International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences
Volume 5, Issue 4, ISSN (Online) : 2349–5219

# The Educational Outcomes of the Relationship between Schoolbooks and Teachers

**Georgios Bikos**
Corresponding author email id: g_bicos@yahoo.gr

*Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 11/08/2018*

***Abstract* – After mentioning the important role the school textbook has been playing mostly in the educational systems of Western countries for centuries, we analyse how school textbooks have also affected the school's predominant teaching methodology. Thereafter, we point out (a) the ways in which the teacher's *discourse* interlaces with the written *discourse* of the textbook and the learning outcomes arising from this interplay. Moreover, we refer to countries like Greece in which the education system is centrally controlled (and therefore, the teaching staff of each school can neither choose what to teach to their students, nor select the book or books to be taught or the books which their teaching will be based on), which means, *firstly*, that the Ministry of Education determines which book will be taught in schools, *secondly*, that it is written on request by the Ministry and published - printed by the correspondent state institution and, *thirdly*, that the Ministry precisely determines each year what part of the subject matter of this textbook will be included in the curriculum and the material to be tested; (b) we analyse whether the teacher has the legal right to teach material which is not included in the pages of the schoolbook. Finally, (c) we come to a conclusion as to which of the two *kinds of discourse* is symbolically, essentially and educationally stronger within the current educational system, both in Greece and internationally.**

***Keywords* – Educational Legislation, Schoolbook/ School Textbook, Teaching Method, Learning and Educational System.**

## I. Introduction

The following work discusses the educational outcomes which may arise for students from the relationship between the written *discourse* of the texts of the schoolbooks they study and the oral *discourse* of their teacher who teaches the corresponding subject. (And by considering the teacher's discourse to be oral, we do not ignore the relatively few times in which the teacher either asks the students to write down some phrases dictated for them to learn - that is to study or learn off by heart - or distributes photocopies with his / her own notes.)

The relationship of students to schoolbooks is always mediated by the teacher and the spoken word that he articulates in the classroom. Thus, any analysis of their relation to the content of the learned chapters of the schoolbooks must, in order to be complete, also address the relationship of the teacher's teaching / *discourse* in the classroom with the *discourse* of the chapters of schoolbooks considered to be "exam material". Therefore, given the importance of the role of the teacher in *what* and *in what way* the students understand, learn and *internalise* from the content of their school textbook, we can assume that any teaching outcomes which conclude in learning outcomes (because *teaching* and *learning* do not coincide), derives from the interweaving of these two *kinds of discourse*[1].

However, how does the teacher's *discourse* intertwine with that of the schoolbook? Are the two *discourses* parallel to each other, or does the one sometimes *undermine* – or even "cancel" - some aspects of the other, such as its cogency, perhaps? And if the teacher's *discourse* infringes or modifies the written one[2], are his / her interventions recorded into the mind and memory of the students or perhaps not, because they are not considered to be so trustworthy as to *be accepted*, or because the teacher's *discourse* by not being written, cannot, in any case, leave such strong traces in the mind-memory of the students as the *written* discourse of the book does?

Besides, how and to what extent do the teacher's suggestions affect students on how and how much they will eventually study the chapters of the book taught?

The following is an attempt to answer these questions.

## II. Main Body

Let's first compare the teacher's *discourse* to that of the book's as far as the teaching and learning outcomes are concerned, based on the fact that the former one is accomplished through hearing and the latter one through vision, mentioning that according to research data on "the effectiveness of the senses in learning and memorizing information, [...] we learn [...] 11% through hearing [and] 83% through vision. [However,] we remember 10% of what we read [and] 20% of what we hear" (Simatos, 1997: 15)[3].

We can see, therefore, that while the first sentence ("We learn ...") gives the impression that *reading* produces more powerful learning outcomes than listening since reading is accomplished through vision, and "we learn 83% through vision," the second sentence ('we remember ... '), clearly shows that reading brings about weaker memorization results of the things comprehended, compared to hearing (see the difference of 10% to 20%).

However, let us also read: "All investigations [...] have concluded that written discourse [...] becomes more effective as the difficulty of the information presented increases or the interest of the individual in this information is being diminished!" (Simatos, 1997: 46 - see the same references on p. 47 of Simatos.) Thus, even if a student is not interested in the subject of a text, they are forced to

---

[1] As Dewey also characteristically writes, "the school book and the teacher compete with each other in the presentation of the material to be taught to the child" (Dewey, 1902: 24).

[2] Dewey also refers to such a *modification*. And the following passage testifies to the exact meaning of it: "The material is subject to such a modification and revision to simply reduce certain scientific difficulties and generally be downgraded to a lower intellectual level" (Dewey, 1902: 24) in order to obviously be understood by students. (It goes without saying that this statement is true over time.)

