

GPSG Working Paper #06

The Evaluation of Human Resources in Modern Public Management

*Dr. George Aspridis
Assistant Professor
Department of Project Management,
Technological Educational Institution of Larissa*



Abstract

In modern society, the public sector plays an important role when it comes to economic development and growth of a country. This paper's focus and interest are on human resources of public administration. The most important chapter to be analysed, is "the evaluation of personnel". The analysis for the evaluation and subsequently the personal development and career planning of human resources based on both academic theories and their practical implementation. Thus, we fully understand the evaluation system and of the personal development of employee in Greek public administration.

Keywords: *Human resources management, performance appraisal, public sector, Common Assessment Framework (C.A.F.), civil servants*

Author Bio: *Dr George Aspridis has been elected Assistant Professor in «Business Administration with an emphasis on Human Resources Management» at the Department of Project Management, Technological Educational Institution of Larissa. He is Scientific Collaborator of the National Accreditation Centre for Continuing Vocational Training and of the Monitoring Service for European Social Fund Actions, Ministry of Employment and Social Security.*

1. Introduction

Globalisation converts the old - traditional model of public administration to a modern and flexible model, based on the demands of the enlarged EU. The new model of administration will combine the adaptation of an effective organisation model and the requirements of the EU administrative model. The new model is based on, proportionality and administrative Europeanisation, which creates formal and informal rules, modern processes of public policy that will shape common beliefs and values incorporated in the specific national policies.¹ Globalisation also provides a new logic in the management of human resources, through the aid of professionalism, whereas it attributes particular accent in the values of effectiveness and the work efficiency.

Performance appraisal is the process by which organisations evaluate job performance. Employees, their supervisors, the human resources department and ultimately the organisation benefit from the evaluation, when it is done correctly.² Public management as a term recognizes that the government, the non-profit administration and the private sector

¹See P. Karkatsoulis (2004), "Europeanisation instead of globalisation. Realistic or utopia? Evaluating the administrative reforms in the E.U.", *Journal of Administrative Science*, no 10, pp. 427 – 29 [in greek].

²See W. Werther Jr. and K. Davis (1985), *Human resources and personnel management*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., U.S.A, pp. 303 – 306.

share some common characteristics. These characteristics can be used as tools that may maximise efficiency and effectiveness in public sector.³

The current paper provides a comprehensive narration for the management of the performance appraisal system in modern public sector. The objectives of this paper are to explain the uses of performance appraisals, to describe the methods of the evaluation in public sector and to analyse the role of evaluation in the strategic management. This article will emphasize the importance of the performance appraisal in the public sector via the evolution of the Greek system from the 19th century till nowadays; it will also present the current state of the performance appraisal and the prospective of the system in the modern public sector of Greece.

2. The development of the evaluation system of human resources

During the 19th century and up to the first decade of the 20th, the civil servants in Greece were under completely political party dependence and submission. For instance, Ch. Trikoupis declared in 1882 that *“the status quo and development of administrative personnel are depending not on their achievements and output but on their complete loyalty to the party and on its trust”* and fought to impose the law of meritocracy that had been established by the revolutionary constitutions. The permanence of public employees was first established by the Constitution of 1911, which included articles concerning the permanent judges and the members of the State Audit Council, while it provided also permanence to all juridical employees (*articles 88, 89, 90, 98 and 102*). In the case of the administrative employees, the 1911 Constitution anticipated (*article 102*) their permanence - from the moment of foundation of State Audit Council.⁴ The permanence and the meritocracy were discussed a lot in the following years. For instance, the Article 1 of the Coercion 516/1948 *“For the control of loyalty of public employees and servants”* reported that *“apart from the existing laws for the required qualifications for employment in public sector, from now on it is required for the employee to be respectful to the law”*. The institution of permanence was created in Greece under the outcry to parties transactions.⁵ Finally, their permanence in its entirety came into force with the fifth Revision of the 1975 Constitution.⁶

During the Third Greek Democracy (*after the restoration of Democracy – July 1974*), the effort of re-establishing the Democracy within public administration began. One of the first steps for re-establishing the Democracy was the creation of a new evaluation system. The first system of evaluation that the Greek administration used was established, in 1975, after the fall of dictatorship and with the changes followed, in 1977, and was dealt as an ambitious one. Nevertheless, it did not achieve its objectives, because of the lack of valid and essential criteria of evaluation and the absence of educated executives that could have helped it to be effective.

