Administration and Self-Government". During this period, 190 directors and education officials attended 8 intensive training programs, which were implemented during that period, in the centers of Athens and Thessaloniki (Lemonis, & Kolezakis, 2013: 174-175).Of course, with paragraph 5 of article 29 of the same law, the above conditions are in essence, reversed, since it is stated that "the certificate of administrative competence is not considered a necessary qualification for the candidates for school principals, during the first two applications of this law".

Although in recent years initiatives have been undertaken through postgraduate training programs, mainly by universities, as well as occasional training activities by other institutions, which are funded by the participants themselves, these efforts are still fragmented. At the same time, there is a lack of motivation to encourage school principals, whether prospective or active, to attend training programs. The assumption of directing a school unit in Greece is an empirical, amateurish endeavor. It depends only on the willingness of the school principals themselves to inform and self-educate and participate in training programs. However, it is a criterion for the evaluation and selection of education officials in Greece (Kelesidis, 2018: 92).

III. EVALUATION AND SOCIAL CONTROL

Bernstein (2003) in his book "Class, codes and control: The structuring of pedagogic discourse" is concerned with the main question of how class-regulated power relations and principles of social control govern the various social practices that manifest themselves at different levels and in various agents of cultural reproduction, thus controlling the consciousness of subjects. Bernstein's aim is to investigate the issue of social control applied to various social institutions, such as education, through which their behaviour is influenced (Bernstein, 2003). Bernstein (2003) considers that all aspects of our lives in society are under the supervision of authority or a form of symbolic control. For him, this is something invariable and he believes that it will always be the case in a society (Bernstein, 2003). The functional coexistence of individuals in society requires the adoption and implicit acceptance by them of certain restrictions on their freedom (formal - informal rules and social norms), social discipline, and the acquisition of social consciousness (Bowles, & Gintis, 1976: 270). Within these rules and standards set by the state, the evaluation process of teachers and educational staff is part of the process, which exercises social control over educational practices. Society imposes control on teachers and their administrators through ideological guidelines determined by the general educational framework. Evaluation in a social class society is a necessity for two contradictory reasons. First, it is a tool for categorizing and hierarchizing individuals (see social classes), but also a means for social change and the transformation of social structures (Katsikas, 1995: 135-138). Evaluative processes are a field of signaling power and, at the same time, a field of social struggle, imposition and domination or social negotiation. The evaluative process determines a particular cultural status and identity, which presupposes acquiring knowledge and skills, which are expressions of power and relative strength. Evaluation is how the ideological underpinnings of social practices document current social arrangements as necessary and legitimate. Evaluative processes 'proselytize' and act as mediators of establishing the dominant socio-political system, perpetuating the social inequalities that emerge in globalised society (Witte & Mannon, 2010). (Witte & Mannon, 2010). Evaluation in education serves both pedagogical needs on the one hand and social needs, which aim at increased control (Katsikas, 1995).

IV. EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE SELECTION PROCESS OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

Evaluation takes place in all aspects of life and is inextricably linked to individuals, context, time, objects, and situations (Konstantinou, 2000). The fundamental parameters of evaluation are five, according to Konstantinou (2015): the purpose for which it is conducted, the object being evaluated, the evaluating agency, the criteria established and the process. There are many ways in which an individual's professional competence can be measured and assessed. Some methods are psychometric tests, interviews, assessment centres, self-assessment and 360-degree feedback (the collection of perceptions of the people surrounding the person being assessed in an imaginary complete circle), work samples and biographical data (Kalogiannis, 2020).

In the context of educational policy, institutions set criteria by trying to identify suitable individuals with the skills and the necessary "capital" to effectively respond to their diverse tasks (Koutouzis, & Spyriadou, 2018). The administrative selection of school principals is very important, since the performance outcomes of each school unit are determined by finding competent managers (Bakalbasi, & Fokas, 2016). School principals in different EU countries do not have the same characteristics. Thus, each country defines the evaluation and selection of school principals in positions of responsibility differently, following "its priorities, policy choices and historical legacies" (Mademlis, 2014). Most countries select school administrators through the education system, with a degree in pedagogical science, making the argument that they contribute to the profession they have consciously chosen. In contrast, some others put emphasis on people with knowledge of management science (Mademlis, 2014). Thus, the only prerequisite to occupying a principalship in Belgium, Latvia, the Netherlands, and Norway is teaching experience. Administrative experience and training are taken into account by local authorities in Norway. In Greece, but also in Cyprus, Lithuania, and Turkey, in addition, experience in positions of responsibility is also assessed. In Slovenia, candidates for school principals must have served at some time as counsellors or mentors. The countries where all three requirements - teaching experience, administrative experience, and management training - must be met are Malta, Romania and Iceland. Spain requires knowledge of the second national language of the country. In Sweden, school principals are not necessarily teachers. They do not need to have teaching experience. But they should have been trained in the special university-level department of the National Education Agency (Eurydice, 2013).

