

Regulating the Teacher: Educational Policy and Professional Identity in *To Vima* under the Greek Dictatorship

Orestis Ilias Papadimitriou¹, Konstantinos Dimoulis²

¹MA Graduate, University of Western Macedonia, Florina, Greece; Historian, Ionian University, Corfu, Greece

²Postgraduate Programmes Instructor, University of Western Macedonia, Florina, Greece

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100800001>

Received: 08 August 2026; Accepted: 17 August 2026; Published: 24 August 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines the public and institutional representation of teachers in *To Vima* under the Greek military dictatorship, focusing on the relationship between educational policy, institutional regulation, and professional identity. Drawing on qualitative content analysis of selected newspaper material, interpreted alongside the legislative and historical framework of the period, the study explores how teachers were positioned within a highly centralised educational system. Particular attention is paid to professional mobility, criteria of professional suitability, teacher preparation, in-service education, and supervisory structures. Rather than reconstructing teachers' lived or subjective professional identities, the analysis investigates the institutionally prescribed and publicly represented professional roles made visible through newspaper and legislative evidence. The findings reveal a persistent tension between the pedagogical and social authority attributed to teachers and the bureaucratic and ideological constraints placed upon their professional autonomy. The article argues that authoritarian educational governance operated not only through curricula, legislation, and institutional structures, but also through the regulation of the professional subject responsible for implementing educational policy.

Keywords: educational policy; teachers; professional identity; state regulation; educational administration; Greek dictatorship; *To Vima*

INTRODUCTION

Educational policy is expressed not only through institutional reforms, curricula, and legislation, but also through the ways in which educational actors are positioned within systems of administration and regulation. Under the Greek military dictatorship, teachers operated within a highly centralised institutional environment in which professional mobility, training, supervision, and career trajectories were closely connected to formal procedures and state authority. In the educational coverage of *To Vima*, this relationship becomes particularly visible. Teachers appear as members of an organised public-service hierarchy, but also as pedagogical professionals invested with educational and social responsibility. This dual position raises a broader question concerning the relationship between institutional regulation and professional autonomy under authoritarian educational governance.

Existing scholarship on education during the Greek dictatorship has examined important dimensions of educational policy, including institutional restructuring, ideological control, curriculum, language policy, and state intervention in schooling. Considerably less attention, however, has been directed to the ways in which the teacher was publicly represented as a professional subject situated within these regulatory structures. Examining this dimension shifts attention from educational policy understood primarily through legislation and institutional reform towards the professionals expected to implement that policy. The newspaper press provides a particularly significant, although necessarily mediated, field for such an inquiry, since administrative measures, professional expectations, and educational debates became publicly visible through forms of reporting that were themselves produced within the constraints of an authoritarian media environment.

Professional identity is not a fixed or self-evident category, nor can it be reduced to formal occupational status. Research on teachers' professional identity has emphasised its contextual and dynamic character and the importance of distinguishing professional identity from related concepts concerning teachers' roles and professional knowledge (Beijaard et al., 2004). Moreover, professional identity is shaped within broader policy and institutional environments. Sachs (2001), for example, demonstrates how competing forms of professionalism may be constructed through educational policy and institutional discourses, while Day et al. (2006) emphasise the interaction between social structures, professional contexts, and individual agency in the formation and negotiation of teacher identities. These perspectives are particularly relevant to the study of teachers within a centralised authoritarian educational system, where institutional definitions of legitimate professional conduct cannot automatically be equated with teachers' own understandings of their professional selves.

In this article, professional identity is therefore not understood as equivalent to teachers' subjective self-understanding or lived professional experience. Rather, the analysis concerns an institutionally prescribed and publicly represented professional identity: the roles, responsibilities, attributes, and boundaries assigned to teachers through administrative regulation, educational policy, and their representation in the newspaper material examined. This distinction is essential because professional identity, professional status, professional autonomy, and bureaucratic position, although closely related, are not analytically identical. The available sources provide evidence primarily about how teachers were institutionally positioned and publicly represented, rather than about how individual teachers understood, negotiated, or enacted their professional identities in everyday educational practice.