After the change of government (*government of Panhellenic Socialist Movement*), in 1981, a new system of evaluation was established, which, also, did not succeed in corresponding to the expectations of the Ministry of Interior, since it failed to distinguish the best from the mediocre and bad employees. It had such a structure that all employees were characterised as *“excellent”*, aiming at maintaining a good work climate in the public sector,

³See L. E. Lynn Jr. (1996), *Public Management as art, science and profession*, Chatham House/CQ Press.

⁴See G. Aspridis (2010), “The history of public administration in Greece from the 1821 Revolution until today”, in Ath. Fotopoulos *The education in Greece*, Athens, Herodotus Publications (under publication) [in greek].

⁵See D’ Revisory Parliament - Committee PSIXI’ 1953, import, s. Ist’, *ibid*.

⁶Op.cit, note 5.

without paying any attention to improving the output of public organisations and establishing meritocratic and essential criteria for a maximized effectiveness.

The government of New Democracy, in 1992, tried to create a new evaluation system, the most possible objective and meritocratic, which, nevertheless, was very strict in lots of its details and it was not accepted from the public servants. Specifically, it failed in making them realize its objective, which was to make them better, to improve the total output of public services and to make all the employees co-responsible for the productivity of [public] organizations (*Management by Objectives*). The result of all these was innovating - for Greek standards (*because some they presented Greece as an awkward partner*⁷). The proposals such as the establishment of the quota method, of objectives and self assessment were not implemented in Greece. The system remained inapplicable and the evaluation was based on qualitative data.

The aforementioned systems could not restore the feelings of insecurity and fear and specifically the fear of failure, reprisals, control etc of the administrative personnel. They did not succeed in persuading the employees that each system of evaluation functions in their favour and tries to make them better and more productive; it does not prevent them from evolving. Instead it makes them feel part of a total unity, because an ideal system of a performance appraisal is for the best of the employees. It was not understood that each employee's obligation is to serve the citizens. The study of evaluation systems of personnel, after 1974, leads us to the conclusion that none of them functioned efficiently nor did they help in the employees' personal development and the output of public administration in total.

3. Prospects of reform

During the second decade of the 21st century, the public administration was found at an important crossroad due to the freedom of markets, technological developments, improvements in the sectors of information and communications and increased demands by the citizens in the modern world. The public administration owes to ensure all its competitive advantages, so that it can survive and become more effective and efficient for the citizens and not to be absolutely disdained.

In the past few years there have been efforts to replace the existing system of evaluation of human resources with a new one, which will be based on objective and measurable output criteria. A pilot system has been applied in certain national services of the state and in the wider public sector such as the Hellenic Organization of Telecommunications and the municipality of Amarousion. The reason that the establishment of a system of evaluation has been delayed is that each minister perceives its development differently - and unfortunately lots of changes occurred in the political leadership of the relevant ministry of Interior.

The personnel of public administration, despite the changes that were implemented in the past few years, is characterised by weaknesses such as the lack of mobility, the insufficient exploitation of skills and knowledge available by employees with increased formal qualifications, the incomplete training of public employees, legalism, lack of meritocracy, lack of strategy and administrative planning, as well as the lack of a wider organisational frame for the operation of the public sector. The public administration has not established objective appraisals in the system. All the above have resulted in undermining the prestige

⁷See L. Tsoukalis, "Greece : Like any other European Country?", *The National Interest*, March 1999 [in greek].

and the reliability of public services and decreasing the effectiveness of public administration. That influences the quality of our democracy. Besides, there are many who claim that the public administration functions in favour of cliental relations since the foundation of the Greek State.

Therefore, meritocracy is the terminus. C. Stephanopoulos, the former President of the Hellenic Republic, stressed that *“one of the most important values that we have to comply with and apply, necessarily in public administration, is meritocracy. This value indicates the reward of employees that corresponds to their duties and the punishment of those who were negligent and intentionally worked in an unfair way...the state owes to promote capable employees and to reward them. Moreover, it owes to check and punish unprincipled and corrupted employees”*.⁸ The former minister of Interior, C. Skandalidis, stressed that *“we all know for whom the reports are created. They are all excellent reports...It is an established a way of thinking existing many years”*.⁹

The basic characteristics of a new evaluation system of human personnel in public administration need to include, among others, the meritocracy and the evaluation during one's career, the efficiency, the controls and the motives, the linkage of wage with productivity and finally the lifelong learning and [vocational] training of human resources.