[3] Also see the same in Aslanidou, 1992: 21.

study due to their school responsibilities, they are quite likely to *comprehend* its content, whereas if they are simply listening to information on the subject (which they might not be interested in) being orally delivered in the classroom, they are likely to not even be able to concentrate on hearing the teacher's delivery of information, and therefore fail to understand anything.

We shall begin a further analysis with the following statement: When teachers teach schoolbook material, they obviously move - on a first estimation of ours - in the same direction as the text in the book, functioning as some sort of "transmitter" of the content of this text to the students.

However, the first thing to note is that no teacher ever teaches all their classes in the same way (often enough, not even in the same style), or even as effectively. And this is not only due to the fact that no one can be in the same mood for each teaching session or day, but above all, that each "class" has its own characteristics, to which the teacher adapts and responds accordingly. (Thus, it is absolutely true that every oral teaching session is a kind of theatrical act and performance. And this means, among other things, that just like every actor or actress does not *perform* equally well every day or in the same way because of personal matters, the teacher cannot teach in the same way during all teaching hours. It also means that the influence of the student audience on the teaching process [which, to a certain extent, acts on the effectiveness of the teacher's teaching discourse and work] is not always the same, just like the reactions of the audience of a theatrical performance do not always exert the same influence on the way in which the actor plays.)

But the most important thing to mention here is that the teacher's *discourse* is not always understood by all students. And, unfortunately, the elusiveness of a teacher's *discourse* is not encountered *only sometimes* in specific teachers, but seems to be a permanent feature of some teachers. This means that a percentage of teachers teach by articulating a discourse, more or less elusive and not readily perceived. In these cases, therefore, the teacher's *discourse* does not significantly interfere with the student's process of understanding the *discourse* of the schoolbook.

Apart from that, and to begin referring to the way the teacher intervenes in the actual *discourse* of the schoolbook, we first point out that there are cases in which the teacher *interferes* with the text of the schoolbook *by cutting off* parts of it when he / she removes texts or paragraphs from the designated by the Ministry of Education curriculum, considering these parts to be elusive or bearing unnecessary knowledge or "details" that the students needn't be bothered with. But this cannot be done if the subject falls into the category of the subjects which are tested at the University Entrance Examinations, sat by Greek students nationwide. But such *deductions* are quite common in subjects of general knowledge.

Often, however, the teacher *interferes with* the learner's relationship with the content of the textbook *by predetermining or specifying*, to some extent, what the appropriate way for the student to study is, in order to achieve "learning" (or their successful testing from the teacher during the next lesson). This is accomplished in the following ways: Firstly, there are sections of modules or chapters that the teacher asks the students to read at home only once and not learn. (In these cases, if the students are in a grade higher than grade A or B of Junior High School, they do not study the material at all because they understand that they will not be tested on it.)

Secondly, the teacher points out to students that some specific paragraphs or sections are to be skimmed only and get the main idea or just make out a simple summary to learn.

Thirdly, during the actual lesson, teachers explicitly or irreducibly allow students of upper secondary classes to understand which elements of the taught material they consider *important* and which ones *insignificant* or what they consider *most important*. (And those students who have no particular ambition for high scores usually study only these parts.) In case they present some of the insignificant elements, they usually do it briefly or explicitly state that these are not key points of the subject. So, teachers affect the way the majority of students will study the text in the textbook, since most of them will study its most important points more carefully, and will therefore be careful to memorise, or de facto commit more of this important information to their thought-memory.

Fourthly, there are times when the teacher tells students how to "learn" the content of one, some or all the chapters of the school textbook that they teach, by asking them, for example, not to memorise word for word their texts, or (on the contrary) to "learn" exactly what the book says - that is to memorise it. Sometimes, some teachers suggest that they also keep notes of what they read, highlight the main points, etc. So, it goes without saying that these suggestions also define to a certain extent how the students will study and assimilate the *discourse* of the schoolbook, at least those students who will apply their teacher's suggestions – because no one should believe that *most* students follow (such) advice from their teachers. While some of those students, who care to stick to these suggestions, stick to them literally, others to a lesser extent or roughly.

Finally, we have to mention that there is another way in which the teacher *chooses* some texts of the book they teach, which they force students to study much more carefully than they study the rest of the book. These are the texts the teacher wishes to test the students in writing (or orally) upon his or her warning.

In addition, since in secondary school education in many countries there is the institution of final written examinations held at the end of the academic year and the material to be tested is determined by the teacher, we find that teachers have one more possibility regarding the textbooks they teach: To determine what the students will study *twice* (although this is true only for those students who study during the academic year) or they will study more carefully and they will learn "better", that is understand the material in greater depth and ensure that they have memorised as much as possible and for as long as possible. (It should be noted that under the relevant legislation, a percentage of material which corresponds to about 2/3 of the material taught is defined as the content of the Final Examinations - see e.g. the case of Greece. [C2 / 3639 – Official Government Gazette 1271 / 19-10-2000, Ministerial Decision of the Ministry of Education]

However, what we have mentioned in the last two paragraphs does not constitute ways of teacher interference which *reduce, restrict* or *alter* the content of the school textbook, or *convert* its meaning or the meaning of some of its parts, but simply ways of selecting those parts which a large number of students will be forced to study more carefully, and thus, further consolidate their cognitive (or even textual) content. So far, we have referred to ways of selecting those parts of the *discourse* of the schoolbook which will exert the greatest influence on the students as readers, by virtue and based on the teacher's desire, which is also harmonized, to a certain extent, with the curriculum defined by the Ministry,.