Against this background, the article addresses two related research questions: How were teachers represented in To Vima within the regulatory structures of the Greek dictatorship? How did these representations articulate the tension between pedagogical and professional authority on the one hand and bureaucratic and ideological regulation on the other? By approaching newspaper evidence alongside, but analytically distinct from, legislative sources and historical scholarship, the study examines professional mobility, criteria of professional suitability, teacher preparation, in-service education, and supervisory structures as interconnected dimensions of the institutional positioning of teachers.

The article thus focuses on the public and institutional representation of teachers rather than attempting to reconstruct their lived professional experience. Its contribution lies in examining educational governance not only through the formal structures and policies of the authoritarian state, but also through the definition of the professional subject entrusted with their implementation. From this perspective, the regulation of education involved simultaneously the regulation of professional roles, the boundaries of legitimate professional autonomy, and the institutional conditions within which teachers were expected to act.

1. Educational Policy and the Regulation of the Teaching Profession

The position of teachers within an educational system cannot be understood solely in terms of classroom practice or pedagogical responsibility. It is also shaped by the institutional arrangements through which the state defines professional duties, regulates careers, determines mobility, and establishes the boundaries within which educational work is performed. In the Greek case, this relationship between teaching and state authority had developed well before the dictatorship. The post-war educational system remained closely connected to the priorities of the national state, assigning teachers a role that extended beyond instruction and incorporated broader responsibilities for moral and national formation (Αδάμου, 2002). State intervention consequently concerned not only what was taught but also the professional environment in which teachers operated.

This dimension became particularly pronounced after the political change of April 1967. The new regime intervened extensively in education, reversing major elements of the 1964 reform through Αναγκαστικός Νόμος 129/1967 [Compulsory Law 129/1967], which reorganised general education within the institutional and ideological framework established after April 1967. The legislation formed part of a broader restructuring of education under the new political conditions and strengthened the connection between educational structures and central state authority. Within this institutional environment, teachers occupied a distinctive position: they were

both public servants operating within an administrative hierarchy and educational actors entrusted with responsibilities that extended beyond the transmission of knowledge.

The professional role of teachers was therefore embedded in a regulatory framework that combined administrative requirements with broader expectations concerning duty, discipline, and institutional responsibility. Existing research has emphasised the extent to which state intervention affected teachers' work through circulars, official instructions, and mechanisms of control that established clearly defined limits for professional action (Xρόνης, 1993). In this context, the teacher cannot be understood exclusively as an autonomous pedagogical actor. Professional activity was conducted within a system in which administrative authority retained considerable influence over the conditions and practical organisation of educational work. This did not eliminate the pedagogical dimension of teaching, but placed it within a broader institutional structure in which formal procedures and public-service obligations assumed particular importance.

The administrative regulation of teachers' careers provides an especially revealing example of how this institutional framework became publicly visible. Transfers, promotions, organic posts, educational districts, service requirements, and staffing needs were not peripheral bureaucratic matters; they directly affected teachers' professional trajectories and everyday working conditions. *To Vima* reported on precisely this administrative dimension. On 20 June 1971, the newspaper published "Conditions for the Transfer of Primary and Secondary Education Officers," while on 3 May 1972 it presented the new Royal Decree regulating teacher transfers (*To Vima*, 20 June 1971, p. 11; *To Vima*, 3 May 1972, p. 8).

The 1972 report is particularly revealing of the institutional positioning of teachers within the educational administration. Transfers could involve movement between schools, placement in administrative offices or special institutions, co-location with a spouse, promotion, mutual exchange, or reassignment within or beyond an educational district (*To Vima*, 3 May 1972, p. 8). At the level of newspaper representation, professional mobility thus appears largely through the categories and procedures of educational administration. The report makes visible a teacher whose place of employment and professional trajectory were mediated by formal requirements, service needs, and administrative decisions. This does not establish how teachers themselves experienced or interpreted these arrangements; rather, it demonstrates how their professional position was publicly represented through an administrative framework.