A. Greek educational system: Evaluation and administrative selection process of school principals

In the Greek educational system, no relevant training in school management issues is required to take up a position of responsibility. The selection systems of school principals in Greece, over time, have been based on four categories of criteria: a) the scientific and pedagogical background and training (e.g., qualifications, training), b) the official status and teaching, leadership and administrative experience, c) the personality-general profile of the candidate (interview) and d) the evaluation of the educational work (never implemented although it was introduced many times) (Kelesidis, 2018: 92). Most of the time, in education officials' evaluations, the emphasis is placed on years of service in education rather than on the knowledge and skills of the candidates. This has been a matter of concern to experts as it discourages competent, younger individuals from seeking to

In-Service Training and its Role in the Administrative Selection Process of School Principals

occupy a principal position. On the other hand, the absence of a program for the development of administrators has led to the acquisition of these positions by people who lack knowledge and skills and simply have many years of educational and/or administrative experience (Saitis, 2008: 264-265).

According to the institutional framework that was in use in Greece with Law 309/1976, the principal's position was permanent. School principals in primary and secondary schools were required to have 17 years of service. School inspectors' evaluation reports were also considered (Mademlis, 2014: 30-31). Later, the law 1304/1982 abolished the tenure of education officials. Laws 1566/1985 and 2187/2000 defined the school principals' selection criteria and responsibilities. However, from 1982 until today, 18 different laws have been enacted regarding the evaluation of school officials in Greece (Kelesidis, 2018). It is common knowledge that there is no consistent pattern of selection and evaluation of candidate school principals. Since 1982, each school principal selection process has been made under a different law (L. 2043/1992, L. 2188/1994, L. 2986/2002, L. 3467/2006, L. 3848/2010, L. 4327/2015, and L. 4473/2017). As can be expected, these constant changes create a feeling of insecurity for people who are asked to participate in selection procedures without knowing in advance according to which criteria they will be evaluated. The ranking of the selection criteria fluctuates with each change in the law. The selection criteria are mainly based on teaching and administrative experience. In the context of the international trend of finding competent leaders in addition to managers, the interview, which evaluates the personality and general constitution of the candidate officials and has been criticised for its variability, is also graded (Papaioannou, 2010). From the data of the 2020 annual report of the Quality Assurance Authority for Primary and Secondary Education, concerning a comparative review of the institutional framework for the selection of education executives, it is clear the changes in the weighting of the selection criteria have been used since 2002. Thus, for example, in the criterion "Personality -General Consistency", which is evaluated by interview, the percentage variation of the total candidates' rating ranges from 20% (L. 4823/2021) to 34.3% (L. 4473/2017). From the above, it is apparent that the state is using the selection criteria to control the educational officials' choice, to implement and orient its educational policy according to the dominant ideological-political practices.

The purpose of this research was to investigate the views of school principals in the prefecture of Rethymnon regarding their training needs and role of its training in their selection process.

V. METHOD

For this research, the quantitative method of investigation was chosen as it is the method that can best capture the empirical reality since it is based on data collected directly from principals.

A. Sample

The survey sample consisted of Primary and Secondary Education school principals of the prefecture of Rethymnon. In the area of Rethymnon, there were 37 primary schools and 38 Secondary Education schools. Of the 53 school officials who responded to the survey, 25 (47.2%) were male and 28 (52.8%) were female. Of the 53 school principals who participated in the survey, 35 (66%) were school principals in secondary schools and 18 (34%) were principals in primary schools. Regarding the age groups, the largest percentage (84.9%) belonged to the age group of 51 and above and 15.1% were between 36-50 years old. In terms of years in school official position, 12 (22%) were school principals for the 1st time, another 12 (22%) were for the 2nd time, and more than half, 29 (54.9%), had served more than two times. Regarding seniority, we found that a large proportion of 45.3% had more than 29 years of service experience. Concerning the educational level of school principals, 25 of them (43.4%) hold only a primary degree, 4 of them (7.5%) had obtained a second degree, 7 (13.2%) had a master's degree and 20 teachers (36%) had a PhD. Regarding certification in computer use, it is very encouraging that of the 53 school principals, 52 (98.1%) are certified.