In addition to what we have developed here, we find it appropriate to mention what happens when the teacher decides to teach something *outside the book* (and therefore outside the subject material) – despite the fact that rarely do teachers make such a decision[4]. (The scarcity of such a decision is due to many reasons, one of which is the lack of sufficient number of teaching hours for the whole curriculum, which we mentioned above.) But before we proceed to the analysis of this matter, it is necessary we highlight a few things about the content of the schoolbook which ought to be taught and the teacher's duties as to what he / she should teach in general.

The modules, which the teacher ought to teach, are also clearly defined through legislative texts. This is the reason why one might claim that not teaching any part of the designated material for any reason, constitutes a *potential* "illegality[5]." What is particularly worth noting is that the state-defined curriculum for almost all courses, (Chronis, 2003: 166), has always been *the content of the corresponding schoolbook* – and in particular, the *content of a single book,* since there is not an institution for the use of multiple books in Greece[6] - because *it has not yet been established* that the teacher bears the responsibility to determine the material taught, as is the case in other countries around the world. (Chronis, 2003: 24-25)[7] This is quite conservative for the Greek educational system or any system that wishes to be modern and progressive.

Nevertheless, the question of the teacher's freedom is not exhausted in *what* they ought to teach, since every teacher is, in any case, free - regardless of whether or not they are given this right by law explicitly – to teach this designated curriculum, using whatever means they want or consider appropriate and effective. Besides this, the National curriculum for each subject taught clearly states that teachers are required by law to: a) adopt *what* they should teach and b) (attempt) to achieve the *teaching objectives* stated in this Curriculum through their teaching[8]. Within the framework of this free *way* of teaching (because it is *not* obligatory to adopt the didactic methodology and the teaching methods that are often recorded in the Curriculum, as they are only registered as indicative), teachers can teach this material, even by exercising some sort of criticism. But when a teacher gives a negative evaluation of the content of the schoolbook to their students, they degrade its *credibility-validity*, thus limiting the possibility of it being internalised by them. However, for us, this limitation is quite insignificant for most students and (based on our experience) the *impairment* of its credibility is *also rather insignificant*, since sometimes - when students are not well acquainted with their teacher or when they have evidence during classes that their teacher is not knowledgeable about the content of the modules or some of the modules taught - the children question the judgment of their teacher when he / she states that the schoolbook says something wrong. This

---

4 Also see Chronis, 2003: 166, where it is pointed out that "teachers are afraid" to take such initiatives because of relevant "intimidating measures" that the Ministry of Education has taken from time to time and "abandon actions that will have an impact on their professional careers." A footnote on the same page refers to the findings of Anthogalidou's research, according to which 64% of secondary school teachers "support that teaching should be based primarily on the schoolbook", believing that this is due to the aforementioned fear.

5 However, to date, no administrative control has been exercised on those teachers who have not been able to teach the entire curriculum, since the reasons why this is supposed to happen are excusable. We read the following statement of a teacher's answer to a researcher's question (although some of its parts seem to be exaggerated but indicative of a man who thinks, acts as a teacher, but perhaps also of a man who answers quite irresponsibly): "You enter the class and you are God. [...] you are independent. Nobody checks on you. [...] You can do whatever you like, even if you do not use the designated book. You can tell the students to study it and teach them a whole different thing. No one will ever know! You can teach nothing, not even the book, [...] they will not find out about it." "Have you ever done such a thing?" "Of course, I have done a number of things, but in agreement with my colleagues and the principal" (Giannakaki, 1997: 391-392). The author summarizes: "Teachers commit many deviations in the classroom that are very important" (Giannakaki, 1997: 393).

Let us, however, comment on the teacher's previous statement: Despite what he said about his independent and uncontrolled teaching, he states (truthfully or falsely, it does not matter so much) that what he did, he did only with the Principal's assent (and his colleagues' in the school who participate in the collective Body that takes some of the decisions concerning the operation of the school and is called the *Teachers' Association*), apparently so that he may have an administrative "cover" and not be considered as *acting improperly* or, even more so, *illegally* in terms of his teaching work. This leads us to the conclusion that the teacher's freedom of choice as to the material he teaches is not unlimited, despite the fact that, since not all teachers teach *all the curriculum* (for a number of reasons, some of which have been mentioned above and some of which are due to *personal-educational choices* of the teachers themselves), the material taught is not the same in all schools in the country.