The Clerical Code also stresses the importance for the growth of human resources in public administration. According to the Recommendatory Report of Law on new Clerical Code (*Law 3528/2007*), the new code includes some important innovations that concern the equality and the meritocracy for the public employees. In article 1, it reports that “. One can find the importance of evaluation in Article 1 (*Law 3528/2007*).¹⁰

The Clerical Code emphasizes the importance of motives, the training and the further training of public employees, the reform of the system for the selection of directors of permanent jobs with the application of completely objective criteria. Among others it forecasts the rationalisation of the human resources management, the faster hierarchical development of workers with increased qualifications, the determination of objective criteria of choice of heads and the confrontation of stiffness in the mobility of personnel.

The effectiveness of establishment and application of an effective system for personnel evaluation will depend on its integration in a wider frame of strategy of public administration. For this reason the use of suitable methods that will be characterised by clarity and simplicity, will correspond to the needs of organisation and will help it to develop dynamically, is necessary.

The individual output owes to be combined with the output of the organisation, because of good administration, leadership in order to enjoy good administrate and effective leadership. The members of a team owe to accept the role that employees and their colleagues play in general. A sense of teamwork should be created, in order for the members to focus their interest on the achievement of predetermined goals. The objective of managerial leadership is to achieve the biggest possible incitement of workers, so that the differences of output between the employees are decreased and finally the objectives of individuals, team and organisation coincide. On the other hand, the workers owe to achieve their goals and at the same time the objectives of the team.

⁸Speech of former President of Hellenic Republic in the Union of Officers in Thessaloniki, 28/10/2002 (http://www.presidency.gr/omil_content.asp?rid=87) [in greek].

⁹According to his speech in the meeting of National Council of Administrative Reform (*National Centre for Public Administration and Local Government, 30/4/2002*) [in greek].

¹⁰See the officials transcripts of LII, 24/1/2007, Meeting of session of parliament (*See Parliament Proceedings, 24/1/2007*), <http://hellenicparliament.gr> [in greek].

In order to increase an organisation's efficiency, the administration must improve the communication between the employees, and the employees should be in line with the demands of their work and team; thus the action of each member of the team is additional to the remainder members of the team. It is also necessary to motivate the employees, for the CEOs to play an important role in the effectiveness and in the guidance of the team and for the central administration to support its individual units. If the evaluation system fails, the most capable executives of public administration do not reach their full potentials.

4. The prospects of the establishment of an ideal system of evaluation of human personnel in the Greek public administration

Managers are focusing on improved human resources management as a means of restoring the competitive position of their companies in an increasingly challenging global marketplace.
R. Miler – Ch. Snow¹¹

The changes in official situation of human resources owe to be included in a system of Management by Objectives (MbO), which will promote the meritocracy, the effectiveness and the activation of executives of administration. This system owes to take into consideration both the engagement of public employees and their lifelong learning. It is necessary to follow the provisions by the European law.

MbO is the completed process of determination of objectives, evaluation of achievement and remuneration of result, promoting the improvement of output, education and growth of workers.¹² The goal of the evaluation system implementation is the maximization of the contribution of workers to realize the organization's strategic objectives. All (*individual, team and organisation*) will enjoy the profit from their work. MbO is a participative and continuous process that aims to develop the individuals and the organisation. MbO plans daily works and it shapes a new approach that focuses on the executives and their growth. Also, it supports and informs the workers for their output and finally it contributes to the recognition and the remuneration of their output.¹³

The creation of a collective body, an independent service that will manage all public employees from the moment of their engagement could guarantee the effective operation of human resources. This body will also include the competences of Supreme Council for Civil Personnel Selection and National Centre for Public Administration and Local Government and it will function as a model of independent authority and it will take care of all questions that concern the human resources management. It is necessary, to establish objective criteria and a meritocratic system for the official changes of personnel.¹⁴

So far the administrative functions are based on the letter rather than the essence of law. We need to move towards a model that consists of flexible conditions, corresponding with those of the private sectors, the mobility of workers and the correspondence between wage and productivity. These changes are necessary in the highly competitive modern status

¹¹See R. Miler and Ch. Snow, Designing strategic human resources systems, Organizational dynamics, Summer 1984, p. 34 [as referred to W. Werther Jr. and K. Davis (1985), *Human resources and personnel management*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., U.S.A.].

¹²See G. Aspidis (2007), "Study for human resource performance evaluation registration in the private sector", *Journal of Administrative Science*, no 13, pp. 171 – 214 [in greek].