The distinction between the different forms of evidence used here is important. The legislative framework formally prescribed the institutional conditions governing the teaching profession; *To Vima* made particular aspects of those conditions publicly visible through its reporting; and the present analysis interprets these materials in relation to professional regulation and identity. Read together, but not treated as equivalent forms of evidence, they show how educational policy extended into the organisation of the professionals expected to implement it. Decisions concerning where teachers served, under what conditions they could move, how professional advancement was organised, and which criteria determined placement constituted practical mechanisms through which state authority structured professional careers.

This administrative dimension also contributed to an institutionally prescribed and publicly represented professional identity. In the newspaper material examined here, the teacher appears not simply as an individual educator but as a member of an institutional body whose professional position was defined through service categories, administrative procedures, and the organisational requirements of the educational system. Such representation should not be equated with teachers' subjective or enacted professional identities. Rather, it reveals the professional role made visible through the institutional language of administration and regulation. Personal, family, economic, and pedagogical needs were present within this framework, but they were articulated in relation to the formal structures governing professional mobility and service.

The central tension examined in this article therefore lies between pedagogical and professional authority and the institutional regulation of the teaching profession. The educational coverage of *To Vima* provides a mediated field in which this relationship can be investigated. Rather than treating regulations concerning teachers as merely technical or bureaucratic information, the analysis considers how newspaper reporting, read in conjunction with – but analytically distinguished from – legislative evidence, illuminates the relationship between educational

policy, state authority, administrative organisation, and the prescribed professional role of teachers under the dictatorship.

2. Corpus and Analytical Approach

The present article draws on a thematically selected corpus originally assembled for a qualitative study of educational coverage in *To Vima* under the Greek dictatorship. The material was retrieved from the newspaper's historical archive and covers the period 1967-1974. The source study did not employ exhaustive issue-by-issue sampling or construct a quantitative inventory of all education-related items published during this period. Instead, it used purposive, research-driven selection based on three criteria: relevance to the educational focus of the research, location within significant moments of the period, and the capacity of individual items to illuminate changes in the public representation of education. Particular attention was directed to periods in which educational issues became especially visible, including the aftermath of the 1967 coup, the beginning and end of school years, periods of intensified discussion of examinations, and the student mobilisation of 1973.

The present article constitutes a more narrowly defined secondary analysis of that corpus. Its unit of analysis is the individual newspaper item, including news reports, articles, commentaries, and short informational texts, with headlines and subheadings considered where they contribute to the framing of the material. From the broader educational corpus, the analysis focuses specifically on items relevant to the institutional regulation and public representation of teachers. The principal newspaper evidence concerning professional mobility consists of two items: "Conditions for the Transfer of Primary and Secondary Education Officers," published on 20 June 1971, and the report on the new Royal Decree regulating teacher transfers, published on 3 May 1972 (*To Vima*, 20 June 1971, p. 11; *To Vima*, 3 May 1972, p. 8).

Methodologically, the study is situated within the broader framework of qualitative research in the humanities and social sciences (Kosmas & Nikolidakis, 2024) and, more specifically, employs qualitative content analysis, understood as a systematic and interpretative method for examining textual material through the development and application of a coding framework (Schreier, 2012). The analysis is based on repeated reading, thematic coding, and progressive refinement of analytical categories. The broader coding framework distinguished among educational policy and administrative regulation, ideological framing, representations of teachers, pupils, and university students, and journalistic strategies of emphasis, marginalisation, and omission. Individual items were further examined in relation to the character of their discourse, including administrative, descriptive, evaluative, normative, ideological, and conflict-related forms of presentation. For the purposes of the present article, these categories were narrowed and reorganised around two interconnected analytical dimensions: institutional regulation and professional identity.

The first dimension concerns the formal procedures, administrative classifications, service criteria, and institutional decisions through which teachers' professional trajectories were organised. The second concerns the institutionally prescribed and publicly represented position assigned to teachers within the educational system, particularly the tension between pedagogical authority and membership in an administratively organised public service. These dimensions are analytically distinguishable but closely connected, since arrangements governing service, mobility, supervision, preparation, and professional status simultaneously structured teachers' institutional position and contributed to the public representation of legitimate professional roles.