See also what a teacher said in her interview to a researcher: "I do not often have time to teach what *the curriculum* requires [...] I write [in the *Material Book* which is an official *Service Book*] that I taught what they ask me to without doing it, when in reality I have taught another thing"(Giannakaki, 1997: 392). From this statement, it appears that the teacher thinks or knows that she is required to teach the chapters of the school book contained in *the curriculum*.

6 However, a new has recently been passed establishing "the introduction of [...] more than one textbooks for the student in courses, when deemed necessary" (Law 2525 [GG 188, Issue A΄/ 23-9-97], Article 7, paragraph 3), but because of the wording "in courses, when deemed necessary", the use of multiple books is valid - as it has been since the 1960s - only for foreign language courses (Chronis, 2003: 115). (For the history of legislative-state provisions for the implementation of multiple books in Greece, see Kapsalis, Charalambous, 1995: 196-197.)

7 And speaking of "foreign countries", we do not only refer to Western countries, since in Turkey, since the beginning of the 1990s [...], multiple schoolbooks have been used "(Tsianakas, 2006: 61) though not in all courses.

8 The teacher "is not free to teach any scientific opinion they consider to be more correct [...] Nevertheless, they have the right to choose the most appropriate pedagogical method in their judgment to satisfy the statutory objectives". (Andreou, 1999: 49) these objectives are specified in the Curricula, which are contained in legislative texts (Laws, Presidential Decrees, and Ministerial Decisions).

happens because students assume that the authors of the school textbook, who have been *selected* by the Ministry of Education as the book's authors, are definitely more knowledgeable about the topics they write about in the schoolbook, that is, an 'officially' state-recognised book, than their teacher[9]. Thus, it is not always easy for a Secondary Education teacher - and in particular a Senior High School teacher - to work with their students and function as a person 'superior' to the knowledge of the authors of their schoolbooks. If students were to accept such a 'function' of the teacher, it would be like rendering him / her a role of *an authority,* even of a short-range. But, as Karapostolis states, there is a prevailing perception nowadays according to which: "the most respected human right is to take for granted that the authorities abuse their power. [...] Generous and versatile, modern liberal society gave them the privilege of being skeptical before their time" (Karapostolis, 2003: 12).

Apart from the prevailing social perceptions, which shape these tendencies in young people these days, adolescence is also 'to blame' for the aforementioned, as it is the age of secondary education students; teenagers are characterised by the following contradiction: no matter how intensely they are in need of role models (persons or any other kind) (Kourkoutas, 2001: 107, 189), they question the value of those persons who appear, are self-portrayed, or are seen by society as role models[10].

Consequently, if we compare the authors of the schoolbooks – who are not perceived by students as 'real' but only as *names* - with their teachers - who are *visible, intimate and familiar* and spend time with almost daily - we can easily understand why they have a much greater readiness to *challenge* their teachers in terms of the validity of their teaching *discourse,* rather than the written *discourse* of the writers of the books they study. And this readiness is due, of course, mainly to the fact that every teacher is *exposed* to them daily, *and in every possible way* - that is, as a physical presence (see, for example, students making judgement on the teacher, even concerning their aesthetics and cost of clothing), as well as a psychological personality. On the contrary, students have no *actual* relationship with the authors of the schoolbooks as persons, since the latter are always absent from the field of vision and the place where the former live and are trained. Thus, the *familiarity* itself and the everyday proximity they develop with their teachers make them, unconsciously, question their teacher, when given the opportunity. (Regarding the didactic *proficiency* of the written *discourse*, the authors of the textbooks do not enjoy any immunity because secondary school students know that the *only ones who reserve the right* to judge it are themselves (the students) as readers.)

On the basis of what we have mentioned, we understand that even if teachers wish to express to the students their disagreement on what the handbook mentions (especially when it comes to an issue that they can see is not of minor importance), they may not do so, precisely because they think that they cannot convince them about the correctness of their standpoint-judgement.

At this point, however, we find it useful and interesting to investigate whether the teacher is entitled under the current legislation to teach what the book mentions by criticising or overturning it. And the answer to this is rather negative, since even the relevant legislation and circulars do not provide for a possible clash of positions between a teacher and a schoolbook. Moreover, the material taught is only contained in the schoolbook and is not intended to be determined, not even partly by the teacher. Therefore, the teacher simply has to express, reformulate, communicate and clarify (*intact*) the word of the textbook (Tokatlidou, 1986: 378, 1999: 41), while - according to another point of view - it is "neither right", nor "good" (and therefore should not be done), to explain the purposes, imperfections, biases and mistakes of the texts. Under a stricter consideration, however, such teaching may even be considered as violating the relevant legislation.