B. Research Tool

The questionnaire was used as a research tool, because it allows the collection of a large amount of information in a short period. A questionnaire with closed-ended questions on the five-point Likert-type scale was used. The questionnaire contained 25 questions and was organized into three thematic sections. Initially, 9 questions referred to the demographic characteristics of the sample: gender, age, grade, years of service, years in an administrative position and education level. The following thematic section concerned the training needs of schools officials with 11 questions, of the type "Should training be compulsory or optional?", "What are the factors that are considered capable of encouraging them to train?" and "What period of time do they consider most appropriate to receive training?". The third thematic section consisted of 5 questions that were related to training and whether it should be taken into account in the selection process of school principals. The questions were of the type "Do you agree that training should be accompanied by certification through examinations, assignments, presentations, etc.?" and "What are the desired changes to upgrade the role of the school officials?" For the statistical analysis of the data, the descriptive statistics method was used using the SPSS program.

VI. FINDINGS

A. Training needs of school principals

Regarding the training needs of the school principals, 52 (98.1%) out of 53 consider training to be essential. 36 (67.9%) school principals think it should be in a mandatory form, 14 (26%) want it to be optional, and 3 (5.7%) are not sure.

With the multiple response analysis, common factors that encourage school principals to attend training programs are recognized. We observed that the first motivation factor (98.1% of the total responses) was personal development, second, the "needs and problems of the school unit" (96.3% of the total responses), third was scientific and technological developments (92.6% of the total responses) and the last factor was additional criteria for career advancement (68% of the total responses).

It appeared that only half of the respondents were concerned about extra evaluation ranking points, as 26% of school principals said they agreed, 17% were not sure, and 24.5% said they disagreed. Social recognition hardly concerns them at all as a motivational factor, since a large percentage of 55.7% of school principals answered that they disagree and 17% are not sure.

In response to the multiple question on which issues the training could help them, 96.2% of school principals' total responses referred to being able to introduce changes and innovations, 90.5% (of the total responses) to improve the educational process, 88.6% (of the total responses) to improve the school climate, 86.8% (of the total responses) to help in school modernization, 73.6% (of the total responses) in the renewal of the teaching staff and educational practice and 71.7% (of the total responses) to enhance the prestige of education. In last place, they ranked the improvement of students' performance (66% of the total responses).

The subjects which school principals would like to be trained in order of importance were: organization and management of the school unit (92.4% of the total responses), introduction of changes and innovations (90.5% of the total responses), counselling and guidance of teachers (88.7% of the total responses), human resources administration (86.7% of the total responses), management of risks and crises concerning the staff and students of the school unit (84.9% of the total responses), leadership and conflict coping (83% of the total responses), ICT and digital skills together with problem solving and decision making techniques (81.1% of the total responses), evaluation of students, teachers and educational work (79.2% of the total responses), educational - school psychology (73.6% of the total responses), communication dysfunctions and the art of persuasion together with modern environments and burnout (71.7% of the total responses), educational legislation (67.9% of the total responses) and in last place time management (58.5% of the total responses). School principals preferred to be trained by colleagues with a wide range of experience (84.9% of the total responses), by academics - scientists (83% of the total responses), consultants - coordinators (64.2% of the total responses), while only 39.6% of the total responses of school principals referred to training supervisors.

School principals preferred training to be initial and periodic (96.2% of the total responses). 68.2% of the total responses stated that it should be initial and before taking up a position of responsibility, 67.9% of the total responses stated that it should be periodic during the tenure, while only 39.7% of the total responses agreed with the establishment of a school for school principals, with 17% unsure and 28.3% disagreeing. Regarding the form and duration of training, 27 (50.9%) school principals preferred accelerated seminars, 25 (47.1%) agreed with annual training, 20 (37.8%) preferred three-month training or six-month training. Also, 66% of the total responses mentioned that training must take place before the school year starts and 50.9% of the total responses pointed out training during the school year with a release from their job duties. Less than half of the total responses (45.2%) mentioned that training should take place during their free time, while they disagreed that training should take place on weekends (49.6% of the total responses).