A distinction is maintained throughout the analysis among three forms of evidence. Newspaper evidence is used to establish what *To Vima* published and how particular aspects of the teaching profession became publicly visible. Legislative evidence establishes what the state formally prescribed, while historical scholarship provides the contextual and interpretative framework within which both are assessed. These evidentiary levels are read in relation to one another but are not treated as interchangeable.

This distinction is particularly important because *To Vima* operated within an authoritarian media environment characterised by censorship, self-censorship, and political and administrative constraints. Newspaper discourse is therefore treated as a mediated historical source rather than as a transparent record of teachers' professional experience. The analysis does not infer teachers' subjective professional identities from administrative reporting, nor does it treat *To Vima* as representative of the Greek press as a whole. Instead, it examines the institutionally

prescribed and publicly represented dimensions of the teaching profession that become visible through the selected material.

The sampling strategy necessarily imposes a further limitation. Because the source corpus was purposively rather than exhaustively constructed, the study does not claim statistical representativeness or provide frequency-based conclusions about educational coverage across the entire 1967-1974 period. Its purpose is interpretative: to examine how selected newspaper material, read in conjunction with legislative evidence and historical scholarship, illuminates the relationship between educational policy, administrative regulation, and the public construction of the teacher's professional role under authoritarian governance.

3. Regulating Professional Mobility: Teachers within the Administrative Hierarchy

Teacher mobility provides a particularly revealing perspective on the relationship between educational policy and professional status under the dictatorship. Transfers were not merely technical procedures for reallocating personnel. They constituted an institutional mechanism through which individual careers were organised in relation to the operational requirements of the educational system. Professional mobility therefore offers evidence of educational policy at the level of implementation: state regulation concerned not only educational structures, but also the conditions under which teachers occupied and moved between positions within them.

This administrative dimension is particularly visible in the coverage of *To Vima*. On 20 June 1971, the newspaper published "Conditions for the Transfer of Primary and Secondary Education Officers," while on 3 May 1972 it devoted extensive space to the new Royal Decree governing teacher transfers (*To Vima*, 20 June 1971, p. 11; *To Vima*, 3 May 1972, p. 8). The latter presented a detailed regulatory framework governing the mobility of primary and secondary teachers and made visible the extent to which professional movement was organised through formal administrative procedures.

At the level of newspaper representation, place of employment, movement between schools, and professional progression appear within a vocabulary of service requirements, formal criteria, deadlines, staffing priorities, and administrative decisions. The teacher consequently becomes visible primarily as a member of a centrally organised public service whose professional trajectory was mediated by institutional rules. This does not imply the absence of personal preference or professional agency. Rather, such preferences acquired administrative effect only insofar as they could be accommodated within the categories and procedures recognised by the educational authorities.

The language of the 1972 publication reinforces this institutional framing. References to education officers, organic posts, educational districts, transfers, promotion, and special schools organise the professional role around administrative location and service status. Classroom practice, teacher-pupil relations, and pedagogical decision-making remain largely outside the frame of the report. What becomes publicly visible instead is the teacher's position within a regulated professional hierarchy: the post occupied, the district of service, eligibility for movement, and the formal conditions governing professional mobility.

This representation is relevant to professional identity, but the distinction established earlier in the article remains essential. Administrative status cannot be equated with the totality of teachers' professional identity. The newspaper evidence reveals an institutionally prescribed and publicly represented dimension of professional life rather than teachers' subjective or enacted identities. Nevertheless, the institutional conditions under which a profession operates contribute to defining the boundaries within which professional roles are publicly understood and practically exercised. In this sense, the administrative location of teachers forms part of the broader construction of their professional position.

The regulations also reveal points at which institutional requirements intersected with individual circumstances. Provisions concerning the co-location of spouses, movement between educational districts, promotion, and reassignment indicate that family considerations, residence, and career aspirations were recognised within the administrative framework. Yet these circumstances entered the system through predefined categories and formal procedures. The individual teacher was therefore acknowledged within the regulatory structure, but in terms established by the educational administration.