But what happens if the teacher wishes to teach *additional* material even though the relevant legislation does not provide for such an act, nor is it encouraged by the school reality itself (including the school principal)? Is it allowed? According to an interpretation of educational legislation, which is perhaps considered to be formal, *no*, whereas according to another, *yes*[11]. However, even if we still consider that the legislation does not prevent the teacher - at least explicitly - to articulate a different teaching *discourse* from that of the schoolbook, we must point out that this freedom has clear boundaries: the teacher must neither teach material that is contrary to the teaching objectives of the course as defined in its Analytical Curriculum, nor material which *contradicts* the content of the book. But how exactly is this *contradictory content* defined? We suppose it should be defined as follows: it is the content, in a sense, which *abolishes* some of the points in the *discourse* of the book and discredits it. But what happens if this *abolition* is not contradictory to the teaching objectives as defined in the relevant course curriculum, or even worse, if it is such that it *promotes* these objectives, while the content of the "abolished" part of the textbook does not serve the defined objectives?[12] (For, unfortunately,

[9] See the same in Georgousopoulos, 1998: 49, where we read that the schoolbook "has the prestige and authority of being unique. [...] How many times does a child raise their hand and challenges you and says, 'What you are saying, Sir, is not in the book.' This means I am wrong; when you try to convince them that the book is wrong, they tell you it's not possible for a whole state to make mistakes. [...] The following amazing incident once occurred. During the Panhellenic University Entrance examinations, students were admittedly given the wrong theory for an exercise in Physics. And there was an official announcement made deciding that the wrong answer in the schoolbook was the only legitimate answer to the question." (Georgousopoulos, 1998: 49-50)

[10] For the general trend of questioning in puberty, see Kourkoutas, 2001: 111.

[11] "The teacher of elementary and secondary education is not entitled to teach subjects of his or her field of study which are not contained in the curriculum or use writings different from those approved by the Ministry of Education" (Andreou, 1999: 46). Babiniotis also writes that the teacher who wants to be right in their work deliberately "refuses" the passive implementation of some badly written books" (Babiniotis, 1990: A16).

[12] In this respect, we note that although textbooks should contain what the curriculum defines for the subject taught, as Chronis states, "in the event of *a dissonance between the curriculum and the corresponding schoolbook, the latter almost always prevailed*. [See also Noutsos,

it is often the case that sections of books - if not whole books - of the Greek school promote the opposite values, attitudes and teaching objectives to those set out in the curriculum which correspond to each one. But the recording of such points must and can be the subject of dissertations and special research studies that are worth to be prepared.) We deliberately leave the question unanswered for our reader's reflection.

It should also be noted that, even if the teacher teaches something other than the material of the schoolbook, they are under no circumstances entitled to test the students on that extra material (Takatlidou, 1986: 378, 1999: 41)[13]. Therefore, given the difficulties and the prohibitions concerning the teaching of extra material, students work on this extra material on the subject presented to them by the teacher – no matter how rarely the teacher does so - only as "listeners" and not as "trainees", in the full meaning of the term. Thus, the elements that compose this extra material impress on their minds only to a minimum extent, as the students slightly memorise what they receive only through hearing the teacher. (And of course, the effectiveness of this oral *discourse* of the teacher absolutely depends, firstly, on the communicative effectiveness of the teacher's rhetoric-speech - which is determined by their expressiveness and speaking skill and the persuasiveness of their expressed logic and arguments - and secondly, on the attention-concentration with which students will follow.) Therefore, when the teacher refers to elements other than those contained in the schoolbook, they make up *a kind of discourse* that cannot fully function as teaching in the usual way, as it is received by the student audience like the *discourse* of a lecture.

However, it follows from the above mentioned that a 'normal lesson', that is, an *appropriate* lesson according to the current school and teaching standards of the Education system of each country which fully controls Education (through State Services) in terms of its content and teaching, or a lesson that is perfectly *legal* and *validated*, is only the one in which the teacher teaches material which they are entitled (or legitimized) to teach and test in writing under the relevant educational legislation and relevant circulars of the Ministry. And this kind of material is only the one corresponding to the written texts of the schoolbooks. (Therefore, a correspondence between the written *discourse* of the schoolbooks and the *discourse* that the teacher is entitled to may be tested in writing, in the form of an exercise or a task or, usually, in the form of an assessment test.)

But this finding and the situation testify to the institutional and pedagogical power enjoyed by written *discourse* within the School system, as opposed to every teacher's oral *discourse* which is perceived - albeit explicitly - as inferior to the written one, and of lesser symbolic, pedagogic and teaching power – therefore, leaving fewer traces in the memory of the students.