In addition, motivations for principals to seek training are interesting academic subjects (96.2%), trainers of recognized prestige (90.6%) and financial compensation (60.4%). They do not seem to consider the release from their job duties as an additional motivation, with 47.2% disagreeing and 20.8% stating uncertainty. On the last question of the thematic axis on whether principals prefer their personal/professional concerns to be taken into account in the design of training programs, 46 (86.8%) school principals answered yes, 5 (9.4%) said they were not sure and 1 (1.9%) disagreed.

B. The role of training in school principals' selections

Regarding the thematic axis of the questionnaire concerning training and the role that it can or should possess in the evaluation and selection of school principals, on the question whether they agree or disagree that training should be accompanied by certification through examinations, assignments, presentations, etc., the school principals agreed with 75.5%, 13.2% stated uncertainty, 11.3% disagreed. The qualifications that they considered should be taken into account in the evaluation of school principals were, in order of preference, teaching experience (96.2% of the total responses), personality (94.3% of the total responses), experience in positions of responsibility and certified computer literacy (88.7% of the total responses), training in management (86.7% of the total responses), acceptance and appreciation of board the teachers (73.6% of the total responses), foreign language certification (64.1% of the total responses), postgraduate studies in administration (60.4% of the total responses), postgraduate studies in pedagogical subjects (56.6% of the total responses) and scientific - research work (30.2% of the total responses).

In-Service Training and its Role in the Administrative Selection Process of School Principals

The desired changes for upgrading the role of the school principals according to them, in order of preference were: training in management (90.6% of the total responses), providing additional incentives (79.2% of the total responses), evaluation of previous tenure (73.6% of the total responses) and 58.5% of the total responses requested to change the selection process. Regarding the question of whether the training received should be taken into account in their evaluations, 26 (49.1%) answered yes, 24 (45.3%) responded that it should be taken into account conditionally, and 3 (5.7%) answered no. 37 (69.8%) agreed that training should be linked to advancement in the administrative hierarchy, 10 (18.9%) were not sure, 6 (11.4%) disagreed.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this research was to investigate the views of school principals in the prefecture of Rethymnon regarding their training needs and the role of their training in their selection process. Regarding the training needs of school principals and the characteristics of training, the majority of them state that: a) it should be mandatory, as found in the studies of Antipas (2018), and Bakalbasi and Foka (2014), b) the factors that motivate school principals in training was, in order of importance: personal development, the school needs and problems, changes - innovations, scientific and technological developments of the society and the improvement of the educational process, c) but they do not believe that they can help decisively to improve the performance of pupils, d) the subject matter knowledge, in particular, in which they wish to be trained in order of priority was: school organisation and administration, changes and innovations in teaching, teacher counselling and human resources management. In several previous studies the same preferences have appeared (Antipas, 2018. Bakalbasi, & Fokas, 2014; Papaioannou, 2010. Papaioannou et al., 2013), e) they would like to be trained in order of priority by their colleagues with extensive school experience, academics, counsellors - coordinators and training supervisors. These results are in line with those of Papaioannou's (2010) research. f) Regarding duration, format and period of training, they prefer a combination of initial and periodic training, with accelerated seminars, preferably before the beginning of the school year, g) additional incentives that could motivate them were in order: the interesting subject matter knowledge, recognized trainers and perhaps some financial compensation, if their time is outside their working hours and h) wish that the personal - professional concerns of school principals must be taken into account in the design of their training, as found in the studies of Antipas (2018) and Papaioannou (2010).

About the research question of whether training should be evaluated and graded in the process of judging and selecting managers, the majority of managers: a) answered positively, either conditionally or unconditionally, b) would like training to be related to advancement in the management hierarchy, c) believed that the qualifications to be taken into account in their evaluations are in descending order: teaching experience, personality, experience in positions of responsibility, certified computer knowledge, training, acceptance by the board of teachers and at the end degrees and writing - research work; d) to evaluate the skills acquired from training; and e) indicated that the main desired change for upgrading their role is training in school administration and organization.