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴According to the transcripts of the committee of Revision of Constitution, meeting IB' (Wednesday 29/11/2006) and IH' (Wednesday 31/1/2007), <http://hellenicparliament.gr> [in greek].

quo. This change will create increasingly more demands for essential responsibilities for the heads of departments in the companies, who are also included in the personnel. For example, the Common Assessment Framework (C.A.F.) is a system of self-assessment of Ministries and Departments of public sector. It aims to the organisation's improvement via its evaluation and feedback by the stakeholders.¹⁵

MbO constitutes a permanent administrative process, which ensures the management of total output, flexibility, productivity and efficiency, through target setting, follow-up and the revision of adaptation of objectives, the administrative support and the permanent growth of human resources. The essential annual evaluation, the remuneration of records and finally the planning of necessary future programs of education and growth are also required.¹⁶ The first steps have been accomplished via New Public Management that focuses its interest on the evaluation of output and effectiveness and includes the privatisation of public enterprises and the Cooperation of Public - Private Sector. The public sector learns from private companies and achieves the best possible exploitation of its human resources through the Cooperation of public private sector. The State owes to asquire specialized executives and ensure that the knowledge of these executives will be available in all institutions.

The MbO is based on the relation of three factors : (a) the administration of human potential with various programmes that have effect on the individual evaluation of employee and the organisational output, (b) the indicators of workers evaluation can be distinguished to : personal characteristics, labour behaviours and work outcome and finally (c) the indicators of attribution of the public sector, that aim at the guarantee of engagement of executives at all administrative levels but also of the remaining personnel, in order for them to achieve high total and individual results and the desirable level of output.¹⁷

The MbO facilitates the guidance and the team collaboration aiming at planning, application and briefing of programmes of administration as well as in the benefit of motives and education. In modern systems, the organizational philosophy should be pluralist, the organisations owe to learn, to exist criteria of evaluation and feedback and finally the organisation needs to be flexible.¹⁸

The effectiveness of measures will depend on their integration in a frame of strategy of public administration, in order to support one another, to have cohesion and in addition not to come in conflict with each other and to be included in the overall planning and timetable while the State maintains its staff and has a supervisory role. The objective of ideal system of evaluation of human personnel is to face all the possible problems, either coming from evaluators or from assessed or in the system itself. For this reason, it is necessary to use of suitable methods that will be simple and will be characterised by clarity, will correspond to the needs of the organisation and they will help it to be developed dynamically.

The individual output owes to combine itself with the total attribution of organisation, because it is the interrelation of good administration, leadership and other factors. A sense of team work should be created in order for the members to focus their interest on the achievement of predetermined goals. The objective of managerial leadership is to achieve the biggest possible encouragement for workers so that the differences of output between

¹⁵See Ministry of Interior (2007), Common Assessment Framework, Athens and M. Vaksevanidou (2007), "C.A.F as a measure to implement quality management in the public sector – Possible benefits for public organizations and corporations in Greece", *Administrative Communication*, no 42, pp. 39 – 47 [in greek].

¹⁶See J. Chandler (2003), *Comparative Public Administration*, Papazisis, Athens, pp. 167 – 170.

¹⁷See M. Rammata and M. Kourtidis (2006), *Organization analysis and human resource management*, University of Nottingham Publications, Athens, pp. 75 – 7 [in greek].

¹⁸See N. Chiotis, "Performance management", *Manager*, February 2002, pp. 21 – 4 [in greek].

the employees are decreased and finally the given objectives of individuals, team and organisation coincide. On the other hand, the workers owe to satisfy their objectives and at the same time the objectives of team.

In order to increase the efficiency of organisation, the communication between personnel should be improved and individuals have to compromise with the requirements of their work and team. The leader plays an important role in the effectiveness and in the guidance of the team and the central administration to support its individual units. So the employees develop through professional models.

The persistence in the use of a system of panderers following antiquity contributes also to the failure of the establishment of a completed system of evaluation that has placed the after evaluation promotions of more capable executives of public administration low in priorities. If an evaluation takes place, the employees will find in promotion of working at a new place; thus the phenomenon of job offerings without coverage will cease.

The use of new technologies, will help the improvement of performance of the workers, while at the same time, it will develop the administrative process of public organisations. The new technology will improve the quantitative outputs which will be explicit, precise and will be compared with the existing models; but the evaluation of qualitative criteria will be omitted. Moreover, new technology will locate the weaknesses of current evaluation system, improve it and give each employee the possibility to get informed via internet. On the other hand, new technology will benefit the administrative personnel to have open channels of communication with organizational units in Greece and abroad.¹⁹

The development of an evaluation system in the public sector owes to be based on the change of mentality of public employees via the reduction of party influenced admission in the administration, the establishment and the maintenance of effective labour relations in modern management. The role and the duties of CEOs must be reformed so their number will be increased.