It is noteworthy, however, that in the Middle Ages the "social status of the teacher" had been raised because their role and work was considered to have " the teaching behavior of Christ as a model, as suggested by Saint Augustine in his work De Magistro (389 AD)" (Matsagouras, 2002: 54). Thus, in the context of this situation, "the notion of 'I teach' remained almost identical to the notion of 'I say' and 'I inform'- a concept that has been deeply rooted in Western culture and was based until recently on the socio-cultural conditions of the past centuries (Matsagouras, 2002: 54-55). And this view suggests a logic-based teaching model rather than an empirical one, that is, one based on the provision of experiences to students[14]. All this means that the teacher's *discourse* enjoyed great acceptance, power and prestige in the school premises and the student audience, as well. Therefore, we have to keep in mind that what we claim about the prevalence of the *discourse* of schoolbooks in our educational system - especially in the West - is, in general, a phenomenon appearing in a certain historical period (hence a historical phenomenon), and in particular, one which relates to the era beginning with the discovery of typography (Matsagouras, 2002: 55).

Since the beginning of the 19th century, therefore, the schoolbook has been the most institutionally acceptable teaching tool that has been used in schools, since it itself constitutes an important and very old educational institution[15]. Thus, "the schoolbook [...] remains the most widely used educational tool [...] and [...] [in most cases,]

---

1988: 130, whose work concerns the period 1931-1073.] Any chapters of the curriculum not contained in the schoolbook were omitted." (Chronis, 2003: 67 - see also 118- 119) and circular 129129 / 4-11-77, in the same: 257) as we also read on p.119 of the same book concerning the twenty-year period 1961-1981, "only in the case of two circulars out of nine does the curriculum seem to have had some sort of priority. This, of course, does not mean that the schoolbook ceased to form the basis of teaching, but that either some chapters that were not contained in the curriculum were omitted or there was a reminder to use the [...] book according to the curriculum."

[13] In 1979, "the Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs. threatened (through circular C.126 / 8-1-79 read in Chronis, 2003: 262) with penalties those teachers who asked the students, especially in written examinations, to answer questions which were not contained in the 'current' curriculum and were not included in the approved school books " (in the same: 130 and Noutsos, 1988: 164, where a relevant extract from Presidential Decree 5911/1933 is also given). Recent documents of school counselors also point out that in the end-of-year exams "[...] elaborations made during lessons, not included in the curriculum, are excluded." (document by School Counselor Chr. Patsou for Sociology teachers, Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs/) Regional Directorate of Education & Training of Attica/ Secondary School Counselors / 387/24-5-09). (The same is also stated by Counselor for the Legal-Political Sciences Branch in a relevant document [Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs / Regional Directorate of Education & Training of Greece / Secondary School Counselors / No. 592 / 11-5 -09].)

[14] The main causes which made Medieval and Byzantine Schools to be *logic centered*, see also: 55. On the same page, it is also pointed out that this *logic orientation* is largely responsible for the dominance of the teacher centered teaching method, which has prevailed in the Western School.

[15] For the fact that the schoolbook is one of the oldest and most important teaching tools, see Bonomidis, 2004: 1, Fountopoulou, 1995: 45, Kapsalis, Charalambous, 1995: 144, 242 and Chronis, 2003: 123. Whereas for the important role the schoolbook plays in the Greek educational system, see in the same: 111, 116-117, Chrysafidis, 2004: 87, Kapsalis, Charalambous, 1995: 127, 144-145, 133-137, Flouris, 1995: 128, 329-330, 341-342, Babiniotis, and Noutsou, 1988: 165-166. (Although Noutsous' book covers a period ending in 1973, what she mentions is still true today.)

the sole source of learning for the majority of the student population." (Adamou, 2002: 289)

For countries such as Greece, we must specify that the general school system is formed in such a way - namely its pedagogical, educational and legislative reality, and relations between students and teachers - that it greatly restricts the possibility of any teacher *discourse* which would challenge the value and truth of the contents of the school book, preventing teachers from functioning as an educator and produce similar learning outcomes. Therefore, the Greek School system does not 'support' the teaching role of teachers, when they address their students (as teachers) with a different *discourse* from that of the school book. Thus, we can assume that, ultimately, the *discourse* - and indeed the role - of the teacher that the Greek School system 'supports' is the one that assures or strengthens the persuasiveness of the *discourse* of the textbooks. Thus, the teacher's oral *discourse* is somehow subordinated to the text of the book they teach. As Mavrogiorgos rightly points out, "the educational practice in Greek school has given [the school book] mythopoietic dimensions: it is what the teacher is supposed to teach and what the student needs to learn." (Mavrogiorgos, 1992: 171 - see also in Mavrogiorgos, 2001: 87 and Kargakos, 1998: 81). In order to avoid giving the impression that this obsession in the school book is only found in Greece, we note that, as Bonidis mentions, according to "an American survey carried out in 1988 ... on average 1/3 of the teaching time is devoted by teachers to books and more than 80% of the entire teaching process is spent searching for subjects [...] in books." (Bonidis, 2004: 1, footnote: 3) And "a research with 179 participating teachers, which was carried out in nine countries during the school year 1991-1992, highlighted the dominant position of the book both in the preparation and in the operation of the teaching process" (Bonidis, 2004: 1-2, footnote: 4 at the same: 1-2, footnote: 4).