According to the above, school principals are driven in their training choices and their selection evaluations by the legitimate criteria set by the state for the skills and competencies a principal must have. The instrumentalization of training and selection criteria supports the social and educational control of teachers' behavioral practices for a position of responsibility. The managerial, pedagogical, and instructional approach to training in all educational contexts de-ideologizes educational policy practices and shifts the responsibility to the teachers for their training and the internalized "inadequacy" they experience. The state defines the process of evaluation of teachers and education officials, which serves its ideological and educational orientation without, at the same time, providing the necessary training. The teacher who would like to be in a position of responsibility as an employee is forced to meet the skills and certified knowledge that the state establishes as selection criteria in its legislative framework each time, on his or her own initiative. Evaluation procedures are a field of signaling power and, at the same time, a field of social imposition and domination. A specific culture is thus formed in educational practices by documenting current social regulations as necessary and legitimate. Training and position as a selection criterion is part of the 'conversion' of teachers and the legitimisation of the dominant ideological-political system by perpetuating their educational opportunities to access positions of responsibility.

In conclusion, the research highlighted the needs and specific characteristics of the training that should be implemented in the context of educational practices. The findings were similar to those of previous studies. The school principals of Rethymnon prefecture consider that training should be taken into account in their evaluation and in their advancement in the administrative hierarchy in general. As limitations of the survey, we could mention that the conclusions drawn from the survey relate to the population of primary and secondary school principals of Rethymnon and cannot be generalized to the whole country. Despite the limitations mentioned, the research has highlighted many issues regarding training and the role it should play in their selection evaluations according to the principals of Rethymnon. Thus, based on the findings of the survey, we could suggest the following: a) the state and the designers of training programs should take into account the surveys conducted on the field, b) training should be provided de-ideologized and according to the needs of school principals before they take office, c) additional incentives should be provided for the participation of school principals in training programs, and d) the evaluation system for candidate school principals should be improved, emphasizing processes for creating a democratic education.

REFERENCES

- 1) Andreou, A. (2005). The training of education executives. In C. Bagakis (Ed.), *Training and professional development of the teacher* (pp. 309-316). Athens, Greece: Metechmio.
- 2) Annual Report 2020 (2020). *The Selection of Education Executives from 1982 to the Present: The Institutional Framework and Cases of its Implementation. Its Operational Framework and its Contexts*. Athens: Quality Assurance Authority for Primary and Secondary Education.
- 3) Antipas, G. (2018). Educational Necessity - Educational needs of education managers from the perspective of the managers. *Erkyna*, 15, 83-110.
- 4) Bagakis, G. (2005). *Training and professional development of the teacher*. Athens: Metechmio
- 5) Bakalbası, E., & Fokas, E. (2014). Views of school principals of Primary and Secondary Education on their selection system and their training in management. *Research in Education*, 2, 145-166. doi: 10.12681/8840
- 6) Bernstein, B. (2003 [1990]). *Class, codes and control: The structuring of pedagogic discourse* (Vol. 4). London: Routledge.
- 7) Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- 8) Dulkeridou, P. (2015). The training of teachers and school principals of primary school units. Overview of the legislative framework. *Educational Review*, 59, 83-98.
- 9) European Commission (2007). *Improving the quality of teacher training*. Brussels: Commission of the European Communities.
- 10) Eurydice (2009). *Key numbers for teachers and school leaders in Europe*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- 11) Giavrimis, P. (2013). Teachers' conceptualizations of the effectiveness of training in the integration of ICT in educational practice. In A. Ladias, A. Mikropoulos, Ch. Panagiotakopoulos, F. Paraskeva, P. Pintelas, P. Politis, S. Retalis, D. Samson, N. Fahantidis, A. Chalkidis (Eds.), *Integration of ICT in the Educational Process*. Proceedings of the 3rd Panhellenic Conference of the Hellenic Scientific Association of ICT in Education, Department of Digital Systems, University of Piraeus, Piraeus, 10-12 May 2013. www.etpe.eu/new/custom/pdf/etpe2012.pdf
- 12) Giavrimis, P., Giossi, S. & Papastamatis, A. (2011). Teachers' attitudes towards training in ICT: a critical approach. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(3), 283 - 296
- 13) Chatzidimou, E., & Taratori, D. (2003). The contribution of teaching skills in Education and Teacher Education: The example of microteaching. In E. Koutsouvanou, C. Vagianos, A. Papaioannou, I. Papadopoulou & M. Papa (eds.), *Proceedings of the 20th Panhellenic Conference: Knowledge, Values and Skills in Contemporary Education* (pp. 190-200). Athens, Greece: ELLIEPEK.
- 14) Chatzipanagiotou, P. (2001). *The Training of Teachers. Issues of Organization, Planning and Evaluation*. Athens, Greece: Typotheto - Giorgos Dardanos.
- 15) Chatzigiannis, T., Limaraki, M., & Chlapanis, G. (2012). Educational needs of school principals. Proceedings of the 15th International Conference of the University of Patras "Interculturality, Education Administration, Economic Crisis and the Greek as a Foreign Language". Patra, Greece, 23-25 November 2012.
- 16) Kalogiannis, D. (2020). *The school principal and his/her professional competencies. Knowledge, skills and values for effective performance of the role*. Athens, Greece: Grigoris.
- 17) Karras K., & Economidis V. (2015). The training and retraining of teachers in Greece. In W. C. Karras K., Education, training, and retraining systems for teachers in the modern world (pp. 112-148). Athens, Greece: Gutenberg.
- 18) Katsarou, E., & Dedouli, M. (2008). *Training and Evaluation in Education*. Athens: Athens, Greece: Ministry of Education and Pedagogical Institute.
- 19) Katsikas, Ch. (1995). Family and school achievement: the coincidence of a relationship. *Nea Paideia*, 74, 121-128.
- 20) Kelesidis, E. (2018). Historical development of the selection systems of education executives during the post-independence period. *Research in Education*, VII(1), 81-99. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12681/hjre.18123>
- 21) Konstantinou, Ch. (2000). Teacher evaluation as a social, pedagogical and professional necessity: a reasoned proposal from a theoretical and practical perspective. *Scientific Yearbook of the Department of Education DE*, 13, 75-87.
- 22) Konstantinou, I. (2015). *The evaluation of teaching and educational work in Greek education. Investigation of institutional measures, educational positions, and scientific data (1833-2011)* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Ioannina, School of Education, Department of Pedagogy of Kindergarten Teachers.
- 23) Koutouzis, M., & Spyriadou, K. (2018). Attitudes and opinions of Primary Education Authorities on the selection of Educational staff: Laws 3848/2010 & 4327/2015. *Education Sciences*, 2, 37-71.
- 24) Lemonis, I., & Kolezakis, A. (2013). The complex task of the School Unit Director and his lack of relevant training in Educational Unit Management. *Educational Cycle*, 1(3), 67-184.