The system of evaluation can increase the output of an organisation in each phase of its existence and owes to be characterised by flexibility in the establishment of criteria and in the measurement of efficiency of the organisation and the individual. A different evaluation system is needed each time the organization changes its developmental stage. The fact that most systems of evaluation did not approach perfection is owed to that they are affected by external environment, the organisational culture and the behaviour of personnel that continuously changes. So the organisational system has to adapt to the social conditions. The system of evaluation owes to be concrete, the changes evolving it have to be frequent and the criteria should be most explicit and predetermined.

5. Conclusions

This paper aimed at presenting and analysing the systems of performance appraisal and the development of human potential. It is aimed at integrating and updating many aspects of performance appraisal while concentrating in the system of public sector. The systems of evaluation of human potential could not restore the feelings of insecurity and fear of workers and specifically the fear of failure, reprisals and control in Greece. The system did not convince the employees to function in favour of themselves and try to be more productive. Most systems of evaluation are not perfect because they are affected by the external environment, the organisational culture and the behaviour of personnel that

¹⁹Op.cit, note 13, pp. 171 – 214.

continuously changes. The changes that are forecasted cannot have direct results, decrease neither their value nor their usefulness. It is necessary for a controlling mechanism of evaluation to be created, so that its weaknesses and its problems of application are located and its continuous improvement will be ensured. All of the above have no value at all if there is no interest for better performance by the employees. And last but not least, we do not have an ideal system of performance appraisal in public sector because of the government policies; policies that are never implemented because of the political and economic conjunctures.

For an effective system of performance evaluation, in public sector, it is necessary to accept the following suggestions:

i. The criteria of the system owe to be explicit and predetermined and they should be adapted to the real data (*place, product, time, executive potential, technology, economic data*) of the organisation. The criteria should provide an accurate picture of the employee performance.

ii. The changes cannot have immediate results. This does not decrease neither their value nor their usefulness. A system of evaluation has to be created, so that its weaknesses and the problems of application are found, its continuous improvement is ensured and the complete acceptance of workers in the public administration is gained.²⁰

iii. The organization benefits because the performance appraisal system enables some corrective action to be taken by the personnel.

iv. The system of performance evaluation must review performance formally at least annually.

v. The system of performance appraisal has to be in the centre of public management.

vi. The system of performance evaluation will form a new organizational culture in the public sector.

Bibliography

Anderson G. (1993), *Managing performance appraisal*, Blackwell, Oxford U.K. and Cambridge U.S.A.

Anstey G. and Clive J. (1976), *Staff appraisal and development*, George Allen and Urwin, London.

Argyriades D. (1998), *For a public administration which communicates with the citizen*, Ant. N. Sakkoulas, Athens – Komotini [in greek].

Aspridis G. (2004), Doctoral Thesis, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, University of Athens, "*Comparison of Systems on the Evaluation of Personnel Attribution in Public and Private Institutions*", unpublished [in greek].

Aspridis G. (2007), "Study for human resource performance evaluation registration in the private sector", *Journal of Administrative Science*, no 13, pp. 171 – 214 [in greek].

²⁰Op.cit, note 13, pp. 171 – 214.

- Aspidis G. (2010), “*The history of public administration in Greece from the 1821 Revolution until today*”, in Ath Fotopoulos *The education in Greece*, Athens, Herodotus publications (under publication) [in greek].
- Brewster C. and Sparrow P. and Vernon G. (2007), *International Human Resource Management*, 2nd edition, CIPD, London.
- Cabinet Office (1988), *Office of the minister for the civil service. Training development division. Evaluating training. A manual*, London.
- Cabinet Office (1998), *Office of the Minister for the civil service. Management training. EO-SEO level trends in best practice*, London.
- C.A.F. Works (2006), *Better service for the citizens by using C.A.F.*, Austrian Federal Chancellery.
- Carrol A.B. and Bucholz A.K. (1999), *Business and Society : Ethics and Stakeholder Management*, 4th edition, Southwestern Pub.
- Chandler J. (2003), *Comparative Public Administration*, Papazisis, Athens.
- Chiotis N., “Performance management”, *Manager*, February 2002, pp. 21 – 4.
- Haberbeg A. and Rieple Al. (2008), *Strategic management – Theory and application*, Oxford University Press, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Halachmi A. (ed.) (1999), *Performance and quality measurement in government – Issues and experiences*, Chatelaine Press, Burke, VA, U.S.A.
- Harvard Business Review (1991), *Appraising performance appraisal*, Boston, vol. 617, pp. 495 - 619.
- Hegewisch A. and Brewster C., (ed.) (1993), *European developments in human resource management*, Granfield University, School of Management, U.K.
- Hunger D. and Wheelen T. (2000), *Strategic management*, 7th edition, Prentice Hall, N. Jersey, U.S.A.
- IISA (2001), Twenty-fifth International Congress of Administrative Sciences, *Governance and Public Administration in the 21st Century : New trends and new techniques*, Bruxelles.
- Karkatsoulis P. (2004), “Europeanization instead globalization. Realistic or utopia? Evaluating the administrative reforms in the E.U.”, *Journal of Administrative Science*, no 10, pp. 421 – 46 [in greek].
- Kefis V. (1998), *Management of public services and public enterprises of utilities*, Interbooks, Athens [in greek].
- Lynn L. E. Jr. (1996), *Public management as art, science and profession*, Chatham House/CQ Press.
- Makridimitris A. (2008), *Public Administration – Elements of administrative structure*, Sakkoulas, Thessaloniki [in greek].
- Makridimitris A. and Michalopoulos N. (2000), *Experts’ reports on public administration*, Papazisis, Athens.
- Ministry of Internal Affairs, Public Administration and Outsourcing (2007), *C.A.F and implementation guide*, Athens [in greek].

- Ministry of Press and Mass Media (2002), *Greece in the E.U. : The new role of the new agenda*, Athens [in greek].
- Olve Nils-Goran and Roy J. and Wetter M. (2000), *Performance drivers –A practical guide to using the balanced scorecard*, Wiley, N.Y.
- Papalexandri N., “Performance Management : an important instrument of H.R.M.”, *Manager*, February 2002, pp. 13 – 16 [in greek].
- Prokopis P. (ed.) (2003), *How to plan and manage an effective wage and salary program*, Alexander Hamilton Institute - Kriterion, Athens.
- Rammata M. and Kourtidis M. (2006), *Organization analysis and human resource management*, University of Nottingham Publications, Athens [in greek].
- SIGMA / OECD (1997), “Promoting performance and professionalism in the Public Service”, *SIGMA Papers*, no 21, Paris.
- Staes P. and Thijs N. (2005), “Report on the State of Affairs of the C.A.F. after five years”, *EIPASCOPE*, vol. 3, pp. 41 – 9.
- Stewart R. (1997), *The reality of management*, 3rd edition, Butterworth Heinemann, London.
- Torrington P. and Chapman J. (1983), *Personnel management*, Prentice/Hall, U.S.A.
- Tsoukalis L., “Greece : Like any other European Country?”, *The National Interest*, March 1999 [in greek].
- Vaksevanidou, M. (2007), “C.A.F as a measure to implement quality management in the public sector – Possible benefits for public organizations and corporations in Greece”, *Administrative Communication*, vol. 42, pp. 39 – 47 [in greek].
- Veremis Th. and Dragoumis M. (1998), *Greece - Revised edition*, Oxford, California, Clio Pr., U.S.A.
- Verheijen T. (1999) (ed.), *Civil service systems in Central and Eastern Europe*, Edward Elgar, U.S.A.
- Werther W. and Davis K. (1985), *Human resources and personnel management*, 3rd edition, McGraw-Hill, N.Y., U.S.A.
- Wooldridge B. (1988), *Increasing the productivity of public sector training*, Public Productivity Review.

Websites

- <http://www.ekdd.gr/ekdda/index.php?lang=en>
<http://www.ermis.gov.gr/portal/page/portal/ermis>
[http://europa.eu.int/enterprise/corporate social responsibility.htm](http://europa.eu.int/enterprise/corporate%20social%20responsibility.htm)
<http://www.greatplacetowork-europe.com/gptw/index.php>
<http://www.harvardbusiness.org>
<http://www.hellenicparliament.gr>
<http://www.iso.com>
<http://www.oke.gr/greek/gnomi95.htm>
<http://www.plant-management.gr>

<http://socialissuesmanagement.blogspot.com>
<http://www.ypes.gr>

Email: gaspridis@gmail.com

© George Aspridis 2010