Professional mobility should consequently be understood as more than personnel management. It illustrates how educational policy was translated into administrative practice and how that practice structured teachers' professional trajectories. Newspaper reporting made these mechanisms publicly visible, while the regulatory framework itself demonstrates the extent to which teachers' careers were embedded within a hierarchical system of service obligations, eligibility criteria, and institutional priorities.

The coverage of teacher transfers thus reveals a specific configuration of state–profession relations. Teachers retained pedagogical and social responsibilities, but significant dimensions of their professional careers were organised through centrally defined procedures. What emerges from the material is therefore not simply an image of educational bureaucracy, but a form of governance in which the organisation of the teaching workforce became one of the mechanisms through which educational policy was implemented.

4. Defining the “Suitable” Teacher: Training, Supervision, and Professional Status

Administrative regulation of professional mobility constituted only one dimension of the institutional position of teachers under the dictatorship. Equally significant was the state's capacity to define the professional characteristics, forms of knowledge, and standards of conduct considered appropriate for those entrusted with educational work. Regulation therefore extended beyond appointments and transfers to teacher preparation, professional suitability, in-service education, supervision, and institutional participation. These dimensions are examined here primarily through legislative and historical evidence and are analytically distinguished from the newspaper material discussed in the preceding section.

The reorganisation introduced after 1967 affected the criteria through which educational personnel were institutionally assessed. Scientific and pedagogical competence did not constitute the sole basis of professional suitability. Political and social convictions also entered the formal framework within which teachers could be evaluated (Compulsory Law 129/1967, pp. 1111–1112). The significance of this provision lies in the extension of professional assessment beyond specialised knowledge and pedagogical competence. Professional legitimacy could therefore become connected not only to educational qualifications, but also to conformity with wider political and institutional expectations.

This distinction is important for the interpretation of professional identity. The legislative evidence does not demonstrate how teachers understood themselves or enacted their professional roles in everyday practice. It does, however, reveal the characteristics that the institutional framework recognised as legitimate or desirable. In this sense, the legislation contributed to the construction of a prescribed professional identity in which educational competence coexisted with expectations of institutional and political conformity.

Teacher preparation constituted another significant field of regulation. Changes introduced after 1967 affected the institutions responsible for preparing future teachers, particularly through the reorganisation of the curricula of the Pedagogical Academies. Ministerial Decision 154319 of 11 November 1967 introduced a revised curriculum from which subjects such as Sociology, Elements of Democratic Government and Law, Introduction to Economics, and Psychology of Individual Differences were excluded (Ministerial Decision 154319/1967). The reorganisation also reflected the linguistic orientation of the regime: the Greek curriculum explicitly identified *apli katharevousa* (simple katharevousa) as the language of education, the Church, the state, and science. *Katharevousa*, the learned and archaizing variety of Greek historically associated with formal and institutional usage, occupied a central position in the long-standing Greek language question (Mackridge, 2009).

These curricular changes are relevant not merely as alterations in teacher education, but as evidence of the institutional definition of legitimate professional knowledge. Teacher preparation does more than provide technical preparation for classroom practice; it contributes to determining which bodies of knowledge, intellectual orientations, and linguistic norms are regarded as appropriate for future educators. The restructuring of the Pedagogical Academies therefore shaped the institutional profile of the profession before entry into school service, defining both what teachers were expected to know and the intellectual boundaries within which professional formation was organised.

The organisation of in-service education and educational supervision points in the same direction. Following the abolition of the Pedagogical Institute, the further training of primary and secondary teachers was reorganised

through the Didaskaleia. At the same time, the Supreme Educational Council was restructured and assigned supervisory, administrative, advisory, and consultative responsibilities. Its permanent members were appointed by the Minister of Education, while elected teacher representatives were abolished (Compulsory Law 129/1967, pp. 1113-1114; Foukas, 2018).

This institutional change affected the relationship between professional participation and central educational authority. The abolition of elected teacher representation reduced the formal presence of the profession within a body involved in supervision and educational decision-making, while ministerial appointment strengthened the role of central authority. The issue therefore concerns more than administrative reorganisation. It also concerns the institutional space available for professional voice and the degree to which teachers participated in structures that regulated and supervised educational work.