In-Service Training and its Role in the Administrative Selection Process of School Principals

- 25) Mademlis, H. (2014). *The selection of school principals*. Athens, Greece: Grigoris.
- 26) Mavrogiorgos, G. (1983). Forms of training: conceptual clarifications; their political and social context; prerequisites. *Contemporary Education, 10*, 38-52.
- 27) Papaioannou, A., Giavrimis, P., Balkanos, E., & Katsafouros, K. (2013). Necessity and content of school principals' training: an exploratory study. *The social sciences forum, 16*(61).
<https://journals.lib.uth.gr/index.php/tovima/article/download/321/300>
- 28) Papaioannou, M. (2010). The training of school principals: global trends and Greek reality. *Comparative and International Pedagogical Review, 15*, 55-79.
- 29) Papastamatis, A. (2008). The importance of leadership and management in education. In M. Apostolatu, I. Zotos, F. Barona, & M. Nika (Eds), *Training of education executives: actions, results, Results, outcomes, perspectives* (pp. 253-243). Athens, Greece: Pedagogical Institute.
- 30) Peraki, V. (2008). First conclusions from the completion of the project. In M. Apostolatu, I. Zotos, F. Barona, & M. Nika (Eds), *Training of education executives: actions, results, Results, outcomes, perspectives* (pp. 33-45). Athens, Greece: Pedagogical Institute.
- 31) Saitis, H. (2008). School leadership: From theory to practice. Training of education executives: actions-results-perspectives. In M. Apostolatu, I. Zotos, F. Barona, & M. Nika (Eds), *Training of education executives: actions, results, Results, outcomes, perspectives* (pp. 265-274): Athens, Greece: Pedagogical Institute.
- 32) Sakkoulis, D., Asimaki A., & Vergidis D. (2017). Teacher training: issues of definition and typology. The Greek experience and international trends. *Educational Cycle, V*(1), 104-126.
- 33) Salteris, N. (2010). *Educational Forms and Teacher Training System: Conceptual Clarifications, Relationships and Objectives*. In *Institutionalized and new forms of continuing education in search of synergy of good practices*. Athens, Greece: OEPEC.
- 34) Stamelos, G., Vassilopoulos, A. & Kavassakalis, A. (2015). *Introduction to Educational Policies*. Athens: Association of Greek Academic Libraries.
- 35) Witte, J. C., & Mannon, S. E. (2010). *The internet and social inequalities*. London: Routledge.



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.