## III. Conclusion

In conclusion, in countries where the Educational legislation provides for teaching using only one textbook and on the basis of a Curriculum that refers in a "linear" manner to the content of this textbook, the teacher can only do the following: limit the material that the students will study and teach some chapters or paragraphs of it, either by mentioning only those few main points that they consider to be of importance, or by asking them not to learn these parts in the usual way, but simply skim a text. These are the only ways teachers can decisively influence the way students will assimilate and readily approach the content of textbooks as readers, as well as the depth to which they will understand it[16].[17]

## References

[1] M. Adamou, (2002) *the educational system at the service of the national state. The Greek case "1950-1976",* Athens: Papazisis Publications, 2002.

[2] A. Andreou, (collaboration: P. Mantzoufas), *Issues of Organization and Administration of Education and the School Unit*, Athens: Livanis Publications, 1999.

[3] S.G. Aslanidou, *Educational technology and audiovisual education*, Thessaloniki: Kyriakidi, 1992.

[4] D. Blackledge, & B. Hunt, *Sociology of Education* (Transl. M. Deligiannis), Athens: Ekfrassi, 1995.

[5] K. Georgousopoulos, School Library: An Instrument or an Infrastructure Tool; In: *The Library and the Book in Education*: 13 and 14 May 1997, pp. 48-53, Athens: National Book Centre of Greece, 1998.

[6] P. Giannakaki, *the Educational Mediator: His / Her Relationships in Secondary School*, Athens: Vasdeki, 1997.

[7] J. Dewey, *the Child and the Curriculum,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902.

[8] D. Karakatsani, *Education and Political Education: Knowledge, Values, Practices*, Athens: Metaixmio, 2004.

[9] B. Karapostolis, the issue of standards in Education. *Modern Education*, 129: 12-18, 2003.

[10] S. Kargakos, the dictatorship of the one and only school textbook. In: *The Library and the Book in Education: 13 and 14 May 1997*, pp. 78-84, Athens: National Book Centre of Greece, 1998.

[11] A.G. Kapsalis, & D.F. Charalambous, *School textbooks: Institutional evolution and contemporary debate*, Athens: Ekfrassi, 1995.

[12] El. Kourkoutas, *Teen psychology: theoretical issues and clinical cases*, Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 2001.

[13] E. Matsagouras, *Interdisciplinarity in curricula: Theory and practice.* In: G. Bagakis (ed.), *the teacher and the curriculum*, pp. 53-69Athens: Metaixmio, 2004.

[14] E. Matsagouras, *Theory of Teaching: Personal Theory as a Framework for Stochastic-Critical Analysis - Volume One*, Athens: Gutenberg, 2002.

[15] G. Mavrogiorgos, *the Teacher and the Book: Looking for Another Relationship ... In: The Present and Future of School Libraries: Workshop, Saturday 13 January 2001, pp. 19-21*, Athens, Pan-Hellenic Federation of Publishers-Booksellers, 2001.

[16] G. Mavrogiorgos, *Abuse of the school book and ideological implications. In: Teachers and Teaching: For an Anti-*

[16] Thus, in the terms of Bernstein, the teacher typically teaches in conditions of "strong classification", but in fact they have the power to interfere -as they see fit- with some components of the curriculum – e.g. its extent, making this "classification" less strong (see for ["strong"] "classification", Blackledge, Hunt, 1995: 77-78, 90-91). And this ability to intervene allows them to exercise a sort of (limited) "re-framing" of the content of the schoolbook or a "didactic displacement or transition" The term didactic displacement / transition is a term of Verret and "expresses all the changes that the message to be learned and taught undergoes in order to be assimilated by its recipients." (Karakatsani, 2004: 36 - see also: 96, note: 100) for the concept "classification", see also Noutsos, 1988: 31 (also in footnote 3 of that page), which is referred to as "segmentation" and "framing", but also YPEPTH / Pedagogical Institute, 1999: 56 – where "strict" "classification" is mentioned, meaning what we referred to as "strong". (Of the three terms, *segmentation, classification and framing*, we consider the term *framing* more appropriate.)

[17] A somewhat different view is expressed by Fountopoulou: "The curriculum and the various legislative texts which define the framework of the teaching process do not oblige the teacher as to how to handle the textbooks, of course excluding the percentage of the material that must be taught. [...] So, the teacher can easily use the schoolbook as a reference tool, a teaching tool, an absolute master of the course, a complementary element or even an insignificant factor in the teaching process, thus altering the meaning of its existence and its character." (Fountopoulou, 1995: 46) But the last two, obviously, on the basis of the above mentioned, cannot be valid! (And right then, Fountopoulou points out - and correctly - that "the role the teacher will assign to the schoolbook depends on a number of factors such as his / her pedagogical and didactic training, education, personality, responsibility in the exercise of his / her teaching work and the means at his / her disposal." [in the same work])