Taken together, these measures reveal different but interconnected forms of regulation. Professional mobility involved bureaucratic regulation of careers and service conditions; criteria of suitability introduced political and ideological dimensions into professional assessment; teacher preparation defined legitimate forms of professional knowledge; and supervisory structures regulated both professional participation and institutional authority. These forms of regulation should not be treated as identical, but collectively they demonstrate the multiple levels through which the teaching profession was institutionally organised.

The professional role emerging from this framework was therefore more complex than that of a conventional public employee. Teachers possessed specialised pedagogical responsibilities and considerable social significance, yet their professional position was embedded in mechanisms capable of defining suitability, shaping preparation, organising further training, and restricting formal participation in supervisory structures. The evidence examined here does not establish teachers' enacted professional identities; rather, it reveals the institutional boundaries within which a legitimate professional role was prescribed. In this sense, regulating the teacher involved not only administering service conditions, but also defining the forms of knowledge, conduct, participation, and professional authority that the educational system recognised as acceptable.

5. Professional Identity between Pedagogical Authority and Institutional Duty

The preceding sections have shown that the regulation of teachers operated through several interconnected mechanisms: professional mobility, institutional criteria of suitability, teacher preparation, and educational supervision. These mechanisms acquire their broader significance when considered in relation to the professional role they helped to define. The evidence examined here points to a model of teaching framed not only through pedagogical expertise, but also through duty, responsibility, institutional discipline, and social conduct.

This representation was rooted in a conception of teaching that extended beyond classroom instruction. The post-war relationship between education and the national state had already assigned teachers responsibilities associated with moral and national formation (Αδάμου, 2002). Under the dictatorship, however, these expectations were situated within a more restrictive institutional environment. State intervention through regulations, circulars, instructions, and mechanisms of supervision narrowed the boundaries within which professional action could be exercised (Χρόνης, 1993). Historical scholarship similarly indicates that the teacher's role became closely associated with supervision, order, institutional loyalty, and conformity (Δούκας, 2011).

The distinction is important because professional identity cannot be reduced to occupational status or administrative position. It also concerns the forms of authority and responsibility recognised as legitimate within professional practice. In the evidence examined here, pedagogical authority coexisted with strong institutional expectations. Teachers were entrusted with substantial educational and social responsibilities, yet the exercise of those responsibilities took place within a framework that emphasised appropriate conduct, discipline, and conformity with officially sanctioned norms.

This configuration placed teachers in an ambivalent professional position. On the one hand, they possessed considerable symbolic and pedagogical authority because they were responsible for the education and social formation of younger generations. On the other hand, precisely because their role carried wider social significance, the boundaries of acceptable professional action became an object of institutional concern. Authority

and autonomy were therefore not synonymous. A teacher could be assigned significant responsibility while remaining constrained in the forms of initiative through which that responsibility could be exercised.

The tension becomes especially visible when the educational policy of the dictatorship is considered as a whole. State intervention did not concern only curricula or the formal organisation of educational levels. It also extended to teacher preparation, supervision, professional mobility, institutional participation, and criteria of suitability (Χαραλάμπους, 1990; Δούκας, 2011). Taken together, these mechanisms helped define a prescribed professional role in which pedagogical responsibility was closely linked to institutional duty and the maintenance of educational and social order.

This helps explain why apparently separate administrative measures should be read as interconnected. Training, supervision, appointment, mobility, and participation within educational institutions all contributed to defining the conditions within which professional authority could operate. Their cumulative effect was to locate teachers within a structured relationship to the state. The professional role prescribed by this framework was therefore produced not through a single legal provision, but through the interaction of multiple institutional practices that shaped what teachers were expected to know, how they were expected to serve, and which forms of conduct were considered legitimate.