International Journal of Innovation and Research in Educational Sciences
Volume 5, Issue 4, ISSN (Online) : 2349–5219

*Proposition*, Athens, Contemporary Education, pp. 171-178, 1992.
[17] G. Babiniotis, *School books: a blessing or a curse? To Vima*, 5/8/1990, p. A16.
[18] K. Th. Bonidis, *the content of the school book as a subject of research: Diachronic examination of the relevant research and methodological approaches*, Athens: Metaixmio, 2004.
[19] Ch. Noutsos, *Secondary Education Curricula and social control* (1931-1973), Athens: Themelio, 1988.
[20] A. Simatos, Technology and Education: Selection and use of Supervisory Instruments, Athens: Patakis Publications, 1997.
[21] B. Tokatlidou, School books and classroom communication. In: A.F. Lagopoulos, P. Martinidis, K. Blokland-Lagopoulou & B. Spyridonidis (eds.), *the Dynamics of Points*, pp. 377-385, Thessaloniki, 1986.
[22] E. I. Tsianakas, *the image of the 'other' in modern Turkish curricula and school textbooks of History and Political Education of Compulsory Education*, (Unpublished Thesis) Aristotle University of Thessaloniki / Philosophical School / Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy, 2006.
[23] Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs / Pedagogical Institute *Specifications of educational aids, volume II: Specifications for the Publication and Writing of Teaching Books*, Athens: Office of Standardization, 1999.
[24] G. Flouris, Mismatches of educational purposes, curriculum and educational means: Some aspects of educational contradiction. In: M. Kazamias, M. Kassotakis (ed.), *Greek Education: Prospects for Reconstruction and Modernization*, pp. 328-367, Athens: Seirios, 1995.
[25] M. Fountopoulou, *The school book as a tool for the educational process. Diavazo* (Journal), 357: 44-51, 1995.
[26] S. Chronis, *Teaching and Social Control: State Interference in the Work of the teacher*, Athens: Publishing Association of Teacher Writers, 2003.
[27] K. Chrysafidis, the Greek school and the debate on open and closed curricula. In: G. Bagakis (ed.), *the teacher and the curriculum*, pp. 77-90, Athens: Metaixmio, 2004.

Laws - Ministerial Decisions - Service Documents

[28] Law 2525 Ministry of Education (Government Gazette 188, Issue A / 23-9-97).
[28] C2 / 3639 - Government Gazette 1271 / 19-10-2000, Ministerial Decision of the Ministry of Education
[29] Service Document from Sociologist, Chr. Patsou, Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs / Regional Directorate of Education & Training of Attica / Secondary Education Counselors / No. 387 / 24-5-09.
[30] Service Document from the Counselor of Law and Political Sciences, L. Katsira, Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs / Regional Directorate of Education & Training of Greece / Secondary Education Counselors / No. 592 / 11-5-09.

## AUTHOR'S PROFILE

**Georgios Bikos** was born in Athens on 30/10/1967. He holds a Degree in Political Science (University of Athens, Greece, 1994), Sociology (Panteion University, Athens, Greece, 1997), Pedagogical Studies (School of Pedagogical and Technological Education, Athens, Greece, 2001), a Master's Degree in Public Policy ("The State and Public Policy", University of Athens, Greece, 2000) and a Doctorate in the field of Political Science and its Teaching (Panteion University, Athens, Greece, 2008).

He has fulfilled his military service and has been a Teacher in public secondary education since 1998. Since 2011 he has been a Senior High School Principal in various schools in Attica. He is currently Principal of the 7th Senior High School of Kallithea, Athens. He also teaches at the Hellenic Open University, the University of Western Attica (History and Sociology of Reading), the School of Pedagogical and Technological Education (Methodology of Teaching) and the University of Athens, Pedagogical Dept. of Primary Education (Political Rhetoric) for a Postgraduate Programme. He is Director-Scientific advisor of the book series CULTURE AND THE ARTS and TEACHING USING NEW TECHNOLOGIES at GRIGORIS publications (Athens). His previous and current interests include fields such as History of Education, theory and History of Reading and Teaching Methodology.

His writing work includes the following:

*The book as a teaching medium and dominant reading* modes, Athens, Greece: GRIGORIS publications, 2011, 1st edition, 2012 2nd edition, 2014 3rd edition)

*About School Libraries*, Athens, Greece: GRIGORIS Publications, 2014

*School libraries impact on secondary education: a users' study* (in co-operation with G. Giannakopoulos and P. Papadimitriou), (Library Review, Vol. 63 Iss: 6/7(2014): 519 – 530)

Dr. Bikos is a member of the Scientific Board and Editorial Board of the scientific journal ERKYNA issued by the Panhellenic Pedagogical Society of Secondary Education, a member of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Educational Research and Reviews, a member of the Editorial Board of the Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research and an Associate Editor of the International Journal of Library and Information Science.