At the same time, this prescribed role should not be interpreted as evidence of complete professional passivity. The broader historical material suggests an important counter-tension: teachers, precisely because of their education and wider social role, could also be perceived as potential carriers of critical judgement and political or intellectual independence. Contemporary interpretations of the reorganisation of the Pedagogical Academies in 1971, for example, associated the restriction of future teachers' presence in major urban centres with an effort to reduce their exposure to progressive ideas and political currents. Within this interpretation, the educated teacher could become a potentially unsettling presence for an authoritarian political order.

This tension is analytically significant. Teachers could simultaneously be expected to reproduce institutional norms and possess the intellectual resources from which critical judgement might emerge. The regulation of teacher preparation, professional conduct, supervision, and institutional participation can therefore be understood in relation to this underlying contradiction between professional responsibility and professional autonomy. The greater the social significance attributed to the educational role, the more consequential became the question of who defined its legitimate boundaries.

The evidence nevertheless requires caution. The newspaper and legislative material examined here does not establish how teachers uniformly understood, negotiated, or enacted their professional identities. It provides access primarily to institutionally prescribed and publicly represented roles. What emerges is therefore not a comprehensive account of teachers' lived professional identities, but a historically situated model of the teacher as a figure of pedagogical and social authority whose legitimacy was closely associated with institutional duty, regulated conduct, and the maintenance of educational order.

Seen in this light, professional identity constitutes more than a secondary consequence of educational policy. It becomes one of the sites through which educational governance is enacted. Educational policy depends not only on structures, regulations, and curricula, but also on the roles assigned to the professionals expected to implement them. The teacher stands at precisely this intersection: invested with pedagogical and social authority, yet positioned within institutional boundaries that defined the acceptable scope of professional action.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has examined the public and institutional representation of teachers in *To Vima* under the Greek dictatorship, focusing on the relationship between educational policy, institutional regulation, and professional identity. The analysis indicates that the teacher occupied a position in which pedagogical responsibility and administrative subordination were closely intertwined. Professional status was shaped not only by the educational function of teaching, but also by the institutional mechanisms through which the state organised, supervised, and regulated the profession.

The evidence concerning professional mobility shows how educational policy operated through administrative procedures that affected teachers' careers and service conditions. Regulations governing transfers, placement, and advancement positioned teachers within a hierarchical public system in which professional trajectories were mediated by institutional priorities. At the same time, legislative interventions concerning teacher preparation, criteria of professional suitability, in-service education, and supervisory structures extended regulation beyond career administration. Together, these mechanisms contributed to defining the qualifications, forms of conduct, and limits of professional authority recognised within the educational system.

Within this framework, the professional identity examined here is best understood as institutionally prescribed and publicly represented rather than as a reconstruction of teachers' subjective or enacted identities. Teachers were invested with substantial educational and social responsibility, yet the exercise of that responsibility was embedded within structures emphasising institutional duty, appropriate conduct, and administrative conformity. The teacher emerging from the material was therefore neither simply a pedagogical professional nor merely a state functionary, but a figure located at the intersection of professional authority and institutional regulation.

At the same time, the evidence does not support an interpretation of teachers as entirely passive subjects of state control. Their education, social role, and potential capacity for critical judgement introduced a persistent tension between the authority entrusted to the profession and the restrictions placed upon professional autonomy. This tension helps explain why authoritarian educational governance extended beyond curricula and school structures to the regulation of professional formation, mobility, participation, and acceptable conduct.

These findings should be interpreted within the limits of the study. *To Vima* constitutes a specific mediated source operating under conditions of censorship and self-censorship, and the purposively selected newspaper corpus cannot be treated as statistically representative of the Greek press as a whole or of teachers' lived professional experience. Legislative sources, newspaper evidence, and historical scholarship likewise provide different forms of evidence and have been interpreted as such.

The article's contribution lies in showing that the governance of education under authoritarianism operated not only through legislation, curricula, and institutional structures, but also through the definition of the professional subject expected to implement educational policy. Regulating education, in this context, also meant regulating the boundaries of legitimate professional knowledge, authority, participation, and conduct.

Declaration on the Use of Generative AI

Generative AI was used as an assistive tool in the English-language translation, linguistic refinement, and editorial preparation of the manuscript. The research design, primary sources, source selection, analysis, interpretation of findings, and substantive conclusions are based on the original research and remain the responsibility of the authors.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

1. Αναγκαστικός Νόμος 129/1967. (1967, 25 Σεπτεμβρίου). *Περί οργανώσεως και διοικήσεως της Γενικής Εκπαιδεύσεως και άλλων τινών διατάξεων* [Compulsory Law 129/1967: On the organisation and administration of general education and other provisions]. *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως*, Τεύχος Α', 163, 1111-1118.
2. Υπουργική Απόφαση 154319/1967. (1967, 11 Νοεμβρίου). *Περί καθορισμού αναλυτικού και ωρολογίου προγράμματος Παιδαγωγικών Ακαδημιών διά το ακαδημαϊκόν έτος 1967-68* [Ministerial Decision 154319/1967: On the determination of the curriculum and timetable of the Pedagogical Academies for the academic year 1967-68]. *Εφημερίς της Κυβερνήσεως*, Τεύχος Β', 711, 5505-5520.
3. *To Vima*. (1971, June 20). Προϋποθέσεις μεταθέσεως των λειτουργών της Δημοτικής και Μέσης Εκπαιδεύσεως [Conditions for the transfer of primary and secondary education officers]. p. 11.
4. *To Vima*. (1972, May 3). Το νέον Β. Διάταγμα περί μεταθέσεων των εκπαιδευτικών [The new Royal Decree on teacher transfers]. p. 8.

Secondary Sources

1. Αδάμου, Μ. (2002). *Το εκπαιδευτικό σύστημα στην υπηρεσία του εθνικού κράτους: Η ελληνική περίπτωση (1950-1976)*. Παπαζήσης.
2. Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(2), 107-128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.07.001>
3. Day, C., Kington, A., Stobart, G., & Sammons, P. (2006). The personal and professional selves of teachers: Stable and unstable identities. *British Educational Research Journal*, 32(4), 601-616. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920600775316>
4. Δούκας, Τ. (2011). Το σχολείο κατά την εποχή της δικτατορίας 1967-1974. Στο Σ. Μπουζάκης (Επιμ.), *Πανόραμα ιστορίας και εκπαίδευσης: Όψεις και απόψεις* (Τόμ. Β', σσ. 241-252). Gutenberg.
5. Κοσμάς, Π., & Νικολιδάκης, Σ. (2024). Βιβλιογραφική ανασκόπηση: Από την αναζήτηση και συλλογή υλικού στη σύνθεση και τη συγγραφή. Στο Σ. Νικολιδάκης & Π. Κοσμάς (Επιμ.), *Μεθοδολογία έρευνας στις ανθρωπιστικές και κοινωνικές επιστήμες: Ποσοτικές και ποιοτικές προσεγγίσεις* (σσ. 89-102). Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη.
6. Χαραλάμπους, Φ. Δ. (1990). *Εκπαιδευτική πολιτική και εκπαιδευτική μεταρρύθμιση στη μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα (1950-1974)* [Διδακτορική διατριβή, Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης].
7. Χρόνης, Σ. (1993). *Διδακτική πράξη και κοινωνικός έλεγχος: Η κρατική παρέμβαση στο έργο του εκπαιδευτικού*. Εκδοτικός Όμιλος Συγγραφέων Καθηγητών.
8. Foukas, V. (2018). Challenges in Greek education during the 1960s: The 1964 educational reform and its overthrow. *Espacio, Tiempo y Educación*, 5(1), 71-93. <https://doi.org/10.14516/ete.215>
9. Kalerante, E. (2015). Discourse critical analysis of the Dictatorship educational policy (1967-1974) about the Greek-speaking education of the Greeks abroad. *International Journal of Language, Translation and Intercultural Communication*, 2, 69-78. <https://doi.org/10.12681/ijltic.22>
10. Mackridge, P. (2009). *Language and national identity in Greece, 1766-1976*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199214426.001.0001>
11. Sachs, J. (2001). Teacher professional identity: Competing discourses, competing outcomes. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(2), 149-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930116819>
12. Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE.