

Durham E-Theses

Crisis, restructuring and labour flexibility the case of large-scale firms in attica, greece in the 1980's

Euridice Maria Elefsinioti

How to cite:

Elefsinioti, Euridice Maria (1994) Crisis, restructuring and labour flexibility the case of large-scale firms in attica, greece in the 1980's. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5830/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

CRISIS, RESTRUCTURING AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY
THE CASE OF LARGE-SCALE FIRMS IN ATTICA, GREECE
IN
THE 1980'S

by
Euridice Maria, Elefsinioti

Thesis submitted in completion of requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

May 1994

Department of Sociology and Social Policy
University of Durham
Elvet Riverside
Durham

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



14 FEB 1995

ABSTRACT

This is an attempt at relating the present debate on economic and labour restructuring of late capitalist societies in the 1980's, and on flexibility as the assumed key characteristic of such a restructuring, to the Greek case.

Greece is considered as a case of a country that has not experienced in its past development any extensive Fordist forms of capital accumulation and economic regulation, and therefore as one where the ongoing 'restructuring' attempts, including the flexibility issue, have different character and prospects than those of other more advanced industrial societies.

In establishing the above-mentioned evaluation, this study explores the character of the socio-economic pattern of Greek post-war development in relation to, and in the context of, labour patterns and labour relations as well as flexibility aspects.

Through such an exploration it presents firstly: different reasons from those in advanced industrial societies, that led to the failure of the post-war Greek pattern of development after the mid-1970's, in relation to shifts in the regime of capital accumulation and socio-economic regulation which have taken place in Greece during the same period; secondly: the different content, character, and prospects of the restructuring attempts in Greece in the 1980's, aiming more at the restoration or the partial modification of past economic and labour patterns, including their flexible aspects, than at their radical and more advanced transformation.

In doing so, it particularly pays attention to the character of the responses of both the large and medium/small capital, as well as of the Greek state, towards the crisis of the 1980's.

This study's target is first to introduce the reader to the Greek case with reference to past and present economic and labour flexibilities, through the presentation of several aspects of the post-war political economy of Greece relevant to the topic, secondly to contribute, through such an exploration to a more advanced theoretical terrain for the Sociology of labour.

Such a terrain may to a greater extent pay more attention to 1) particular modes of production and socio-economic regulation (including the cultural and political aspects) of different regions, countries and areas of socio-economic activities, and 2) on the content as well as the form of their interweaving and interaction with international processes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To the memory of my beloved father

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Brown, R and Doctor Glavanis, P that both of them happened to be my supervisors, for their guidance and advice and also for their valuable comment and suggestions in accomplishing this thesis.

I cannot adequately express my gratitude to my mother for her encouragement and support for all my studies so far.

I own special thanks to all my friends and colleagues in Greece, but particularly to Duicken Marino, Koutsogiorgopoulos Spiros, Karamessini Maria, Limberaki Antigoni for all they have done for me, and to the "bright absence" for his remarkable inspiration during this year.

Finally I am grateful to Malcolm, Read, Jeanette Dyer John McGrawy, and Nur Hussein, for helping me to proof read and edit this thesis and to Bell, M, and Goff, S, for their warm smiles and patience..

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....I

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... II

PREFACE..... VII

CHAPTER 1

THEORITICAL DEBATES OF THE 1980'S ON ECONOMIC
AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY AND THE GREEK CASE

THE FLEXIBLE FIRM'S NOTION OF FLEXIBILITY AND THE
GREEK CASE:.....1

POST-FORDIST ASPECTS ON THE TRANSFORMATION OF
WORK AND DEVELOPMENTAL PATTERNS AND THE GREEK
CASE.....19

THE FLEXIBLE SPECIALISATION APPROACH AND THE
GREEK CASE:.....27

THE GREEK CASE AND SOME "NEO-FORDIST" ASPECTS THE
NIDL APPROACH.....34

CONCLUSIONS.....44

APPENDIX NO.146

CHAPTER 2

POST-WAR FORMS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
WORK. PATTERNS AND LABOUR RELATIONS IN
GREECE:PERIOD 1960-1975

GREEK ECONOMY AND SOCIETY BEFORE 1960: THE
BACKGROUND.....50

THE INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE GREEK ECONOMY IN THE
1960'S.....56

THE PRESERVATION OF THE TRADITIONAL PATTERNS OF
ECONOMY AND THE EXPANSION OF THE SERVICE
ECONOMY AFTER THE 1970'S:.....59

THE PRE-FORDIST CHARACTER OF GREECE

INDUSTRIALISATION.....65

FEATURES OF LABOUR PATTERNS, LABOUR RELATIONS
AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITIES OF PRE-FORDIST
INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE 1960'S-1970'S: THE BACK-
GROUND.....69

Work Patterns and State Policies:.....74

FLEXIBLE FORMS OF WORK EMPLOYMENT AND
PAYMENT.....77

Forms of Labour Flexibility in the 1960's and mid-
1970's:.....79

CONCLUSIONS.....89

CHAPTER 3

THE GREEK ECONOMIC RECESSION IN THE MID-1970'S-
1980'S. ECONOMIC AND LABOUR RESTRUCTURING
POLICIES

THE CHARACTER OF THE CRISIS OF THE GREEK ECONOMY
IN THE MID-1970'S AND IN THE 1980'S.....92

CRISIS, WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENTS, STATE LABOUR
POLICIES AND EMPLOYERS' RESPONSES:

1975-1985.....96

The attitudes of Greek employers and economic policies of the
Greek state towards the crisis until the mid-
1980's:.....101

THE CHARACTER OF THE RESTRUCTURING SHIFTS IN
GREECE IN THE LATE 1980'S AND EARLY 1990'S AND
LABOUR FLEXIBILITY.....112

Contemporary labour strategies.....113

THE IMPACTS OF, AND TRENDS FOLLOWED BY, THE STATE
AND EMPLOYERS' ECONOMIC AND LABOUR STRATEGIES
IN LATE 1980'S AND EARLY 1990'S IN GREECE:.....121

CONCLUSIONS.....

CHAPTER 4

THE ECONOMIC AND LABOUR PROFILE OF LARGE INDUSTRIES IN THE GREATER AREA OF ATTICA DISTRICT IN THE 1980'S: CURRENT LABOUR POLICIES AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY

THE CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH AND SOME METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES.....132

PREFACE.....137

MAIN TABLES OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY A & B.....139

THE CASE OF UPWARD AND DYNAMIC FIRMS.....145

THE CASE OF "INTERMEDIATE" FIRMS.....153

THE CASE OF "DOWNWARD" FIRMS.....158

CONCLUSION.....166

CHAPTER 5

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....180

APPENDIX No.1.....192

APPENDIX No.2.....194

APPENDIX No.3.....197

LIST OF THE TABLES OF THE SURVEY AND THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.....218

TABLES OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY AND THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS.....222

REFERENCES.....	276
Books.....	276
Articles.....	287
Reports- Surveys - Pamphlets.....	297

PREFACE

This study has attempted to relate the present debate on economic and labour restructuring of late capitalist societies in the 1980's, and on flexibility as the assumed key feature of such a restructuring to the Greek case.

My interest in focusing this study on the relation of the flexibility debate to the Greek case, through the exploration of both the literature of such a debate, as well as the post-war Greek pattern of development in economy and labour until nowadays has emanated from the following reasons:

A significant part of the literature concerning the crisis of the 1980's the attempts at the restructuring of late capitalist industrial societies, as well as flexibility aspects within them, has not been extensively presented in Greece at least in the form of an academic debate. Instead very often several aspects of such debates, particularly stressing on labour flexibility issues, have been treated in an unquestionable and selective way by state representatives, managers, employers, politicians and journalists, but also on the part of Trade Unions and the political parties both from the leftist and the right wing point of view. In fact, though not expressed in an academic form but in a political and journalistic form, several aspects of such debates have been strongly involved and influenced both Trade Unions and other social movements and the Greek politics too.

VIII-

Furthermore, several aspects of the literature concerning the debates on crisis, restructuring in the 1980's and flexibility issues present in my view theoretical difficulties in themselves.

One of the most important ones is the "too abstract" levels in which such debates have moved so far, and by contrast their lesser attention to relating their arguments with 1) particular modes of production, and socio-economic regulation (including their political and cultural aspects) of different regions, countries and areas of socio-economic activities, and 2) the content of their interweaving and interaction with international processes.

These issues are addressed in more detail in the first chapter of this study through an exploration of the problems that the flexibility debate bears particularly with reference to regions or countries like Greece that had not extensively undergone a Fordist past in their development.

Acknowledging the above-mentioned evaluations this study attempts further to examine the Greek case in relation to the flexibility debate with reference to the following issues.

The content, forms, as well as the character of socio-economic patterns of development which Greece followed in the post-war years until the present, in relation to labour patterns and labour relations (including their flexible aspects) that have taken place in the process of that development. More specifically I will attempt to establish that Greece, among others, is a regional case

that has not experienced in the past any extensive Fordist type of development. Instead it was developed as a peripheral economy of Fordist centres, and created its own particular forms of capital accumulation and economic regulation, as well as participation in the I.D.L. (International Division of Labour).

In this perspective, I will attempt to present both the content and the form of the Greek pattern of socio-economic development, as well as their interaction with the Fordist advanced European countries with which Greece had been more closely involved within two distinctive periods.

First the 1960's until the mid-1970's as a period in which attempts at industrialisation and further more advanced economic development accelerated in Greece. The processes that took place in this period are discussed in the second chapter, in relation to and in the context of the labour patterns that had been put into practice in Greece.

Second the mid 1970's until the late 1980's in which de-industrialization and further an acute crisis of the previous developmental pattern of Greece had taken place.

Through such an exploration I will present the extent, the character, and the prospects of the attempted economic and labour restructuring (including their flexibility issues) that followed the crisis of the Greek economy in the 1980's. The main assumption may be considered to be that such attempts of restructuring involving flexibility issues have a different character as well as dynamics in the case of Greece, a country which has not

extensively experienced a "Fordist" past, compared to the character of the recent restructuring attempts of the other more advanced industrial societies on the European and international stage.

In this context, I shall also attempt to illustrate the particular factors that have led the Greek socio-economic and labour patterns to crisis and I will examine the different categories of Greek capital responses and state policies towards it. All these issues are presented in detail in the third chapter of this study.

Finally, I will emphasise my interest in the responses towards the crisis and the character of the subsequent restructuring attempts, on the part of large-scale firms in Greece, in the empirical part of this study which is presented in the fourth chapter. This is due to my interest in the dynamics and constraints of the ongoing restructuring attempts on the part of a relatively more advanced field of economic activities of capital in Greece that had influenced, to a great extent, the shaping of the post-war developmental pattern of Greece. It is also because the exploration of large capital's responses towards the crisis of the 1980's is likely to reflect the dynamics as well as constraints of any broader restructuring steps, in Greek economy at present.

These issues suggested by the findings of our empirical research as well as by other recent studies on the topic are particularly addressed in the fourth chapter and the conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER 1

THEORETICAL DEBATES OF THE 1980'S ON ECONOMIC AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY AND THE GREEK CASE

The acute crisis of capital over-accumulation that emerged in the mid-1970's and 1980's was expressed in escalating production costs, stagnating economic and labour productivity and, on a macro-economic level, in steady stagflation phenomena in almost all the industrialised societies, at a European and also at an international stage. So far, several different approaches have been presented as interpretations of the crisis of the 1970's and 1980's. However a whole range of scholars have attributed this crisis to the rigidities that Fordism, as a model of capital accumulation and socio-economic regulation, gave rise to, during the period of Post-war development (For more details with reference to Fordism as a term see Appendix A1).

Broadly speaking, the most important 'rigidities' of the Fordist model can be related to the following problems:

(a) On the level of production

1) Difficulties with regard to the fast and smooth adjustment of the production process to both quantitative and qualitative changes in market demands.

2) The lack of sufficient cooperation and control with regard to the flows of inputs and outputs of complex technological capital and intermediate products due to the geographical dispersion of production units.



3) The staggering cost of the stocks (in terms of materials, mechanical equipment, and also in terms of maintenance services) that agglomerate forms of post-war production required for their performance.

4) Problems of distance and, therefore, of fast and adequate cooperation and adjustment of firms with their suppliers and buyers.

5) Insufficient control with reference to the quality of the products and services in increasingly much more competitive markets.

(b) On the labour process:

Difficulties for the Taylorist managerial methods¹ in increasing the actual efficiency and interest at work as well as the fast readjustment and the integration of work tasks, as necessary. As a consequence problems of continuous boycotts and absenteeism on the part of the workforces were becoming increasingly apparent.

(c) On the level of the state, and further mechanisms of socio-economic regulation that basically used to take place on a national level:

Insufficiency of the post-war Keynesian state policies was evident due to the progressive internationalisation process in both

¹ (enhancing restrictive forms of work organisation, high dispersion of tasks, and also low levels of skills)

production and markets in general, and by the relocation of significant parts of multinationals activities (both finance and production) to low wage and politically restrictive economies and societies (such as to NIC'S of 1960s - 1970s) in particular.

2. The appearance of increasing disparities with regard to the correlation of the increases in the workforce's payments and other welfare benefits, as well as of employment opportunities, with the increases in the productivity of capital. As a result these disparities challenged in turn, the whole edifice of the socio-economic regulation that had characterised post-war advanced industrial societies and increased uncertainty and broader economic and socio-political problems.

3. Nevertheless, on a more theoretical level, the crisis of capital over-accumulation of the mid 1970s - 1980s may be seen as a result of lack of correspondence of the Fordist Forms of mass production to mass consumption capacities and demands, that overall can not secure available terms for the continuation of the "expanded reproduction of capital"².

The crisis of mid 1970's and 1980's was followed by attempts towards an extensive restructuring of several aspects of the production technological organisation and labour structures by

² (for more detailed interpretation of the reasons for the crisis in the 1980s see Harvey, 1987; Storper Scott, 1988; Sayer, 1986; Coria, 1979; Lipietz, 1986, 1987; Aglietta, 1979, 1982; Perez Freeman, 1986; Limberaki, 1988; Georgakopoulou, 1990).

which these societies had previously operated, particularly in the post-war era.

In the 1980s the concept of economic and labour flexibility became the strategic key-feature in economic and labour restructuring. This was in contrast to the "rigidities" of the previous Fordist forms of Post-war capitalist development that were considered to have contributed to the crisis. In fact, labour flexibility was seen as the means for a successful way out of this crisis, and also of regaining, through new "paths" of development, a new long-term capital productivity and profitability as well as the continuation of the further socio-economic and political efficiency of late capitalist societies (Wood, 1989; Cooke, 1989, Morris Blyton, 1990).

Focusing our interest in theoretical debates that have followed the aforementioned processes in the 1980's, it might be argued that such theoretical debates on labour flexibility have begged answers to two sets of questions:

The first set has paid attention to the following issues: Are there indeed new labour policies underway? What is their content and their form? Is flexibility their key-characteristic? And if so, which forms of flexibility seem to be put into practice? What are the reasons for imposing them, and what may be their impact on current regional, national, and international attempts to secure a broader socio-economic development of the workforce?

The second set has been mainly interested in relating flexibility issues to the following broader questions:

Do these new flexible labour strategies mean a radical transformation of the previous work patterns? Are they indeed related to restructuring tendencies of entire modes of capital accumulation and economic regulation of the Fordist advanced societies on a national and international level? In addition, to what extent do they differentiate or by contrast radically change the social relations of late capitalist societies?

In the light of the above mentioned questions the flexibility concept can be debated from several points of view. If this is the case, this study will basically attempt to focus its interest on the relation of the most important debates on the issue, to the case of an economy which is non Fordist but peripheral to Fordist economies, like that of Greece.

Let us first discuss the most important theoretical concepts with regard to the present economic and labour restructuring changes, and labour flexibility in particular, relating them as necessary to the Greek case.

At the risk of speaking schematically, four main 'schools' have been most closely identified in the flexibility debate, each emphasising different views and focuses with regard to the examination of the flexibility concept. These may be considered:

1. Atkinson and Meager's concept of the Flexible Firm (1985, 1986, NEDO, 1986, 1988) which originated in the theory of dualism of labour markets in the mid-1970s (Doeringer and Piore, 1971).

2. The post-Fordist aspects of Flexible Specialisation (Brusco, 1983; Piore and Sabel, 1984; Kern and Schumman, 1984; Tolliday and Zeitling, 1986).

3. The old and more recent elaborations of 'Labour Process' concepts (Braverman, 1974; Armstrong, 1988; Cohen, 1987; Thompson, 1989).

4. The alternative to numbers 2 and 3, namely the Regulation school which lies in what used to be called the New Fordist school. (Aglietta, 1979, 1982; Lipietz, 1982, 1983, 1985, 1986, 1987; Boyer, Coria, 1986; Boyer, 1988).

Each of these, to my view, belongs to one of the two following categories according to their emphasis within the flexibility debate.

1. The first, namely the "Flexible Firm" school, has mainly a practical interest, focusing on the exploration of what actual types of work and employment flexibility recent managerial policies have called for from their workforces at a firm level. This school has overwhelmingly drawn its concepts from the British experience but also, up to a point, from the European one.

The Flexible Firm approach has been interested merely in assessing, in general terms, assumed current needs for British and other European firms, namely to combine practices which would enable organisations to adjust to both market and technological changes more quickly, smoothly, and cheaply, especially in

recessional economic periods like that of the 1980's. (see NEDO, 1986).

2. The three other "schools" (namely the post-Fordist aspects versus the "labour process" objections and the neo-Fordist aspects as a theoretical compromise of the former two) are interested not merely in the exploration of the managerial shifts in work and employment policies due to partial and temporary needs of the crisis in the 1980's, but have been concerned with broader needs and interests of late capitalist industrial societies in restructuring their entire patterns of capital accumulation and economic regulation. This interest is derived from the relatively similar assumptions of the three schools on the permanent and not merely temporary character of the crisis of the mid 1970's-1980's, that it originated in problems of the whole mode of capital accumulation and economic regulation in which post-war forms of Fordist-Taylorist development had arisen.

More specifically, the "Labour Process approach", although in its more recent elaborations it has in part acknowledged the serious internal problems on the Fordist-Taylorist model of post-war development, has asserted that despite whatever partial changes there are, present capitalist societies cannot continue to exist beyond Fordism as a model of production and Taylorism as a model of organising and controlling labour³.

³ This is due to the fact that the 'labour process' approach, in my view, seems to have strictly identified the post-war form of Fordism and Taylorism with a broader form of capitalist development that was fundamentally crucial for the preservation and

Post-Fordist and neo-Fordist though, have debated the extreme aspects of this literature from different points of view, namely the identification of the Post-war Fordist and Taylorist Form of Economy and Labour with a broader stage of capitalist development characterised by the direct submission of labour under capital.

Thus, although both post-Fordist and neo-Fordist approaches have shared the view that Fordist and Taylorist models, as they were expressed in the post-war era, underwent significant changes in the 1980's, in particular, they do not have the same view in evaluating the extent and character of these changes.

More specifically the Post-Fordist approach assumes that the character of those changes is going to challenge fundamentally the entire edifice of Fordism and Taylorism as a model of capitalist production and economic regulation and, in some aspects, the simultaneous challenge by such a process to the extent of capital's domination over labour. The neo-Fordist accounts have interpreted late capitalist societies, (despite several changes of the forms by which these operate at present) as still Fordist economies still using a Taylorist managerial framework of organising and controlling labour, however, to a certain extent having eliminated in particular fields of their organisation, the extreme restrictive forms of Taylorism (e.g. high dispersion of

further development as well as domination of capitalist modes of production, namely that of the direct submission of labour under capital.

tasks, too much specialisation of performances, separation of conception from execution and so on). In brief the neo-Fordist approach has sought to defend the principal assumptions of the labour process theory, making them less rigid by later more plausible, theoretical elaborations on new alternative forms of organising and regulating production, labour, and further the economy and society by which the principal features that have characterised Fordism and Taylorism may continue to exist.

Let us discuss in more detail the most important aspects of the aforementioned debates on economic and labour restructuring in the 1980's and on the flexibility issue (as one of their central features), and identify some of their theoretical difficulties in general, and with reference to a socio-economic pattern like that of Greece which is 'peripheral' to Fordist economies.

THE FLEXIBLE FIRM'S NOTION OF FLEXIBILITY AND THE GREEK CASE:

1. The concept of the Flexible firm has presupposed that present firms' strategies are increasingly oriented to applying new flexible labour policies that could ease the external and internal adaptability of enterprises to both new technological changes, and also their occasional production and market needs, by simultaneously deploying forms of numerical, functional and payment flexibility.

The first form of flexibility (numerical), is concerned with firms' quantitative capacity to adjust their inputs to fluctuations of outputs. This type of flexibility may be achieved by the firms'

resorting to a supplementary workforce in addition to the permanent one, whose size, duration, and status of employment (including payments) will be more suitable for the fluctuations of production and of the market (e.g. such forms could be part-time, temporary short-term contracts, subcontracting, but also overtime and shift-work forms which can ease the above mentioned target).

The second type of flexibility (functional), is concerned with firms' ability to deploy the skills of their work-force in a way that can match the tasks required by their changing workload, and especially by changing production methods, or their technological means in the long term. It requires, in this sense, versatility of the workforce to work with, and between, jobs in either the vertical or the horizontal integration of work tasks. (see NEDO, 1986).

The third form of flexibility (Payment Flexibility), involves the displacement of the previous relatively stable status of, and level of, payment with more varied and individual flexible forms which seek a more closed relationship between reward and individual contribution to the final output, and/or their adjustment to the occasional production or market financial capacities. Such forms of payments are those that are based in commercial, subcontracted and further short-term contracted work, but also the work performance related forms of pay and profit sharing, with reference to both the permanent and the temporary personnel.

Whilst functional flexibility seems to correspond to long-term, more permanent and advanced internal and external adjustments of firms, seeking more advanced changes of the whole productive and labour pattern of firms' economic activity, (dynamic flexibility), numerical and payment flexibility seems to serve the external temporary adjustment of the firms to the fluctuation of their production or the market, without any extensive changes in their production, technological, organisational, and labour patterns in more advanced terms (Static Flexibility)⁴.

2. Alongside the above mentioned strategies, the Flexible Firm concept has also assumed the establishment of a kind of a dualistic regime not merely in production processes but also with reference to the workforce that is involved in the three forms of flexibility including:

1. A Core category "a la Japanese model" (as that has been conceptualized by Atkinson's concepts) which, in terms of labour is identified by its involvement in "functionally flexible forms" of performances having a more advanced character and role in the firms' operation (e.g. by being involved in highly skilled or/and multi-skilled work as well as forms of more cooperative and participatory labour). Due to its "core" functional character, this part of the labour-force gains simultaneously a higher self-

⁴ (for more information with reference to the content of Dynamic and Static Flexibility see R. Boyer, 1987).

satisfaction from actual work, and a more privileged status of employment and payments.

2. A peripheral category the content of whose work status and duration of employment, as well as their payments, are directly adjusted to the occasional fluctuation of firms to production and market demands. This category has been identified in Atkinson's model with a less skilled or unskilled labour and therefore devalued, or in the best case surely less advanced than the "core" one, in terms of work, employment and payments.

The concept of "Flexible Firm" has been criticised from various points of view such as:

1. To what extent it mirrors similar strategies widely underway on the part of British firms and more over, of firms on the European and international stage.

2. To what degree these policies constitute something new or should they be seen as a continuation, or a partial modification, of traditional practices on which certain firms or particular economic activities have called for in the past. (see Pollert, 1988; Wood, 1989; Brown, 1990; Jones, 1988; Blyton, Morris, 1990).

Let us pay attention to the two most important difficulties arising from the Flexible Firm concept, in general, and with reference to the Greek case in particular.

1) In terms of economic productivity and mainly economic profitability which is assumed to be a current goal of present state

and firms' policies, functional flexibility may not always go together with numerical flexibility and vice-versa.

The "synchronization" of the aims of functional and numerical flexibility, and the actual forms that those policies are usually deploying must not be taken for granted. In some economies such as the Greek one, and presumably in specific less advanced sectors and patterns of economic activity, that also exist within advanced Fordist industrial societies, productivity and profitability are not necessarily closely related to the simultaneous involvement of technological or organisational innovations, and their application in the production and labour processes.

Furthermore, technological modernisation processes are not always followed by more advanced organisational patterns neither managerial nor labour (Coria 1990). Therefore, they may not necessitate forms of functional flexibility to be deployed by the workforce as these have been conceived by the concept of the Flexible Firm supplemented by numerical and payment forms of flexibility. Instead, state or firms' policies, by solely or mainly retaining and expanding, to different degrees, an assimilated to the "peripheral" and flexibly organised work-force, and at the expense of the "core one" (by devaluing the latter's status of employment and payments), may have similarly a "functional role" in economic patterns, which still heavily depend for their productivity on cheap labour, and on the intensification of the work-force such as that of Greece particularly in recessional periods like the 1980's.

In this equally possible scenario, "modest" forms of technological modernisation may take place without necessarily being followed by any extensive functional flexibility targets that often presuppose more advanced organisational and labour shifts. This, to my view, is at present the main interest behind entire state policies and employers' actual practices in Greece in the early 1990's.

2. In terms of the work, employment and payment status of both "core" and "peripheral" workforces, things may be also more complex and multi-faceted than the concept of the "Flexible Firm" has assumed. Concepts that need more investigation are: the actual forms that the core periphery dichotomy may have, and more specifically the extent to which firstly, the "core" is solely identified with only functional forms of flexibility and the "periphery" with numerical ones, and secondly, the degree to which the functional work-force is necessarily characterised by more advanced work, employment and payment features compared to the non-functional work-force.

To be more specific, not merely in Greece, but in supposedly more advanced industrialised countries, certain parts of the workforce may not always become uniformly devalued with sole reference to their less functional significance, and also with reference, to their work, employment, and payment status, even if their formal features (e.g. the forms of their contracts) are similar to those of the "peripheral" workforce as this has been conceptualized in Atkinson's model. For instance, such an

evaluation is to a certain extent relevant to several advanced professions that are still performed on a liberal basis. Instead, such "peripheral" categories in terms of the forms of their contracts may also involve:

First: labour performances of the "core" having a "functional" significance and role for particular firms or certain fields of economic activity. For instance, information and computer services, as well as lawyers and civil engineers' economic activities in Greece, although of a crucial significance, have mainly been based on contracted or sub-contracted work.

Second: in terms of status of work they may also enhance people of advanced professional technical or administrative work and therefore usually of a more creative character.

Third: in terms of payment status, they may sell their labour power on a higher level than a certain part of the permanent categories of the workforce, due in part to their professions or skills, and also their actual involvement in important "core" production or service activities as well as, perhaps, due to capacities that the independent character of their jobs give them in so doing.

In the Greek case, a certain part of these privileged categories of employees, seems to have adapted to both old and new flexible work and employment patterns, coexisting alongside the non privileged, low skilled, low paid, and not permanently employed "peripheral" categories of the workforce. By contrast a certain part of the Greek "core" work-force, even if this had

played a "functional role" in certain fields of economic activity, neither in the past nor at the present, has been characterised by distinctively more advanced work, employment and payment conditions.⁵

Furthermore, functional and numerical types of flexibility may overlap each other, both in terms of production's functional interests, and also in terms of the workforce's work, employment, and payment regime. Greece may also be considered as a case of economy in which both past and existing work patterns have shown this overlapping form of flexibility.

For instance, a significant part of the "core" workforce in Atkinsons' view, due to the restrictive income policies on the part of the Greek state, has both in the past and at present taken up "multiple jobs" or "supplementary" self-employment forms of work. These multiple job forms included features that were assimilated sometimes more to the "core" category, and sometimes more to the "peripheral" one (according to Atkinson's classification criteria). Therefore such forms could include at the same time:

(a) both functional work tasks, and also numerical ones,

(b) and a more complex regime of employment and payments which was, in part, assimilated to the regime of "peripheral workforce", and in part to that of the "core" one.

⁵ (See Papageorgiou, 1988 with regard to the current problems of the top and senior staff in the Greek Firms).

As we will present in more detail in the following chapters this more complex dualistic form of multiple employment, enabled the limited industrialised sectors of the Greek economy to gain an economic productivity and profitability, for a certain period. This was overwhelmingly based on the prolonged reproduction of a very cheap and intensified labour, through the above mentioned ability (multiple work). Past and recent state and employers' policies in Greece, have encouraged directly and indirectly this peculiar dualistic type of multiple employment usually characterised by a high degree of informality, not merely for economic profitability reasons, but also socio-political ones. For instance, the preservation of a relatively non-conflicting social and political climate was possible due to the relaxation of the very low incomes of the Greek workforce, as well as of acute unemployment through the ability of such under-paid categories of the workforce to resort to these flexible forms of multiple employment and therefore acquire additional incomes.

Nevertheless, by doing so, Greek state and employers' policies discouraged, in macro-terms, the expansion of industrialisation and further of a more advanced developmental pattern, preventing increases in productivity and competitiveness, by technological and organisational improvements and labour skill upgrading.

Generalising, it may be argued that Atkinson's model has indeed mirrored, to my view, current dualistic labour strategies on the part of some advanced industrial societies in general and

fields of economic activity in particular, as well as on the part of the EEC and OECD. These have been oriented to correspond both from a higher technological and work organisation, as well as from a socio-political point of view (e.g. being at the same time capable of preventing, through attempts at technological modernisation more acute forms of unemployment) to new economic adjustments necessary after the 1980's crisis, for the regaining of their capital productivity, and further their economic profitability. However, even if such targets, in general terms, are in place on the part of the above-mentioned organisations and several European States' policies, they are not always identical to those assumed by the flexible firm school, neither in terms of interest nor in terms of the actual forms by which these targets are put into practice, reflecting in this way different dynamics and constraints of uneven socio-economic and political patterns in which these strategies are oriented in application.

Concluding, Greece as a case of a peripheral economy challenges the extensive existence of the model of the "flexible firms" on the level of particular firms, even of the most advanced ones, since through my empirical study and the presentation of other studies on the topic, the wide range of Greek firms does not seem to be oriented to a simultaneous goal of both gaining dynamic internal and external flexibilities of their economic and labour patterns. Instead they are presented to a great extent as being interested in their still heavy support by numerical (or otherwise quantitative) forms of labour flexibility for certain

reasons that we will examine later. Furthermore, the flexible firm model is also challenged even on the level of the entire current state's interests and actual policies. More specifically it is challenged on the extent to which even in terms of national or broad managerial targets, the needs as well as the interests that the concept of the "flexible firm" has implied are actually existent, such as the more advanced technological, organisational, and labour modernisation, accompanied with forms of functional flexibility, with regard to the wide range of Greek economy⁶.

POST-FORDIST ASPECTS ON THE TRANSFORMATION OF WORK AND DEVELOPMENTAL PATTERNS AND THE GREEK CASE

Post-Fordist views of the "F.S. school"⁷ have asserted that industrial societies of the 1980's have undergone, or are about to experience dramatic shifts, manifesting not merely temporary and partial economic and labour readjustments, but more permanent processes radically transforming production, labour, employment and managerial patterns in late industrialised societies, and in some aspects of the "F.S. school", their social relations too. (Schuman, 1994, Piore and Sabel, 1984, 1986; Tolliday and Zeitlin, 1986).

⁶(see Report of the Greek Parliament on the new legislative act about the developmental planning and the industrial relations, July 1990, and plan of convergence of Greek economy to the European Unification goals, presented to the ECOFIN'S commission by the Minister of National Economy, March 1993).

⁷ Flexible specialisation school = 'F.S. school' for abbreviation reasons.

According to the "F.S. school" concepts, a) new technological capacities (via the incorporation of new advanced technology in firms' production or service performance), b) consumption related problems that emerged after the crisis of the mid '70s and '80s (fragile markets), c) as well as new consumption interest and needs, which contrary to the past, give priority to design, quality and better service schemes (and not solely to low prices), have led to a break with the Fordist regime of mass production oriented to mass consumption and subsequently of Taylorism as the dominant form of organising and controlling labour.

Subsequently the above-mentioned factors gradually encourage trends towards the establishment of an alternative production and economic regime characterised by flexibly disaggregated, and locally based production and consumption patterns, supplemented by new forms of integration (mainly in the finance sphere) on a regional, national and international level.

Such a process in turn, dramatically lowers the necessity for retaining traditional Taylorist patterns of labour organisation, work content, and managerial control over labour. Instead the new form of the 'flexibly specialised production' that is underway, necessitates:

(a) the creation and generating of similarly flexible functional patterns of work (e.g. more integrated and cooperative) supplemented by an upgrading of the workforce's skills and the increasing of its multi-skilled capacities, and

(b) the loosening of an excessive regulation and strict managerial control, and its replacement with more decentralised and participatory forms, giving more autonomy, initiative and responsibility to the workforce, progressively making, in this way, more harmonious relationships between managements and employees. In "post-Fordist" views such a process is also encouraged due to the increasing realisation of the significance of the "human capital" performance, or at least due to the growing recognition on the part of present managements, that restrictive work-organisations, that have been experienced in post-war Fordist economies, are no longer productive (Kern and Schuman, 1987).

Let us present some similarities and by contrast some differences between "Flexible Firm" concept, and that of the "F.S. school", attempting to interpret present difficulties in the flexibility debate.

(1) The "Flexible Firm school" approach has, in my view, implicitly rather than explicitly paid attention to the present difficulties of accelerating advanced technological innovations, and also their application in production and service activities as the unique medium of increasing capital productivity. This is due to both technical difficulties and reasons directly related to economic profitability (e.g. high cost of technological modernisation) as well as, up to a point, socio-political reasons (e.g. compensating by the use of flexible job forms a direct and distinctive elimination of the employment that is likely to follow

the attempts at technological modernisation, with underemployment forms). Therefore it has implied the necessity of a still strong dependency of firms' productivity and economic profitability on old modes of capital accumulation that in Atkinson's concepts are mainly expressed by the need even of the most advanced firms to also resort to "peripheral" cheap labour, flexibly adjusted to the occasional "economic conjuncture" alongside the more advanced categories of the workforce's. By contrast the concept of the "F.S School" has ignored or in the best case has under-estimated such difficulties (Murray, 1987; Pollert, 1988).

(2) Furthermore, "F.S. school" concepts have exaggerated, to my view, current advanced restructuring trends (organisational, sectoral, technological, labour) of previous Fordist-Taylorist economies on a production level, while they have paid less attention to certain already applied macro-economic strategies basically oriented to the undermining of the post-war regime of economic regulation, in several aspects concerning labour that have been considered as being "rigid" to the present forms of capital's operation⁸. However, these strategies that the "F.S School" concept has paid less attention to, reflect at a macro-economic stage the present need of capital that Atkinson's model

⁸ These strategies are basically mirrored in practices oriented towards the deregulation of certain benefits that a significant part of the workforce had gained in the post-war period. Such benefits could be considered to be (a) the extensive welfare state policies, (b) the establishment of a kind of correlation of the increases in capital productivity, with corresponding increase of the workforce's payments (through the post-war 'fair pay' state policies), (c) the extensive application of relatively standard forms of employment, to mention only some of the most important ones.

of flexibility has implied at a micro-firm level. This need is concerned with the supplementation of not merely particular firms, but entire industrial economies, even of those which are the most advanced, alongside their more advanced restructuring attempts (technological, organisational, labour etc.) and in part because of them, by old forms of capital accumulation, that had, in part, been undermined for a certain period, during the post-war Fordist type of economic and labour regulation (Rubery, Wilkinson, Tarling, 1987).

In brief, the 'F.S. school' views seem to have exaggerated both the interest in advanced technological and organisational improvement, and also the capacities of firms to do so to a greater extent, than Atkinson's model of "Flexible Firm". As a result they have conceived one dimensionally the functional forms of flexibility, that their entire concepts have implied as targets of the present firms, as the unique process being underway at present, reflecting in this way a conceptual exaggeration of the present role of new technologies in increasing the economic productivity and profitability of capital, and further changing broader socio-economic relations.

The "F.S. School" concept has been strongly challenged so far for some additional reasons related to the above-mentioned ones.

Firstly, they do not mirror realistically what economic production and work changes are indeed occurring at present insofar as the large scale of economic activities of late capitalist

societies are concerned. For instance, the reemergence of some traditional medium and small scale economic activities that was evident after the recession in the 1980's in some regions, sectors, or particular fields of economic activities, has been often identified in the "F.S. School" views with trends assumed to be underway oriented towards the establishment of a new advanced "flexible specialisation regime". However, such a process in certain cases manifested only a temporary and defensive response towards the recession of "Fordist" economies in the 1980's without at the same time orienting, both in terms of interest and also capacity, towards more a advanced restructuring, assimilated to "F.S. School" prescriptions⁹.

In certain cases this process also presented new forms that still dominant "Fordist" economic patterns have resorted to, supplementing their production or service performances (e.g by the decentralisation of their activities, through sub-contracting forms with medium and small firms). (Boyer, Coria 1986; Cohen, 1988).

Furthermore, critics have challenged the degree to which (from both a consumption, but also from a capital profitability point of view) the "Fordist" model of mass-production, oriented to mass consumption, is going to be radically replaced at present by flexible fragmented productive units and markets.

⁹(Hudson, 1989 with regard to the case of the restructuring of the old industrial regions in relation to the topic, Hanjimihalis, Vaiou, 1989' 1990 on the Greek case).

In these views, rather than such a process being orientated to replace mass production forms, it seems more systematically than in the past to supplement them (Storper, Scott 1988; Sayer, 1989; Coria, 1990). In addition, with regard to the wide range of more advanced economic activities, rather than the "end of mass production", less radical modifications of the Fordist model are taking place. These are expressed either by more sophisticated technological infrastructure (e.g. in information, planning of production and marketing fields) or by the application of more flexible organisational and labour patterns capable of securing both internal and external adaptability of firms. This is achieved by externalising, and decentralising one part of their activity through either contracting or sub-contracting horizontally or vertically.

These more flexible production and labour patterns may lead to products of a higher quality than in the past, which are more easily or rapidly diversified, or even changed according to the new market needs, but which are still, in so far as their wide range is concerned, being produced in mass production forms, and basically gaining high profitability, due to their capacities to penetrate to advanced mass markets¹⁰.

¹⁰ For example, the alternative to the F.S. school's interpretations, with regard to the restructuring forms in the 1980's and 1990's, namely the 'flexible automation' concept, has drawn its examples from Japan and other European countries, whose present economic and labour strategies are more or less assimilated to the above mentioned description. They mirror in this way the existence of alternative paths of economic and labour transformations than of those that the 'F.S.' approach has assumed

Secondly, they have not merely over emphasized the capacity of extensive modernisation which is non-existent today, but also the interest in technological improvements in isolation from further patterns of domination in present capitalist societies. This is to say that even if a decentralisation trend of capitalist production is underway, it is debatable whether this can easily dispute the general domination of capital over labour, and furthermore change broader capitalist relations of these societies (Wood, 1989; Blyton Morris, 1991).

Thirdly, the end of Taylorism as a form of organising and controlling labour has also been strongly debated, particularly as directly attributed in some views of the "F.S. approach", to the application of new technologies and genuine functional organisational work patterns, even in the most advanced productive units and fields of economic activities that exist at present.¹¹

Furthermore, critics have tended to agree that rather than the "end of Taylorism" as still a dominant trend, what seems to be actually happening in the wide range of firms in even the most advanced economic activities is a variety of slight or more radical

as being the dominant ones at present (Sayer, 1988, Wood, 1989, Aggietta 1979, Storper and Scott, 1988, Hurvey, 1987).

¹¹ For example, empirical studies have argued that forms of organising and exerting control over labour are strongly dependent not merely on the technological needs of production, but also on the socio-political responses of their workforce even of those with more advanced work positions and work roles (Kelley, 1988; Hyman, R. 1988; Tomaney, 1990; Thompson 1989, on the differences between autonomy at work and control over labour process in the firms).

modifications of previous "Fordist and Taylorist" models, aiming at more integrated technological and organisational applications, and comprising more participatory work performances and labour relations than in the past. However, these operate neither in favour of their entire workforce, nor at the expense of the continuing need of managements to control work organisations (Wood, 1989; Blyton, Morris, 1990; Thompson, 1990; Sayer, 1988).

Finally, they have ignored different socio-economic patterns, not having an advanced "Fordist" past, and therefore possibly demanding other alternatives at their restructuring attempts, than those that "F.S School" concepts have assumed. I will discuss this issue in more detail, with reference to the Greek case, in the following section (Lipietz, 1987; Sayer, 1988; Wood, 1989).

THE FLEXIBLE SPECIALISATION APPROACH AND THE GREEK CASE:

The "F.S. school" concept cannot easily fit with socio-economic patterns similar to those of Greece. A basic argument that should supposedly be capable of supporting the viability of the "F.S. School" scenario of development, with reference to socio-economic patterns which are peripheral to Fordist economies, like that of Greece is the following: several features that these socio-economic patterns usually present, though from a mass production point of view they are considered only as disadvantages, could secure, under certain circumstances, a

modern, advanced, and in some leftist views, more democratised developmental choice, for the less advanced peripheral economies (Limberaki, 1988). Such features might be presented as the existence of small (batch) markets in those societies, as well as the still extensive preservation of more flexible small and medium scale economic activities (compared to the agglomerate forms) retaining, up to a point, some advantages of semi-craft production (e.g. in terms of design quality, high differentiation of their products), and overall operating to a great extent by a high degree of informality and therefore flexibility both in their economic and labour regimes.

However, several disadvantages that characterise peripheral economies (including Greece) challenge this assumption. This is due to the following reasons: the "F.S. school" scenario has implicitly presupposed the existence of features that are closely assimilated to more advanced productive, and further socio-economic patterns of development that have characterised post-war "Fordist" economies, but not peripheral ones. Such features are: a) a relatively higher level of technological and organisational development in the wide-range of those societies' economic activities; b) the existence of an extensive industrial tradition having achieved, to a certain extent, to develop and take advantage of economies of scale; c) the securing up to a certain point of an independent and harmonious productive basis (e.g. through the more or less equal development of both capital intermediate and consumerist industrial sectors); d) the existence

of an advanced service sector, and an adequate state infrastructure (through which the private, both large and medium scale economic activities have been facilitated); and finally a relatively high level of their workforce's skills and actual capacities at work that usually were not the case in economies having less developed industrial experience in the past.

This is an assumption that the "F.S. school" views have not merely explicitly presented in my view, but by contrast have paid little attention to its broader importance, with regard to the possibility of the materialisation of any advanced flexible specialization restructuring scenario in less advanced socio-economic patterns¹². However, the paradigms through which the "F.S. school" has drawn its theoretical concepts, reconfirm in themselves the above-mentioned theoretical underestimating. First of all because almost all of them originate in already advanced Fordist economies (like those of Italy, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, and in alternative forms, in Japan). Secondly, due to the fact that even in these advanced societies, these advanced

¹² This underestimation might be obvious e.g. through the observation of how the 'F.S. school' has treated the Fordist-Taylorist model of post-war capitalist development. In such views this model did not necessarily constitute 'the best way' that capitalist societies at that particular period had to go through (due to its higher efficiency both in economic and labour productivity terms,, given the stage of technological development, but also in socio-political terms, due to its capacity to directly exert control over labour). Instead the 'F.S. school' has treated Fordist-Taylorist form of post-war capitalist societies as simply one of the multiple possibilities that capitalist societies had to adopt, and one that casually had been finally adopted (not due to certain reasons that necessitated that model's expansion over the previous handicraft forms of capitalist development). See for further discussion on the topic 1) Lymberaki, 1988. 2) Brighton labour process group, 1977; 3) Kaplinski, 1987)

restructured economic patterns have not avoided getting rid of their still extensive resorting to, and supplementation by labour forms assimilated to the "old modes of capital accumulation" (Murray, 1987, Sayer, 1988 and Rainnie, A 1989).

In this context and contrary to very extreme critiques that reject any possibility for the viability of the 'F.S.' scenario¹³ - it may be argued that, even if such a scenario is also under certain circumstances one of the possible ways through which late capitalist societies can be successfully restructured securing further development through it, on any account its realisation presupposes an already existing and relatively advanced socio-economic and labour framework within which these new economic forms will successfully operate.

The importance of such an evaluation with reference to the viability of the "F.S." scenario to peripheral socio-economic patterns like the Greek one, can be re-confirmed through the following very recent experience with regard to the character and prospects that both large and medium/small capital's responses demonstrated towards the crisis of Greek economy in the late 1970's and the 1980's.

More specifically, in the case of Greece, a kind of restoration and further expansion of the traditional low productive and less advanced (in technological organisational and labour terms) medium and small scale economic activities were observed

¹³(e.g. Williams, 1987; Pollert, 1989)

in the late 1970's and early 1980's, followed by an increase in medium and small firms in both manufacturing and service sectors.

Such a process was characterised as a flexible response in some views towards the acute recession of the Greek economy of the 1980's, since through it these firms retained, up to a point, their profitability (Vergopoulos, 1992). However, on no account can this be considered as a process that was oriented towards more advanced restructuring attempts that could be assimilated both in terms of their interests, but also capacities, as well as of their final prospects, to those which 'F.S.' school approach has predicted.

As several recent studies on the topic pointed out¹⁴, and this study will also attempt to establish, the increase in the traditional medium and small size firms' economic activities in the 1980's, and the preservation of their economic profitability in a recessional period, were not combined with any extensive advanced restructuring attempts of their traditional low productive economic and labour structures. By contrast, it reinforced the following processes: bad expressions of competition emerged among those firms leading certain of them to bankruptcy, or to a distinctive elimination of the formal employment. In addition, the retaining of their profitability, despite their low productivity and also the low quality of their products or services, was often

¹⁴(see Limberaki, 1988; Rylmon, 1992; Karamessini, 1992; Giannitsis, 1992, 1987, KEPE on informal economy, 1992).

gained through their greater resorting to informality, and therefore flexibility of both of their economic and labour framework. This process was also heavily supported by state protectionist measures and grants, until the mid 1980's, and finally took temporary advantages in doing so from the fact that the markets that these economic activities had been oriented towards, were not yet so exposed to the more advanced forms of international competition.

In this context the re-emergence of the traditional basically medium and small size firms' activities in the 1980's, in the Greek case, manifested just a short-term defensive response of their still traditional low productive patterns towards the crisis, and was not followed by any kind of advanced restructuring attempts "a la F.S. scenario" with reference to the wide range of those firms' activities. Furthermore, via such a process, the further worsening of both the Greek economy's competitiveness on a European and international level, and of the Greek workforce's position was exacerbated.

Furthermore, the above-mentioned processes brought about, other priorities than those that "F.S. school" concepts have assumed, making possible a new kind of development to be also achieved from "peripheral" economies like Greece.

To be more specific, as far as the present needs of the wide range of Greek production are concerned, Greece among other non-Fordist economies in the past, and as an example of

failed NICS¹⁵ of the 1960's, rather than needing to overcome the Fordist model (as that was experienced in European and other advanced economies), seems to require, with reference to the wide range of its economic activities, the establishment of several features that post-war Fordist economies had developed. Attempts at the creation of a more competitive and productive modern economy, as a way of getting out of its economic crisis in the 1980's and gaining further development, seems to require if not in full terms a development of economies of scale, definitely certain economic activities of scale in particular competitive sectors. These, however, are not necessarily identified with their conglomeration as an organisational form. Such economic activities of scale (whether public or private ones) may be capable in turn of promoting extensive fixed capital investments, oriented to improve low technological organisational and labour capacities of both large and middle-small scale economic activities that are still widely spread in Greece¹⁶.

If this is the case, the "F.S. school" concepts do not merely inadequately mirror the content, the character, and the prospects of restructuring attempts of certain peripheral economies

¹⁵. NICS = New industrial countries

¹⁶ (e.g. by the establishment of new forms of management services, expansion of information facilities, sufficient infrastructure for organising their marketing and their wholesale and retail networks, extensive state policies towards the development of properly skilled workforce and so forth) (Vernardakis, 1989; Giannitsis, 1986, 1987, 1992; LyMBERAKI, 1988;).

like that of Greece, that are, to a great extent, dissociated from interests and goals, that the "F.S. school" has assumed, but it also has certain difficulties as an adequate scenario, for these economies' way out of their recession, and the securing of a new economic development in more advanced terms in the early 1990's.

THE GREEK CASE AND SOME "NEO-FORDIST" ASPECTS: THE NIDL APPROACH

Since neo-Fordist concepts, and particularly the Regulation schools approach, have supplemented our thoughts and also critiques on both the "Flexible Firm" and the "F.S. school's" views, let us pay attention to some particular aspects of the broad 'neo-Fordist' literature concerning more directly peripheral economies such as Greece, and more particularly to the "NIDL" approach¹⁷ (Lipietz, 1982, 1985; Froebel, 1980; Wallerstein, 1983).

This approach has been particularly interested in studying Fordist socio-economic patterns of production, work organisation, and socio-economic regulation, in relation to specific national/regional socio-economic patterns that had not extensively followed Fordist forms of capital accumulation and economic regulation (insofar as the wide range of their economies is concerned) such as the exploration of northern advanced European regions' development in relation with the less advanced

¹⁷ N.I.D.L approach = New International Division of Labour approach

developmental patterns of southern Europe including Greece (Lipietz, 1985; Wallerstein, Keyder, 1983).

In addition, the "NIDL approach" has been interested in studying current processes and forms of internationalisation of capitalist economies and their interaction with less advanced ones. More specifically it has been interested in exploring current shifts on the part of multinationals to relocate parts of their production to what was previously their "periphery" (e.g. the regions of Southern Europe) mainly because of assumed capacities for labour intensive production processes in low wage economies such as those of Portugal and Greece (Wood, 1989).

This scenario may be assumed in turn to include suitable work, management, and employment patterns for the above mentioned needs of relocated "labour intensive" manufacturing or service activities. Such work, management and employment patterns may be regarded as: Firstly, encouraging the continuation or restoration (in the case of non-existence) of Taylorist methods of organising low skilled, intensified and cheap labour; secondly, retaining quite strict and authoritative Taylorist forms of managerial control and regulation over labour.

In brief such a scenario can be regarded as one that is basically oriented to and presupposes for its successful materialisation the restoration of a sort of a "neo-Taylorist model", being deprived of advanced technological, organisation and labour improvements, and also of relatively advanced, both for the economy and workforce, forms of Fordist types of

economic regulation similar to those of advanced European economies of the past.

What may be the relation between the above mentioned "developmental scenario" for peripheral economies like Greece and the flexibility debate?

1) From a methodological point of view it may be considered as a broader view, approaching current flexible strategies at a more global stage that are basically concerned with flexible economic and work shifts of whole sectors/regions if not national economies.

2) Broadly speaking such a scenario, in my view, may also incorporate up to a point, EEC, OECD and IMF current global economic strategies but also speaking about Greece, of indigenous capital interests too, not hesitating to 'sacrifice' natural developmental goals in favour of possibly higher security, and low risk, by becoming involved in plans orienting to the transformation of a significant part of Greek economy to 'a direct branch' of multinationals.

3) Finally this scenario may be well served by old and current, already widespread, flexible economic and labour practices and present state policies, encouraging forms of a numerical flexibility which will be more suitable to those "newly established" labour intensive industries. In this way, it may be assumed that those economic activities, based on multinationals, will gain with reference to both their core and their peripheral workforce cheap labour costs, forms of intensified labour, greater

flexibility, and through their supplementation by selective and dividing neo-Taylorist managerial strategies, more compliant behaviour on the part of their workforce.

Greek political and academic debates, in the late 1980's in particular, attempting to interpret the content and prospects of state economic and labour restructuring shifts, have not excluded such a scenario from their attention¹⁸. However, such debates have cast doubts on whether such a scenario actually has the capacities to be put into practice extensively in Greece, and through such an exploration with reference to the Greek case, have indirectly challenged in more theoretical terms, the sufficiency of the "NIDL" approach in several aspects. Let us pay more attention to the more theoretical arguments on the topic since what is going on in more practical terms will be presented in the following chapters.

According to the critical views of several specialists that have drawn attention to the topic, even these broader concepts to economic and labour flexibility suffer from certain difficulties. This is due to two main reasons: 1) they have not taken into account more complex factors or processes through which multinationals' shifts and developments are defined at present, and

¹⁸ Furthermore, this has been done, due to a very recent extensive campaign on the part of Greek state policies that more or less promotes Portugal's present developmental shifts (that are in part related to multi-nationals' extensive investing activities in this country), as the paradigm that the Greek economy has to follow in the future to secure new paths of development in the 1990's (see Ioakimoglou, 1991, 1992; Rylmon, 1992; Giannitsis, 1992).

2) the constraints and dynamics that each particular peripheral socio-economic pattern presents with reference to the capacities of the materialisation of the NIDL scenario.

Speaking of Greece as a particular case of Southern European countries, such more complex factors may be the following:

a) On the economic level:

1) the small internal market of Greece; 2) the lack of an adequate state and other infrastructure, (e.g. banking and credit facilities legal limitations and so on); 3) the continuation of the great structural, and sectoral discrepancies of the Greek economy such as the low degree of vertical integration of production, and services, that do not facilitate even those less advanced multinational activities taking place in Greece due to the high final cost of their investments.

b) On the socio-political level:

1) The juxtaposed interests on the part of different sections of Greek capital, that are not necessarily similar to those of multinationals. Such contradictory interests have been expressed so far, either by targets orienting towards the preservation of the traditional economies and markets on the part of medium and small capital activity, or oppositely, by goals aiming at a more advanced form of industrialisation, and new development not dependent on multinationals on the part of more advanced sections of large capital;

2) The state, political parties' and labour movements' practices that usually have their "own history" and dynamics, in differentiating, postponing, or radically changing the multinational strategies;

3) the labour "culture" of the population in both economic and socio-cultural terms. For instance the lack of availability of a certain category of the workforce, that under its past development has gained significant work and social rights, to be pliant in employment and retaining such an anachronistic production and labour framework.

c) Finally to be considered are external factors related to the international socio-economic environment. These have to do with changes in the European and international environment in general, and specifically, with the recent political and economic changes in Eastern Europe which offer, compared to the past, the challenge and possibility for multinationals to also take advantage of those economies by a respective penetration (Papandreou, 1981; Vernardakis, 1989; Giannitsis, 1992; Marmagiolis, Paccinos, 1990; Tolios, 1990).

Attempting to theorise on the above mentioned critiques that have been mainly presented in the form of a political or a journalistic debate, let us present three more theoretical issues with reference to the topic, that have not been sufficiently explored by the NIDL approach:

a) The less advanced "peripheral" societies, like Greece, do not present only advantages in economic and labour terms for the

realisation of the multinational strategies, but certain disadvantages. These are related to the highly varied and uneven internal economic and labour patterns which these societies have presented in their past and current development. Despite the preservation of a relatively cheap work-force, such patterns on the one hand if less developed, do not facilitate or encourage a kind of relocation of even those less advanced economic activities of multinationals due to other disadvantages badly affecting economic profitability. This comment is referred for example to the already mentioned difficulties concerning the lack of available state and further economic infrastructure, the sectoral and structural disparities of the Greek economy, and so forth. On the other hand - as far as a certain part of Greek economic activities are concerned - if more developed (and therefore disposing up to a point actual capacities for more advanced developmental choices than of those that "are suggested" by multinationals), they can not be so easily combined with the above mentioned 'strategies' of multinationals. This comment is referred to a certain part of Greek capital which has successfully operated in the past by a more advanced model assimilated to Taylorist and in part Fordist forms in both their economic and labour structures and it has achieved to improve them, gaining more advanced types of economic activity.

2) Peripheral societies like all other societies not merely in economic but in broader socio-political and cultural terms present multi-faceted and contradictory aspects. Speaking for Greece as a particular peripheral society in terms of the wide

range of its economy, it might be considered as still operating by less advanced technological, organisational and labour patterns, and therefore as one that presents great difficulties in following the rhythms and the more advanced targets of its other "European partners". However this doesn't mean that in terms of needs and expectations it is necessarily eager to restore, or to further develop as an alternative choice, an anachronistic mode of social development that such a scenario (NIDL) has prescribed.

This is mainly due to the fact that though a peripheral one, the Greek economy and society through the past and present forms of internationalisation in which it has also been involved, has radically changed the needs, the interests and life-styles of its population in economic, social and cultural terms. As a result it requires more advanced developmental directions, similar to those of the more advanced European societies with similar advantages which derive through such a process, to those that the more advanced European countries offer to broad categories of their populations.

If this is the case, the difficulties that Greece as a case of a peripheral economy presents, with reference to the multinationals' current strategies, brings about a further point that needs greater theoretical consideration. This is the underestimating of the problems that the uneven socio-economic and cultural reality, even within different European nations, regions, sectors, or particular fields of economic activities bear, that has been very closely related to the present developmental

difficulties if not "deadlocks" in Europe. These have more than a few times, been derived from simplified and 'linear' strategies both on the part of multinationals and on the part of current underlying European Unification goals that presuppose 'equivalent' socio-economic patterns that do not actually exist at the moment and have exerted so far not mainly in favour of reconciling such different societal patterns and disparities, but basically in favour of the successful restructuring and development of the most advanced late capitalist economies in the 1990's.

3) Finally the above-mentioned considerations raise in turn broader theoretical issues, namely that attempts at interpreting and predicting international and national general socio-economic scenarios of trends are legitimate, but they should be more open-minded by:

firstly, exploring their contradictory faces and possible alternatives that exist in their materialisation;

secondly, by taking into account that even if such trends are indeed underway, their actual materialisation is likely to be not only, and not often defined solely from the more advanced socio-economic patterns, and their international forms by which one part of them operates at present¹⁹. Instead they are usually defined in close relation and interaction with differentiated or

¹⁹ (e.g. EEC, OECD, IMF, World Bank, Multi-national corporations and banks).

juxtaposed, sectoral regional or national socio-economic patterns, which though less advanced, present their own dynamics in also defining societal processes and developmental choices (Wood, 1989; Galkin, 1988; Hudson, 1988);

thirdly, by looking insightfully at the peculiarities of each socio-economic pattern (whether more or less advanced) beyond possibly reasonable concepts, which however are inadequate to interpret by themselves, particular societies' processes solely based on too abstract dichotomical classifications of those societies like "core-periphery", "less or more advanced", and so on;

finally, by taking into account not merely economic aspects but also wider socio-political and cultural aspects of those societies that usually as a whole define the character and also the forms of the relations and interactions between national and international processes.

CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we have attempted to relate the Greek case where it was possible and necessary to some of the most important aspects of the flexibility debate.

Through our exploration Greece has been presented as an alternative paradigm:

Firstly: It challenges either "Flexible Firm" or "F.S. School" concepts and also certain aspects of the N.I.D.L. approach as adequate theoretical frameworks for interpreting current needs, interests and actual policies of labour restructuring in industrialised countries that had not extensively experienced a Fordist past.

Secondly: Greece is viewed as a national case explicitly demonstrating that labour and employment restructuring may not necessarily be oriented to a radical transformation of production and of the whole economic and labour patterns, but instead may serve short-term interests of retaining 'old' modes of capital accumulation or slightly differentiating them.

Thirdly: It may also be regarded among other national cases as a paradigm of a 'mosaic' of production, work, employment and managerial patterns (characterised by mainly pre-Fordist, but also 'Fordist' and 'post-Fordist' features) which even internally are unevenly structured. Hence, new economic and labour restructuring policies, whether flexible or, may have 1) various forms and content, 2) different dynamics and constraints, 3) different goals not necessarily all of them to be directed to the

simultaneous transformation of its entire socio-economic regime (Stratoulis, 1988).

Finally, through our exploration concerning the relevance of the current flexibility debate to the Greek case, an attempt has been made to establish a more advanced theoretical terrain for the sociology of labour. Such a terrain should to a greater extent switch the often too abstract Flexibility debate to the peculiarities of particular socio-economic patterns on a sectoral, regional and national stage as well as the specific forms of their participation and interaction with international socio-economic processes.

In the three following chapters I will attempt 1) to contribute to a more detailed exploration of the Greek case with reference to the topic and 2) to elaborate through it the assumptions and arguments related to the Greek case, that have already been presented in this chapter.

APPENDIX NO. A1

Roughly speaking, capitalist development has been identified by two distinctive historical periods. The first one was characterised by an 'expansionist regime' of capital accumulation based on the expropriation of 'absolute surplus value' via the marginalisation of the workforce's payments (either these are expressed in terms of wages and salaries or in terms of incomes with regard to the non-salaried work-force).

It was also identified with a regime of antagonistic regulation which had not adequately secured both capital's and the workforce's reproduction needs.

Such a regime of capital accumulation and economic regulation took place until the end of 19th century or, in some other views, until the inter-war period (1930). The second period was characterised by a regime of an 'intensive capital accumulation' comprised by more advanced - intermediate technology and also organisational patterns and based on the expropriation of relative surplus value. It was supported by an oligopolistic model of socio-economic regulation that established up to a point a relative correspondence of the increase of capital production and capital productivity with mass consumption patterns and also incorporating in part within the latter, certain categories of workforce.

This period of capitalist development has been identified with Henry Ford, the owner of the innovative car industry in the USA, and hence it is called Fordist by several schools.

It commenced during the inter-war period but was further generated and consolidated as the relatively dominant paradigm across almost all the advanced early industrialised societies by the New Deal Doctrine in USA and the Bretton Woods Treaty in 1948 in which its principles for the first time were explicitly clarified on an international level (Boyer 1986, Lipietz 1987).

It must be taken into account that "Fordism" as a term has not been treated in a single way on the part of individual scholars as well as schools. In the Regulation Approach that this study by and large has adopted the Fordist regime of accumulation and socio-economic regulation, though considered as being the dominant paradigm across all the more advanced industrial societies especially in the post-war era, is neither reviewed as the unique model of capital accumulation and economic regulation across all the capitalist societies (e.g. the newly industrialised ones) nor is it perceived as one including a single form of capitalist production and reproduction in each particular society and economy even in those that were the more advanced (or what we called Fordist Centres). It has also neither been solely identified with the agglomerate forms of the organisation of production and of labour, nor merely with labour and production techniques (technical, managerial, organisational).

In "Regulation" theorising every regime of capital accumulation and socio-economic regulation is likely to include uneven patterns of societal development, different modes of production, and a variety of ways of these modes' interweaving on a regional, national or international stage, different forms of the organisation of production, competition, state regulation, as well as of participation in the I.D.L.

The regulation approach also goes beyond a pure economic or technological determinism, and a functionalist perspective (this has been manifested in several systemic theories so far), by understanding regulation as a complex societal concept identified with a broader social pattern of Hegemony by which each one particular region or country operates and interacts with others.

This is usually defined by entire societal terms e.g. economic, labour, technological, scientific, ideological and cultural and also includes their possible antagonistic or contradictory faces.

Finally, it perceives such societal patterns of Hegemony as ones not necessarily defined by solely conscious and deliberate social mechanisms, but also as the spontaneous result of the specific forms (both intentional and unconscious) that social forces and social relations take in particular societies.

In brief the regulation approach has contributed, to my view, a great extent to a conceptual reconciliation of several aspects concerning history, sociology, economy and politics, and also on the switching of the too abstract levels of theorising

socio-economic developments (that had characterised not merely Functionalist and Systemic thought, but also the Marxist thought) to the specifications and peculiarities of the content and the forms of particular socio-economic patterns as well as of their interweaving and interaction in a given space and time.

CHAPTER 2

POST-WAR FORMS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, WORK PATTERNS AND LABOUR RELATIONS IN GREECE PERIOD, 1960-1975:

In this chapter we will first attempt to highlight, from a sociological point of view, issues concerning the historical peculiarities which have characterised the transition of the Greek peasant and 'petty commodity production' economy to its later attempts towards industrialisation and modernisation. This period may be considered as one of great importance with reference to the model of socio-economic development that Greece has followed and preserved till the 1980's. Secondly, we will also particularly focus our interest in presenting the character of industrialisation and further economic development that Greek society has promoted from the inter-war period, and basically in the post-war period (1960's and 1970's), in relation to the work and labour relations patterns which have supplemented this development, including their flexibility aspects. Such an exploration is also likely to provide some deeper explanations of the present character of the crisis of Greek socio-economic and work-patterns in the 1980's as well as the character of the restructuring labour policies (including the flexibility issue) presently underway.

GREEK ECONOMY AND SOCIETY BEFORE 1960: THE BACKGROUND

Before the 1960's, Greece had not experienced any significant type of mass industrialisation during its socio-

economic development which would have been likely to enable it to overcome the socio-economic patterns of its traditional agricultural and petty commodity production. It did not follow parallel routes of development to other more advanced European regions, whose international relations (economic and political) and also inner processes had quickly generated a faster and more radical capitalist industrialism and labour relations transforming their territories to 'advanced regimes of intensive capital accumulation and economic regulation'.

If, in Lipietz's view, Fordism has been characterised as a long-term historical period distinguished by two processes, one of intensive capital accumulation, and the other of mass production and mass consumption, then Greece was only involved peripherally in them (Lipietz, 1983). The relatively recent liberated history of the Greek region, after the yoke of the Ottoman Empire (1830-1870), may be characterised by the following distinctive features concerning the state of its international relations, and also its national socio-economic processes (more or less similar to the other Balkan countries of the same period) (Mouzelis, 1986).

1. From the beginning of its liberated history the Greek semi-feudal society, which was overwhelmingly peasant and supplemented by short and limited "commodity production", had been compelled to be²⁰ strongly based on an exploiting state of unequal trade and credit exchanges, expressed in forms of the

²⁰ due to the acute problems of the previous state of war

continued resorting of the Greek state to foreign loans provided by the dominant powers of Europe (England, France), who were, at the same time, the political guarantors of Greek liberation from the Ottoman Empire. Hence, Greece, with other regions, facilitated up to a point those countries' inner processes of accelerating the rhythms of capital accumulation in their territories and of gaining a more advanced and faster industrialization of their economies (Mouzelis, 1978; Gordatos, 1977; Svoronos, 1978).

2. The creation of a premature state and state mechanism was another historical peculiarity of Greek socio-economic development. Resorts to foreign loans and, through them, the continuation of the unequal state of credit exchanges, to different degrees was one of the main problems of the Greek economy, even until recent years. It led Greece more than once to bankruptcy and retarded, to a great extent, the deployment of any kind of indigenous steps capable of solving the acute socio-economic problems of that period, as well as of transforming traditional socio-economic patterns of Greek society, to more advanced forms.

The economic role of the Greek state was initially limited to a 'tax-collector and tax inspector's' activities whose task was not only to allow unequal foreign exchanges but also to facilitate the distribution and redistribution of incomes in favour of the traditional economic classes and of new bureaucratic ruling classes that had emerged from the expansion of the aforementioned

state activities (Tsoukalas, 1981; Mouzelis, 1986; Papandonakis, 1983).

Nevertheless, until the 1960's the economic role of the Greek state had increased by its close involvement in important banking and credit activities of which a significant part was directly controlled by it, as well as in modest policies to organise a kind of national infrastructure (e.g. telecommunications, electricity, transportation, etc.).

These developments, however, were never extensively oriented at encouraging productive activities nor to reduce economic dependency from abroad, manifesting its continual domination by indigenous social forces which didn't present any radical interests or capacities (entrepreneurial, organisational, political and even cultural) in promoting industrialisation and more advanced productive patterns of socio-economic development. Instead, they encouraged interests of a short-term speculative character whose target was enrichment and consumerist goals (Petras, 1984; Papandonakis, 1983). Therefore, even if theoretically this prematurely interventionist economic role of the Greek state could be assumed as an important factor in accelerating radical developmental processes, compensating for the lack of dynamism among the petty and middle bourgeois classes, in fact the Greek state didn't reflect the domination of willing social forces to play this role.

Instead, the weak and lagging economy of Greece had also inherited an unproductive bureaucratic mechanism, as well as a

ruling class closely related to or overlapping with the advanced traditional strata of peasantry and of petty bourgeoisie, thus reinforcing the former socio-economic preservation of, and their political domination over, Greek society. By contrast, the state discouraged any radical indigenous industrial interests (that were existent in part in the Greek economic scene) to take place by the extensive investing and developing productive economic activities. (Tsoukalas, 1983; Vergopoulos, 1983; Samaras, 1982).

The aforementioned social forces continued to dominate, in various forms, over the state and the Greek political scene both in pre-war and post-war years. Temporary attempts on the part of large finance capital to take over state power failed, as did other more important ones on the part of the most radical but middle industrial classes during the inter-war period (1920-1930). However it is also disputable in the sociological debate, whether the assumed capacities of those social forces could have radically changed the less developed structures of Greek economy and society in a more advanced direction in that period. In addition, class struggles on the part of a limited working-class and more middle-classes, as well as of peasant classes, were expressed in a strong leftist oriented political movement aimed at gaining political power during the second world war years. Nevertheless, they failed once again to undermine the deeply established domination of the old traditional classes, manifesting in this way the continued existence of lagging economic political and social

structures in Greek society. (Tsoukalas, 1983; Vergopoulos, 1983; Mouzelis, 1978; Seferis, 1978).

3. The third peculiarity of Greece was that the most advanced categories of the Greek capitalist class, who had been historically involved in international commercial and transportation activities (merchant shipping) on behalf of the advanced industrialised countries of Europe, have been allowed to accumulate significant capital, that would have been able to reinforce the industrialisation of Greece from the inter-war period onwards. Nevertheless the interests of this class never became aligned to extensive direct advanced productive activities in the Greek territory. From the beginning, this section of Greek capital was strongly incorporated into cosmopolitan activities, playing a significant service role in the IDL (International Division of Labour) of that period. Due to the lack of any national economic political and state framework (similar to those of already industrialised countries) being available to this capital it didn't risk its high profitability in international businesses by diversifying, even a part of them, toward direct productive investments in Greece (Papandonakis, 1983; Petras, 1984; Svoronos, 1978). Instead they related to the Greek economy mainly through credit and bank businesses by partially investing in service activities (e.g. tourism) as well as by becoming only temporarily involved in some direct, already matured, industrial activities (e.g. shipbuilding) particularly in the post-war period. Furthermore, a significant part of their investments was based on

Greek state grants and not on their own funds (Samaras, 1982; Pousos, 1985; Iliadis, 1984).

Since the detailed exploration of the pre-war period is out of the scope of this study these three reasons may provide a rough explanatory framework with reference to the slower steps used by Greek society to overcome its traditional, socio-economic patterns of activities and thus to become involved in more radical and advanced forms of industrialisation and further socio-economic development.

THE INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE GREEK ECONOMY IN THE 1960'S

Roughly speaking, two distinctive processes of socio-economic development took place from the inter-war period until the middle of the 1970s, accelerating after the 1960s:

Firstly, a partial industrialisation of the Greek economy, alongside the preservation of less developed economic activities assimilated to still "petty commodity production", across all the economic sectors (agricultural, manufacturing, service), and secondly an increasing expansion and later generation of an extravagant but not advanced service economy, at the expense of the former attempt at industrialisation (particularly after the 1970s).

More specifically a modest and slow attempt of a 'pre-Fordist' type of industrialisation at the beginning of the 1960's in particular was promoted by the indigenous large and

overwhelmingly less advanced traditional capitalist classes, supplemented during the same period by a temporary and limited location by foreign capitals of some already matured Fordist industries in the Greek territory.

Foreign capital was concentrated upon previously unexploited fields by establishing some capital and basically intermediate industries (such as refineries, chemical products, metallurgy and mining industries), oriented at the beginning to external markets and later to internal ones, and creating in turn a modest and temporary indigenous interest in a few monopoly groups to invest in similar industrial sectors. (e.g. ship building, steel industries, cement mills).

Both of these processes were apparent 1) in the distinctive input of foreign entrepreneurial capital in Greece in the 1960's, which covered about 31% of the balance of payments of current account in that period, and 2) in the diversification of direct investments in those more advanced manufacturing activities (compared to the Greek traditional ones) which in 1963 increased to 11% in total manufacturing. For the first time in Greek industrial history, the participation of those manufacturing industries in the Gross National Product (GNP) became about 7%, and such a process was followed by a significant increase in total manufacturing industries' productivity, which achieved in the period between 1958 and 1973 a growth on average of about 8.5% per year, and by an annual increase of exports of about 10% (Doukakis 1985; p. 25).

These developments gave the impression of steps orienting to a radical and more advanced assimilated to a 'Fordist type' of industrialisation of the Greece of the 1960's, while for the first time Greece came to be included in the category of 'Newly Industrialised Countries' (NIC's). However, such a process proved only to be a 'quasi-Fordist moment' planted from abroad into the Greek economy, and it didn't alter the traditional and introverted character of the internal processes of the less developed capitalist socio-economic development of post war Greece.

The penetration of foreign capital, though at first sight it contributed more to the expansion of industrialisation and less to an 'extroverted' direction of the wide range of the still traditional Greek economy of the 1960's, didn't help in the creation of a more advanced indigenous productive basis on Greek territory. First of all, this was due to the fact that its greater part was concentrated on already matured, mainly intermediate, and later consumerist sectors, and not on advanced capital ones (e.g. mechanical engineering) that were very poorly developed in Greece of that period (Rylmon, 1988, 1992).

Furthermore, foreign investors in the relatively more advanced (in Greek terms) industrial sectors, covering 50% of the total manufacturing investments during the 1960's, (Giannitsis 1986; p.256) rapidly diversified their interests, initially penetrating in traditional indigenous light industries and gaining a significant place in internal markets and later by abandoning

Greece as a field of any direct investment in productive activities in favour of other NIC's²¹. Similar processes were followed in the mid-1970's on the part of a few large Greek monopoly groups that had temporarily decided partly to diversify their traditional financial and commercial business both in Greece and abroad, by becoming moderately involved in direct investment in the above mentioned industries (Giannitsis, 1983, 1986; Vernardakis, 1989, Christodoulou, 1988; Samaras, 1982).

THE PRESERVATION OF THE TRADITIONAL PATTERNS OF
ECONOMY AND THE EXPANSION OF THE SERVICE
ECONOMY AFTER THE 1970'S:

The initial post-war 'conjuncture' for Greece, such as the significant concentration of indigenous but mainly of foreign finance capital in Greek territory, through the use of the Marshall plan and significant US aid given between 1945-1955, was not translated by state and indigenous capitalist classes to targets facilitating the development of a relatively independent and more advanced productive base for the Greek economy. State policies that could enable such attempts to take place, were not oriented in the above mentioned directions, but instead they were focused upon :

Firstly: attracting foreign capital (particularly from USA) to take up the role of the advanced industrialist of the Greek economy, without at the same time being interested in taking

²¹ NIC = New Industrialised Countries

more than financial, but developmental advantages of these more advanced capitals' relocation in Greek territory

Secondly: to the further quantitative expansion of traditional patterns of economy without at the same time encouraging their qualitative improvement (sectoral, technological, organisation and labour).

Thirdly: to an extravagant expansion of traditional types of construction activities necessitated in part by the acute housing problem following war (note for example that between the 1950's and the 1970 30-40% of total direct public and private investments were oriented to housing). (Doukakis 1985; p.20, Samaras 1982 p.261)

Finally: State policies were very little oriented to the creation of a public infrastructure facilitating both production and particularly reproduction needs in an harmonious and controlled form, which to a great extent had characterised the post-war 'Fordist' state's economic regulation. This process had broader impacts on the whole developmental pattern of Greece.

A subsequent result of the state and indigenous capital strategies, was 1) the steady preservation and development (alongside the partial but relatively more advanced forms of industrialisation) of the traditional, low productive patterns of economic activity across all the sectors, that in Marxist terminology were rather assimilated to or slightly differentiated from either 'simple' or 'relatively expanded' commodity production: 2) and after the 1970's in particular, an

extraordinary development of a similar low productive type of service economy (in commerce, tourism, transportation, etc.). The latter was neither orientated to facilitate more advanced production activities, nor can be seen as being an expression of an accelerated industrial development of the Greece of the 1960's and the 1970's, similar to the advanced Fordist European economies of that period. Instead this process, alongside political reasons (namely the state terrorism against the defeated post-war left-wing political movement, that took acute forms in the countryside), was heavily necessitated on the one hand by the progressive recession of parts of the traditional economy, especially of the agricultural sector, and on the other hand by the weakness of 'quasi-industrialisation' in securing employment opportunities and also adequate subsistence incomes, through them, for the surplus workforce of that period (Vernardakis, 1989; Samaras, 1982; Malios, 1978; Mosconas, 1984; Christodoulou, 1988; Milios, 1988).

This process was also reinforced by the lack of available post-war state economic regulation, concerning the creation of an adequate infrastructure easing both production and social reproduction requirements (e.g. education, health, transportation, housing and so on). Subsequently such a lack of available state policies meant that these needs had basically to be satisfied by uncontrolled, and therefore not rationally planned, low quality and low productivity, as well as very often 'speculative' 'petty private' activities. Finally it was also reinforced by the lack of

any state regulating measures of the labour markets which subsequently compelled the surplus work force to secure employment and income in low-range economic activities that, both in terms of production and market demand, as well as of skills, technological infrastructure, and investment cost, could be available to them. This is the reason that alongside the already existent-traditional economic activities of the manufacturing sector and the agricultural sector, the expansion of a poorly advanced service economy was to a great extent reinforced, expressed in forms of less advanced petty and basically domestic firms, and also in self-employment (Tsoucalas, 1983; Vergopoulos, 1986; Mosconas, 1986):

In this context the distinctive feature of these state policies, and the socio-economic processes that followed from the 1960's until the mid-1970's in particular, might be conceived as reinforcing a less advanced and low productive socio-economic pattern of indigenous development, alongside the partial attempts at industrialisation across all the sectors of the Greek economy, namely both in the production and reproduction sphere, reflecting in more theoretical Marxist terms a process of still low direct submission and capitalisation of a significant part of both production and reproduction activities in Greece²².

²². Such an evaluation has been based on an interpretive theoretical approach that regards both production and reproduction spheres as ones that are not only productive in general but, under certain historical circumstances, can both become productive to capital as well.

The above mentioned processes may be summarised in the following data:

a. In 1957 the share of the traditional agricultural sector in GNP was 36.7%, that of the manufacturing sector 24%, and that of services 37.2%. In 1973 the share of the same sectors in GNP was 14%, 36% and 46% while in the 1980's it was 14%, 32% and 51% respectively.

b. Between 1960 and 1973 the rate of growth of manufacturing was about 11% per annum while that of services was 7.5%. However, between 1973 and 1979 the average rate of growth of the manufacturing sector was only 4.4% and in 1980 only 3% while that of services increased to 17%. (Giannitsis 1986, p.248).

Employment Features

d. In 1951 the salaried workforce was 31,2% of the economically active population (EAP); in 1971 it increased to 39,3% and only in 1981 did it manage to approach 48% of the E.A.P., overwhelmingly employed in the service sector. Despite this development, Greece is one of the last countries of the OECD, even compared to other regions of southern Europe, to have not yet generated a salaried workforce (OECD reports 1985, in Doukakis 1985; p.10).

e. Instead in the period from 1960 until 1980 an increasing development of self-employment and of petty and medium sized firms was evident across all sectors but mainly in the tertiary

sector which from a level of 13% of EAP from 1963 until 1966, reached 18.4% of EAP in the period 1968 until 1971, and 24% of EAP in 1978. While it has been estimated to be about 47% of EAP in 1989 (including small domestic firms and medium sized firms) (Christensen 1992; p.23-32).

The "steady" role of patterns assimilated to petty and medium sized commodity production across all the sectors (and not merely in the still too large agricultural one) in the Greek post-war developmental pattern may also be illustrated by the following data with reference to employment forms and structure:

1. From 1951 to 1981 another study pointed out that over one-half of the EAP belonged to the categories of the petty employers (in domestic firms) and also the self-employed. Furthermore, during the same period the petty commodity production - economic activities included 97% of industrial shops and around the 60% of the workforce. (Mosconas 1984; p.186-187).

2. In 1961 the non salaried workforce and petty employers, amounted roughly to two thousand people in manufacturing, over thirty thousand in construction, and two hundred and eighteen thousand people in the commerce sector. In 1971 it was reduced to one hundred and sixty five thousand people in the manufacturing sector, while it was distinctively increased in the other two sectors. In 1971 the total salaried workforce was 43.6% of the EAP with 39.3% in commerce and the other service sectors (Rylmon, 1992; p.52).

This structure of the post-war patterns of development reached its peak at the end of the 1970's leading to a deep structural crisis of the Greek Economy and to shifts in the mid-1980's oriented to restructuring the economy and labour whose character we will present in the following chapters. Let us conceptualize in more theoretical term the mode of capital accumulation and economic regulation in post-war Greece, relating that to established labour patterns and labour relations (including flexibility issues) and exploring their interaction.

THE PRE-FORDIST CHARACTER OF GREEK INDUSTRIALISATION

It may be obvious from the brief account of Greek industrialisation of the 1960's mentioned above that the Greek economy did not extensively experience a 'Fordist past'. The limited and short term increase in industrial development had a pre-Fordist character. In Greece temporarily and peripherally to Fordist centres, less advanced 'Fordist' industries emerged, in both the private and public sector, but never established a 'Fordist regime' of capital accumulation and of economic regulation.

This may be debated theoretically both from the point of view of conceptualizing Fordism as more a technical and organisational model of production, and also from the point of view of seeing Fordism as a broader model of economic regulation and 'regime of capital accumulation' (Lipietz, 1986).

1. As far as the wide range of industrial activities are concerned, Greece had never generated a mass Fordist type of advanced industrial or service activities oriented to the creation of a relatively independent and advanced productive basis for the economy (e.g. by the development of capital and intermediate sectors alongside the consumerist ones). A process that produced as a result a traditional light industrial sector incapable of generating complex manufacturing production, supplemented by intermediate technologies, characterised advanced Fordist economies of the same period. It is distinctive, in this sense, that all the sectors being concerned with the production of means of production remained marginal and disintegrated during the whole 1960's and 1970's even until the present.

Nor were there extensive Fordist organisational patterns of work (e.g. prevalent assembly line mechanised production with a high and strict specification of tasks).

While these patterns of organisation existed in part (e.g. in the textile and shoe industries or in certain administrative work in large private firms as well as in the public sector) they were not combined with technological ones, and therefore did not manage to achieve a strict separation of the conception from the execution of work tasks, due particularly to the low mechanisation of the labour process within those activities. Therefore, Taylorism as a more advanced managerial model of organising labour, closely related to the Fordist type of technological patterns supplementing production, didn't take place on a massive

scale in Greek industries either. However it did appear in part, though in less advanced productive patterns, as a model of an extremely authoritarian and paternalistic managerial style (both on the part of the state and on the part of large firms) of organising and controlling a very cheap workforce in these firms, partly because of the lack of more advanced structural, organisational and technological improvements in their patterns of production (Doukakis 1988, Alexander 1964).

2. Greek attempts at industrialisation didn't generate a Fordist economy of mass production oriented to mass consumption patterns. Instead, due to the lack of any mass and competitive indigenous production, both production and in part consumption were mainly satisfied by the import of industrial and consumerist products.

3. In addition, due to the lack of an "intensive capital accumulation process" in Greek territory (as a result of these processes), Greece could not secure a more advanced Fordist regime of economic and labour regulation, e.g. by enabling even temporarily a correlation of the increase of the economic productivity to a respective increase of the workforce's payment standards, or of welfare state policies thereby encouraging the generation of internal mass consumption patterns, in which a great part of workforce could be included. This process that, to a great extent, took place for a certain period in advanced Fordist economies, never characterised the post-war pattern of Greek socio-economic development and capital accumulation.

By contrast, a distinctive feature and also the basis of the Greek mode of pre-Fordist accumulation was the extreme marginalisation of workforce payments, and through them, the exclusion of a significant part of the workforce from any participation in indigenous consumption patterns.

4. In addition, according to several scholars, despite a reasonable capital accumulation gained through the "pre-Fordist" and "quasi-Fordist" expansion of industrial and other economic activities of the 1960's, but also through transferred "surplus value" and incomes from abroad, the main part of re-investment was oriented towards further expansion of the existing patterns of these businesses, and hardly towards qualitative amelioration of their technological, organisational and labour forms. Instead, gains were gradually directed to the easing of short term profitability, by being overwhelmingly oriented beyond advanced direct productive fields due to its higher investment cost.

5. Traditional flexible labour patterns, whose character we will present in more detail later, expressed the steadily preserved traditional modes of capital accumulation, in the post-war era, and in turn served well their further expansion, while in doing so, discouraging in macro terms any further expansion and more advanced developments in the industrialisation of the Greek economy. By contrast, their continuation was an additional factor exacerbating further expansion of low productive and low quality economic activities across all sectors including the informal economy, particularly after the mid 1970's crisis

(Georgakopoulou, 1986; Vergopoulos, 1986; KEPE, 1992, Tsoucalas, 1986; Milios, 1988).

FEATURES OF LABOUR PATTERNS, LABOUR RELATIONS,
AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITIES OF PRE-FORDIST
INDUSTRIALISATION OF THE 1960'S-1970'S, THE
BACKGROUND:

1. As has already been briefly mentioned, the Greek post-war indigenous attempt at industrialisation overwhelmingly continued to be oriented to an expansion of pre-war traditional light, petty and medium sized industries (almost exclusively targeting internal markets such as tobacco, textiles, clothing, shoes and food), and also to be based more or less on the traditional technological, organisational and labour patterns, by which such activities had operated in the pre-war period. While in the pre-war period these industries consisted of 55-58% of total manufacturing in the 1960's they were 45-48% of it. (Samaras 1982; p.56)

2. As far as the degree of concentration of such industrial capitals is concerned, they have been overwhelmingly organised in petty and medium sized industrial shops. For example, while in the pre-war period, 90% of them used to employ less than ten employees, in the 1960's the figure remained high at 80%. Only in the mid-1980's did such small firms diminish to 43% of the total number of manufacturing firms, manifesting trends of capital concentration in favour of large and medium sized industrial activities (Mosconas 1984; p.187). The productivity of such firms was naturally low not due to their small size necessarily but due

to lack of any financial capacities on their part for technological improvements and also due to the lack of a satisfactory infrastructure, through the Greek state and wider economy, enabling them to make their activities more advanced (e.g. in terms of material, and technical means in relatively low prices, information, and planned marketing services, sufficient co-operative organisation patterns, and so on).

It is characteristic that the added value of very small size firms in the early 1980's was still 31% of the added value not merely of those firms employing over 100 employees, but of those employing up to 30 (Vernardakis 1988; p.171).

3. Greek industrialists lacked both interest, and up to a point the capacity to promote any industries related to the production of capital and advanced intermediate products, and also to exploit the mineral wealth of the country (which almost exclusively was the field of a small number of foreign firms, orienting their intermediate products basically to external markets). As a result, they proceeded with very slow technological improvements even in light industrial activities, which were basically supported "more by handicraft" or less advanced semi-mechanised technical means, rather than by an extensive mechanised production. For example, the participation of mechanical engineering in total manufacturing in both the pre-war and post-war period, did not go beyond 3-4.5% of GNP, with 1960 being the only exception (7.1%) mainly due to the acceleration in foreign investment (Giannitsis, 1986, p.259;

Samaras, 1982, p.56-57). Hence direct technological dependency was the rule for that type of industrial development, and for this reason the direct fluctuation of its economic productivity and profitability was dependent on external factors as well.

Still in the 1980's studies have estimated that import expenditures for materials and technological equipment reached almost 80% of the total added value of a significant part of manufacturing products. In the period between 1963 until 1980 by contrast, the OECD reported that Greece, among the other members, was the unique country which diminished the export of manufacturing products with complex technological composition (Giannitsis 1986; p.258; Vernardakis 1988; p.47).

4. Industrialization attempts in the 1960's, and in particular, in the 1970's were basically oriented to a great extent towards the quantitative expansion of business, and to a lesser extent towards their technological modernisation. This is shown, for example, by the structure of direct investments, which were overwhelmingly oriented to an expansion of fixed plants, rather than a diversification of technical means and organisational patterns (Samaras, 1982). This process was followed in turn by no significant increases of the rates of salaried employment in general (and in the manufacturing sector, in particular) both on the part of large and medium/small firms.

5. Therefore, such a type of industrialisation was heavily based on the increase of fixed plant operations, entailing forms of

intensification of work, mainly expressed in quantitative terms, by its extensive resorting to a still limited and very cheap workforce.

This appeared either in forms of an officially salaried workforce, or in informal flexible categories of workforce, (domestic work, piece work, and other forms of short term contracts and sub-contracting labour as well as self employment), which by and large supplemented a significant part of both large and medium firms' activities. In doing so, the aforementioned pattern of industrialisation was served up to a point by its coexistence with the traditionally petty small and medium commodity production activities, since through them it secured a broader informal flexible-economic and labour pattern, that was temporarily capable of

i. compensating the very low paid or underpaid salaried workforce, by other incomes, derived from forms of supplementary temporary employment; or self-employment, in agriculture and in 'petty services' (especially in urban centres).

ii. reproducing the surplus categories of workforce by giving them "jobs for subsistence", since such a limited type of more advanced industrialisation could not employ them (Tsoukalas, 1986; Kasimati, 1990; Vergopoulos, 1986) .

iii. but also in certain sectors and fields of economic activities, namely those of the "diffused industrialisation" (such as clothing, shoe, leather, commerce, transportation and so on), directly facilitating their resorting to the aforementioned flexible

forms of employment and work, and the "peripheral" workforce that was involved in them (Karamessini, 1992).

This socio-economic and employment pattern was finally supplemented by available state labour policies which, on the one hand, presented a strongly corporatist and interventionist character by cutting labour costs and trade unionism, and on the other hand, lacking any interest in diminishing the arbitrary and therefore flexible state of labour relations, between employers and the workforce which traditionally was based on flexible and individually based forms of employment, working hour regulations, and payments, according to particular firms' production and market needs. Broadly speaking pre-Fordist and 'quasi' Fordist forms of industrialisation that took place in Greece of the period also took advantage until the mid 1970's of:

i. the extensive protectionist economic policies of the Greek state (despite its uninterrupted membership in the EEC from 1961);

ii. its usual resort to credit and bank-organisations, after the 1970's in particular, and also from selectively shared state grants for certain firms;

iii. but overall its extensive resorting to income and 'surplus value' that was imported by economic activities abroad, in which a significant part of Greek capital and also workforce had been involved in the 1960's, and, finally, by the low accelerated internationalisation processes in that period that had not yet challenged the introversion, followed by low productivity

and low quality that both Greek production and consumption patterns have been based on (Rylmon, 1992; Vergopoulos, 1986, 1992; Vernardakis, 1989, Giannitsis, 1983, 1986).

Work Patterns and State Policies:

A. Quantitative forms of intensification of work

As already mentioned, the indigenous industrialisation of the 1960's and mid 1970's was brought about on the one hand, by modest quantitative expansion of fixed plant, and less by technological and organisational improvements of the firms' productive patterns, while on the other hand, it was oriented to the increase in fixed plants in operation in the maximum level by extending the working hours of the existing workforce without increasing the numbers employed.

In brief, this process indicates that a significant component of pre-Fordist industrialisation was the increase in the intensification of labour in quantitative terms. This may be illustrated better by the following data:

a. Despite the fact that the participation of the salaried workforce in the total economically active population (EAP) increased from 33.5 in 1961 to 41.8 in 1971, in 1973 the salaried workforce being employed in manufacturing remained at only 16% of the total workforce.

b. In the periods between 1961 until 1970 and 1971 until 1980 while the average rate of increase of fixed plant in operation was about 8%-9%, the rate of increase of the workforce in

manufacturing did not rise above 1.6% per year. However, as has already been mentioned, the average increase in productivity in manufacturing in the '60's was about 10%-12% per year. (Samaras, 1982; p.256-257; Doukakis, 1985; p.70)

Forms of intensification of the workforce may be assumed to be 1) the officially legitimated high level of working hours, as well as the extensive use of overtime, among both the permanent and also the temporarily employed or contracted workforce. An EEC report shows that in the '60's, weekly hours of employment in the Greek manufacturing sector were, together with Luxembourg, the highest throughout EEC countries: namely 48 working hours per week, while at the beginning of the '80's it had diminished slightly to 43-44 working hours per week (EEC report: Social Developments, 1985, in Doukakis 1988, p.72).

This process was supplemented by the extensive resorting of firms to overtime working hours, in the form of night shifts, extra daily working hours and during weekends, which, particularly till 1975, were only slightly protected by Greek industrial legislation (e.g. strict definition of overtime working hours, regulation of legal extra payments of work on night shifts and weekend work, and so on). Therefore, such a process was arbitrary or otherwise "flexible", dependent on firms' choices of organising weekly operations of their fixed plants, while a significant part of such overtime work was usually not paid at all, particularly so far as the temporary and non-standard job forms

within the domestic workforce were concerned. (Gravaritou-Manitaki, 1986; ILO; Katsanevas, Papavasiliou, 1981).

B. Labour cost and payment status

The preservation of a relatively high level of productivity in the 1960's was heavily based on permanent state and employers' policies, of dramatically restricting labour costs. Such a process was achieved in the 1960's by preventing any correlation of annual average productivity of firms to the real annual salaries and wages. "Cheap" labour cost was the "key word" for both state and employers' policies. It is a common view among Greek scholars, that together with the political compatibility of Greece (namely the extremely authoritarian post-war state, expressed in the mid-1960's in a dictatorship form) cheap labour was the most significant factor in attracting direct foreign investment in that period, and also preserving temporarily the low productivity "pre-Fordist" indigenous industries. (Papantoniou 1979, Doukakis 1986, Poulantzas 1985).

Let us illustrate this picture with data:

A. In the period between 1950 and 1971 the annual increase in total manufacturing sector productivity ranged from about 4 to 4.5% while the annual increase of actual wages and salaries was about 0.9 to 1.5%. In the '60's annual salary and wage purchasing power was equivalent to that of 1929 . B. In the period between 1959 and 1973 the percentage of surplus value and therefore the percentage of capital profits was increased from 1.32 in 1958 to 2.16 in 1973 (Samaras 1982; p.309-310).

The squeezing of labour costs reached a peak, not only in the period of the increase of the upward business cycle, but also in the period of an extremely restrictive political atmosphere (namely during the Dictatorship - 1967-1973). In 1967 the annual share of salaries and wages in the added value of total manufacturing fell from 41% in 1958 to 31% (Study of Papandoniou, 1979 in Doukakis 1985; p.18).

Concluding, a particularly distinctive issue concerning labour cost policies, both on the part of the state and also of employers, may be assumed to be not only the fact that payments were not related to the productivity increase but that they were also too far off covering even the basic needs of the reproduction of a significant part of the workforce.

Let us now relate this issue to the role of flexible work patterns that took place during the same period in Greek economy, and through them to the role of the preservation of traditional patterns of economic activity in the post-war economy.

FLEXIBLE FORMS OF WORK, EMPLOYMENT AND PAYMENT:

Economic and labour flexibility may be considered to be a significant structural feature of work patterns supplementing Greek 'pre-Fordist' forms of industrialisation in the 1960's and 1970's. Flexible economic and work patterns enabled, to a great extent, both the indigenous "pre-Fordist" and the most advanced industries partially assimilated to Fordism to be developed and preserved, gaining a modest increase in productivity and competitiveness and overwhelmingly a high profitability, but also

constraining any further development and qualitative improvements.

Flexible work-patterns took place in the Greek economy as a result of conscious state and employers' policies, manifested by the preservation of industrial legislation not protecting the arbitrary post-war state of work, employment and payment conditions, and further regulating labour markets but also as a result of unconscious responses of the workforce to a broader pattern of socio-economic development, with neither capacities nor interests in expanding more rational and planned forms of modernisation, increasing in this way the opportunities for more advanced forms of employment.

For example, in the period between 1960 and 1971 the crisis in the low productive, traditional agricultural sector, combined with further political reasons, led to about 800,000 agricultural workers seeking new employment and incomes in large urban centres and in the Greek capital in particular. Industries were capable of employing only 1/8 of them (Vernardakis, 1989; p.44-45). In 1962, additional studies have estimated that 27% of the economically active population were unemployed or underemployed. (Samaras, 1982; p.47). A spontaneous and to a great extent, uncontrolled (informal) pattern of non advanced petty services, and activities auxiliary to manufacturing, followed from this weakness in the Greek economy.

However, a distinctive feature of the Greek state's and employers' policies was that both of them encouraged these kinds

of petty and often 'parasitic' forms of employment and economy. This was in response to the acute problem of unemployment and also due to it being convenient for the speculative interests of Greek industrialists, since through it they could secure for a long time an underpaid salaried workforce, and also of supplementing their temporary production needs with an additional, informal, flexible workforce, usually recruited from the unemployed and underemployed population.

By doing so, however, they also contributed to the creation of a peculiar type of low quality informal economy. This happened until the 1980's and was exacerbated by the recession of the Greek economy due to state tolerance towards it. Overall it was reinforced due to the lack of any available broader economic mechanisms (except for more rigorous taxation policies) capable of incorporating these forms of employment into more productive and efficient patterns of economic activity²³.

Forms of Labour Flexibility in the 1960's and mid-1970's:

The main forms of labour flexibility taking place in the 1960's until the mid-1970's were 'numerical' flexible employment, work and payment patterns as Atkinson's model has

²³ A study had estimated that the informal economy in Greece still covered in 1989, about 30% of total economic activity (Paulopoulos 1988; p.51). While with reference to the manufacturing sector a more recent study has reported that the economic activity that is excluded from national accounts even today is roughly about 90% of the official manufacturing activity (and is basically originated in the still widely spread medium and small sized industries and also in self-employment forms) (Kepe, 1992; p.103-106).

conceptualized them. However, contrary to Atkinson's concepts these forms had, in the short-term, a functional role if not to the Greek economy in general, to particular Greek industrial firms in productivity and profitability increase.

Flexible labour patterns were expressed:

i. in forms of domestic work, piece-work, part-time subcontracted employment and temporary work, or on a self-employment basis across all the sectors of the economy.

ii. by policies encouraging the increase of the workforce's mobility abroad, and also,

iii. by the multiple employment of the low-paid officially salaried workforce, in similar forms to those mentioned above.

Let us present them according to their functional significance, since they usually overlap with each other. Three forms of flexible labour patterns supplemented the economic development of Greece from the 1960's until the mid 1970's:

1. The first was the supplementation of industrial firms with the use of an additional, usually informal, workforce beside the officially salaried one. This may include: i. family based underpaid, or often un-paid, workers supplementing petty manufacturing firms, a significant number of which were temporarily subcontracted in turn to larger firms, performing specific tasks in their production; and ii. piece-work on an individual basis with an overwhelmingly female domestic

workforce contracted on a similar basis with particular industrial firms.

A significant part of these categories of workers were not included in the census as a part of the officially salaried workforce²⁴. Naturally, since they have not been included in the officially salaried workforce, they were ultimately unprotected by industrial legislation. Instead, their whole conditions of working hours, and also status of employment and payment, were directly controlled by the firm's production and market needs.

The Greek Ministry of Labour, in the mid-1980's, had particularly estimated piece-work, on a home-work basis, to be performed by over 200 thousand workers (90% of them female), namely about 6% of EAP. However, the economic and productive significance of their participation in total manufacturing, and moreover, in particular manufacturing and other sectors (e.g. clothing, shoes, leather, plastic and retail), was much higher (Katsouras 1993; p.36). Studies in domestic and family work in the mid-1980's estimated that 60% to 70% of the total workforce in traditional clothing industries was performed by these two types of temporary, contracted female workers (Karanika, 1985; p.42).

Unfortunately, there are no complete direct studies of these categories for the period between 1960 and 1970. However, as several scholars have agreed, there are some indirect indicators implying the extensive existence of these peripheral categories

²⁴ Or instead, they were presented as petty employees, or self-employed workforce.

within the workforce. For example, in the 1960's (a period of the acceleration of manufacturing development) there was an evident tendency towards decline in both the workforce in general, and in particular of female participation within it. From 43.3% in 1960 the officially active female workforce diminished to 32% in 1972. Scholars of employment mobility have interpreted these changes as indicating among other trends (e.g. the increasing emigration of the work-force in that period) the increased use of informal, cheap female employees in the advanced business cycle of the 1960's (Vavouras, Petrinioti 1986; p.339, Vergopoulos 1986; p.90-91).

The distinctive feature of these forms of numerical flexibility may be considered to be a socio-economic pattern in which, both the core and peripheral workforce, particularly in manufacturing, were subtly differentiated from each other, in terms of their regimes of working hours, but also in terms of the status of payments and employment. This is mainly because of the fact that industrial legislation gave very little protection to the official salaried workforce (in terms of relatively permanent employment, higher salaries, or further social benefits such as health, insurance, pensions, etc.) (Katsanevas, Papavasiliou, 1981; Katsanevas, 1982).

The exception was, up to a point, the salaried workforce employed in public services, and in part, in public organisations and banks in the Greater Area of Attica which, during the 1960's was roughly similar to that of the active workforce in

manufacturing, namely 15-16% of the total active workforce (Tsoukalas, 1986; p.190).

So, attempting a brief comparison with Atkinson's model, Greek work patterns were assimilated to those of Atkinson's model of the "Flexible Firm", but however, not expressed at a firm level, but rather at a state level. However, the most important difference in the Greek case may be assumed to be that the "functional workforce" in economic terms, namely those involved in direct productive activities, both core and peripheral, didn't take the advantages due to their productive significance in the Greek economy. Instead, a category of the work-force which was not fully "functional" in economic terms but "functional" in sociopolitical terms (through their compliance with the post-war regressive ruling classes' maintenance of power), namely the public service workforce, was unprecedentedly in a better economic position than the two former categories, basically due to their permanent status of employment and also some social benefits, rather than any significantly higher payments. To mention only one example: the lowest salaries and wages of workforces in manufacturing firms were only 38% of those of public servants being employed in public security and police services at the end of the 1960's (both wages and salaries but also extra social security expenses have been included in this evaluation) (Doukakis, 1985; p.17).

Conclusively, while these forms of flexible economic and labour patterns had in fact taken place, playing a crucial role in

particular sectors or fields of activity, especially in the secondary and tertiary sector, it must be mentioned that in Greece they never generated a broader and more permanent link assimilated to that of flexible specialisation production, by and through the flexible forms of cooperation between large and small industries directly, like that of other countries in the past, e.g. of Japan or of "third Italy" (Limberaki, 1988; Karamessini, 1992).

However, even if it may be assumed that the direct significance of such a "dualistic form" of economic and labour flexibility between more advanced industrial activities and the traditional ones, was mainly concerned with and facilitated directly only particular fields of manufacturing and service activities²⁵, the preservation and further expansion of the economic and labour patterns was of great importance to the entire mode of industrialisation and further capital accumulation in the post-war period. Their continuation across all sectors, followed by an intensified work and flexibly adjusted workforce, and also by low incomes, or even underpaid labour, enabled indirectly the transfer and further exploitation of additional "surplus value" expropriated by these economic and labour patterns, particularly from the agricultural sector, through available state redistribution policies.

²⁵ (see Kioulafas, 1990 on the 'deassociated' dualistic character between large scale advanced capital and small sized less advanced capitalist activities)

So it is not accidental that the process of labour incomes in agriculture was roughly similar to that of the prolonged restriction of wages and salaries of the workforce in the manufacturing sector in particular, in the whole of the period from the 1960's until the mid-1970's (Rylmon, 1992; p.58-60).

2. The second form of labour flexibility was the supplementation of the salaried workforce with temporary forms of multiple employment that were mainly based on self-employment. The status of those supplementary work forms was usually informal. This was due to the following reason; in so far as the non-self-employed "second" job forms are concerned, part-time and temporary employment had been introduced as an institution in Greek industrial legislation from 1963, but without any extensive regulation (except for minimum daily wages) affecting conditions of this type of employment (e.g. maximum working hours, insurance, pension, extra payments on working weekends and for night shifts etc.). As a result, non-legitimated but widespread multiple jobs had also been included in the informal, and therefore flexibly regulated forms of employment.

Although neither direct data nor surveys exist on multiple job diffusion, there are powerful indirect indicators, making obvious its extensive presence from the 1970's to the present: the strongest is the desperately low official salaries and wages of the 'core' workforce. Studies indicated that in 1970 not only were 51% of average households in urban centres (consisting of four members) supported by only one salary, but also that the 38% of

them supported by two salaried employees couldn't cover even their lowest needs, e.g. rent, food, etc. (Babanasis 1981: Study on Poverty in Greece of 20th Century in Doukakis, 1988; p.17). Therefore, people's usual resort to seeking additional income through part-time or temporary employment in other firms, or by being self-employed either in agriculture and the manufacturing sector, or in other petty service activities (e.g. in tourism or such as: taxi drivers, retailers, waiters, cleaners and so on), was a matter of survival and not of a further enrichment for the majority of this work force.

Let us mention an example: the average wages and salaries of the small manufacturing firms in the 1960's was lower than the already very low wages and salaries of the large manufacturing firms. The same happened with reference to the average added value per employee. While the average added value of the rest of the work force (namely those employed in domestic firms, and the self-employed, across all sectors of the Greek economy, except for the agricultural sector which was lower), was roughly similar to that of large manufacturing industries (see Rylmon, 1992; p.56-57).

State policies and employers' practices indirectly encouraged these multiple job-forms since they could secure firstly, the continuation of a very cheap salaried workforce in industries, thereby compensating for their low productivity, and secondly, a temporary solution to the acute unemployment and

under-employment problems, in so far as the broader categories of the surplus work force were concerned.

3) The third form of labour and economic flexibility in the Greek socio-economic pattern of the 1960's and 1970's was expressed by a process of encouraging workforce emigration abroad. Such a process initially may be considered as a spontaneous response of an underpaid workforce, and moreover, its surplus underemployed or unemployed part, to an economy not being capable of either employing them or securing higher incomes. Nevertheless, state policies encouraged its further increase in the 1960's, since it served, firstly, as an important economic resource for the low productive Greek economy, and the revitalisation of the internal markets too, and secondly, as an additional way of avoiding acute unemployment problems (Vergopoulos, 1986; Vernardakis, 1989; Samaras, 1982; Christodoulou, 1988).

These economic and labour policies on the part of the Greek state enabled emigration of the Greek workforce to reach about 1.5 million in the period between 1961 and 1971, overwhelmingly moving to advanced Fordist regions of that period (Germany, Belgium, Holland and also America)(Samaras 1982; p.48-49). Emigrant workers together with the traditional part of the workforce which used to be employed in international merchant shipping and other commercial activities abroad, contributed in the form of remittances to an income of over 20% of the GNP of Greece in the whole of the 1960's (Vergopoulos,

1986; p.71). Such a process enabled about 30% of total consumption in the Greece of 1960's and mid 1970's to be supported by this type of income, compensating in this way for the extreme marginalisation of a significant part of the low paid workforce from any consumption capacities and therefore from internal markets (Samaras, 1982; p.308, Rylmon 1992; p.83).

Generalizing, this type of income also enabled the fragile Greek economy of the 1960's and mid 1970's to counterbalance the low productivity of its limited industrial sector, and to repay in part for its usual direct or indirect resorting to foreign loans, after the 1970's in particular, "exporting" in this way its already increasing inflationary trends (Milios, 1988).

CONCLUSIONS

1. Concluding, work patterns including the flexible ones of Greece in the 1960's and 1970's overwhelmingly expressed a lagging industrial development as well as an underdeveloped state of labour relations. Flexible work patterns, involving both the "core" and "peripheral" workforce, were its main manifestation, actually expressing the capacity for the direct imposition of the interests of Greek capital over labour (by non economic mechanisms) in an economy still based on old forms of capital accumulation²⁶. These work patterns compensated temporarily for the low productivity of the Greek economy due to its failure to generate and develop more advanced and rational forms of industrialisation and further economic development.

2. They could proceed because of the post-war strongly corporatist and authoritarian state policies, which were taking place not merely on the economic stage (e.g. central regulation of labour costs), but also on the political stage (e.g. patronising and at the same time restricting in various ways political activism and trade unionism). This manifested itself in its most extreme form in the mid-1960's until the mid-1970's as a dictatorship (Koukoules, 1984; Retrinioti, 1985; Katsanevas, 1982; Poulantzas, 1985).

²⁶ Labour flexibility in the Greek case, was not merely absent or limited according to some views (Kioulafas, 1990) but was in contrast a structural feature of the old, lesser developed in capitalist terms, modes of accumulation that predominantly continued to comprise the post-war Greek economy and labour character.

By contrast, these processes mirrored regimes with less developed labour relations, reflecting the existence of a limited working class which lacked any significant industrial experience. As a result, these classes overlapped and confused their socio-economic interests with those of traditional petty and middle social strata, which less developed patterns of capitalist economic activities across all the economic sectors continued to sustain (Tsoucalas, 1978, 1986; Vergopoulos, 1986).

3. Labour patterns in turn moulded, up to a point, the industrial forms of development that have taken place in Greece until the middle of the 1970's. While they enabled a short, temporary and fragile pre-Fordist type of industrial development, they simultaneously constrained its further qualitative improvement, by first of all bringing up a 'spoilt' entrepreneurial class. This class was solely dependent on the intensive exploitation of labour and, by doing so, was lacking in any broader needs, interests and also culture to promote in macro terms more advanced forms of industrialisation and further socio-economic development by organizational and technological improvements in production activities²⁷.

²⁷ If hypothetically, the state's role in such a socio-economic pattern could be seen as the accelerator of a more advanced development, through broad and permanent restructuring sectoral, technological organisational and labour shifts of the Greek economy, the post-war state also failed, in some views, or furthermore, was not interested, in others' views, in doing so.

In addition, these low productive, though flexible, labour patterns, also contributed to depriving the Greek workforce of any significant industrial and further advanced productive experience, (e.g. by developing higher capacities at work, and also available skills) as well as averting a more creative attitude towards work by encouraging any values or interests in increasing their individual labour efficiency, initiative and innovation. In this way they also reinforced short-term and easy profit, but low quality productive activities across all the sectors, leading the Greece of the '80's into deep crisis.

This crisis character emanated from the entire previous developmental pattern, and not merely from the international economic recession during the same period. We will discuss it in the following chapter relating it to new processes in the work and labour relations "regime" which appeared after 1975, and also to subsequent economic and labour restructuring policies of the later 1980's and early 1990's.

CHAPTER 3

THE GREEK ECONOMIC RECESSION IN THE MID-1970'S-1980'S. ECONOMIC AND LABOUR RESTRUCTURING POLICIES.

THE CHARACTER OF THE CRISIS OF THE GREEK ECONOMY IN THE MID- 1970'S AND IN THE 1980'S

In the period between 1975 and mid-1980, there was a significant break in the previous socio-economic development of Greece. The oil crisis (1974-1979) and the subsequent recession in production and markets in Europe was followed by the fall of the repressive political regimes of post-war Greece (with the fall of the dictatorship). Both these processes hit harder at the highly dependent and peripheral economy of Greece since they seriously challenged the basis on which previous socio-economic development had been supported; namely the continuation of very cheap labour cost by the arbitrary post-war state of labour relations and work patterns, as well as the previous capacities of the less advanced and productively lower Greek economy, counter-balanced by additional incomes and funds from abroad. (Vergopoulos, 1986; Milios, 1988)

The main symptoms were the tremendous cost of imported technological products and materials (due to the technological dependency of the Greek economy), the weaknesses of the state and firms in extensively resorting to credit and bank organisations (due to their higher interest rates), but also the fact that the Greek economy no longer had as great capacities, compared to the

past, to be supplemented by foreign currency and remittances from an emigrated capital and workforce, due to the international crisis. These not merely manifested a temporary crisis originated by external factors (e.g. the oil crisis), but in fact the outbreak of a deep crisis of the entire previous model of industrialisation and economic development, which Greece had experienced after the post-war period until the mid-1970's.

Conceptualizing the character of the crisis of the Greek post-war model of capital accumulation and economic regulation

The crisis that had gradually emerged after the mid-1970's was influenced by the capital over-accumulation crisis of the post-war advanced Fordist economies.

The over-production of capital actually manifests the over-production of means of production, of labour, as well as 'means' for the reproduction of the work-force that are normally used for the exploitation of labour on a given degree of capitalist exploitation.

The fall in the degree of capital exploitation evokes in turn, devaluation and destruction of a significant part of capital. In the peripheral to Fordism forms of economic development like those of Greece the capital over-accumulation crisis had in fact arisen before any conditions of capital over-accumulation matured in Greek territory (Lipietz, 1987, Boyer, 1988).

In this context, the crisis of Greek patterns of economic development occurred as a result:

Firstly, on the one hand of the lack of conditions (technological, organisational, sectoral, etc.) for an intensive capital accumulation (as far as the large scale of the indigenous productive basis is concerned), followed by the subsequent fall of capital and labour productivity, as well as capital profitability;

Secondly as a result of the crisis of the further social-political forms of the Greek mode of regulation that were mirrored in the differentiation of the balance of power between capital and labour, with the labour force strongly disputing the existing modes of both capital accumulation and socio-economic regulation.

However, in the Greek case this explanation may not be sufficient alone. Other factors should taken into consideration. Specifically the support of the Greek expansionist, pre-Fordist model of capital accumulation by the transportation of "surplus value" and also incomes from the Fordist economies. This was the result of the particular forms of interweaving of a certain part of the Greek economy and labour to the broader European and international division of labour, (that has taken place through the "exportation" of the surplus workforce abroad, and also through the commercial and merchant shipping Greek capital's activities in the Fordist economies).

In this context, the crisis of the peripheral to Fordism Greek model of socio-economic development is also in part a result of the obliteration of the "imported benefits" (transferred surplus value and also incomes) from abroad that this developmental pattern took as an advantage to counter-balance its

internal problems, due to the further crisis of Fordist economies themselves in the 1970's and 1980's.

The main expressions of this crisis that badly affected the Greek economy may be regarded as the commercial shipping shock, in the mid-1970's and the early 1980's, where redundancy measures on the part of recessional Fordist economies hit emigrant categories of the workforce, as well as the fall of rates of growth in the tourist sector of the Greek economy, the crisis of the financial markets, and therefore of the capacity for an extensive resort to them.

2. Furthermore, the crisis of the Greek developmental pattern after the mid-1970's can by no means be considered as a crisis emanating from its previous economic and labour "rigidities" similar to those that it has been asserted the Fordist models of accumulation and economic regulation presented, since the Greek economy didn't undergo an extensive Fordist past.

Instead it is a complex crisis emanating, firstly, from the partial, limited, and less advanced realisation of an assimilated to Fordism model of development, and secondly, from its contradictory coexistence alongside the extensive, too flexible, but not advanced pre-Fordist forms of capital accumulation and social reproduction (assimilated to proto-capitalist and even pre-capitalist forms that both enabled but also constrained this mode of development). Therefore, what arises as a result of both these interweaving processes is their failure to generate a more advanced and competitive developmental pattern for Greek society

(Milios, 1988; Rylmon, 1992; Karamessini, 1992; Georgakopoulou, 1991).

CRISIS, WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENTS, STATE LABOUR
POLICIES AND EMPLOYERS' RESPONSES : 1975 -1985.

Working class struggles of this period were aimed more at expanding and protecting daily rights at work, rather than at promoting further shifts in the economy and politics. The most important targets for the workforce in this period were the protection and expansion of employment opportunities, the securing of minimum work payments, and trade-union rights. Their demands included: higher annual wages and salaries; a kind of protection for insurance; health and pension rights; reduction of daily working hours; restriction of arbitrary overtime; elimination of low paid employment on night shifts and at weekends; equalisation of status of payments for both the male and the female workforce; restriction of arbitrary conditions of hiring and firing; the establishment of free trade-unionism on a firm level; free collective bargaining without the previous strong state intervention; as well as the abolition of the restrictions on strikes, (e.g. the lock out as an asset of employers responding to strike activities).

By doing this, however, labour movements of that period had in fact promoted targets aimed at assimilating to Fordist economies, and types of economic and labour regulation. These not merely challenged, but actually postponed up to a point, the continuation of the previous state of arbitrarily flexible labour

patterns and labour relations, and subsequently, the continuation of the entire model of post-war capital accumulation and economic regulation by strongly challenging the profitability of the Greek capital.

State policies, in turn, incorporated in part some of these (assimilated to a Fordist type of regulation) claims, to a "Keynesian" short-term remedy for the recessional Greek economy, whose main forms as far as the labour force was concerned were:

1. Partly a modest increase in annual wages and salaries, and more so, a gradual expansion of a moderate "welfare state" that had never been put into practice in Greek post-war economic history.

2. the encouragement of new places with standard forms of employment by changes in the industrial relations legislation, which would be mainly oriented to a further expansion of the already relatively standard employment of the public sector, and also of the service sector but less so of manufacturing (Magliveras, 1987; Tsoucalas, 1986; Doukakis, 1989). Let us illustrate these processes by presenting the following data:

Labour costs:

Actual wages and salaries declined to 33-34% of the GNP in the period between 1975 and 1983, they decreased by 5.4% in the period between 1979 and 1981, and in 1988 their purchasing power was similar to the one in 1978. However, they were highly

differentiated between the public and private sectors, and service and manufacturing sectors of the economy in favour of both the former ones. For example, speaking for manufacturing the level of wages and salaries in the added value of traditional light industries (shoes, clothing, food etc.) continued to be very low, namely 15% to 20% of the total added value of the manufacturing sector. (Doukakis 1988; p.85) Furthermore, due to the long duration of very low labour costs the Greek workforce, despite the increase in its nominal and actual wages and salaries, continued and continues to be the cheapest among the EEC countries. The average annual labour costs of Greece in the mid-1980's for example, was only 13% of gross manufacturing product whilst that of Spain and Portugal was 19% and 18% respectively (Vergopoulos 1986; p.85-86).

In addition more recent studies, concerning the period between 1978 until 1988, pointed out that the average annual change of wages and salaries was around 0.9 in Greece, while respectively in the EEC it was about 2.3% (OECD, historical statistics, 1990 p.94)

Furthermore, during the same period the total average unit labour cost, rather than having been increased compared to the annual average unit labour cost in OECD countries (which was 55% in 1978), had been actually decreased to 40% in 1988. (OECD, 1990/91, in Vergopoulos 1992, p.83).

The slow increase of labour costs during the same period can be confirmed by the increase in the capital dividend (or

share) in added value of the manufacturing sector in particular. This was 19% between 1975 and 1989, and reached 32% of added value of manufacturing sector in 1990 (OECD, economic outlook, Dec., 1990, p. 142).

Finally, the fact that manufacturing capital reinforced labour intensive industries, as a way of coping with the crisis, certifies that labour costs, despite their modest increases after the mid-1970's, were still low, and a significant method of retaining that capital's profitability. (Ioakimoglou 1992)

In fact, rather than a distinctive increase of the direct labour cost, what has taken place after the mid-1970's has been a modest expansion of social security and health expenses mainly on the part of the state, and to a lesser degree by the employers, so that in the period between 1977 and 1988 they had increased their share of GNP from 7% in 1974 to 12.1% in 1988 (Vamvoukas & Petrinioti 1989; p.329-330). With reference to the manufacturing sector such a process affected very little further increases of labour cost. Instead the latter remained more or less steady (Ioakimoglou, 1991, 1992).

Employment increase and differentiations of the employment status:

The salaried workforce rose from 41% of the economically active population in 1971 to 49.2% in 1981 and to 68.7% in urban centres. However, salaried employment in the manufacturing sector was expanding less radically. From 26.5% in 1971, it rose to 29.5% in 1989, while in the period between 1981 until 1989 it

decreased by 1.2% (Christensen 1992; p.25). Instead, the increase of employment in the private and public service sectors was unprecedentedly higher after 1980 in particular. Employment in the public sector rose from 23% in 1971 to about 30% in 1984. (Tsoukalas, 1986; p. 179-180 & 190-192).

The most important feature in studying the trends of employment of that period is that the increase of employment in the public and broader service sector has been accompanied more by the permanent status of employment and other work benefits (e.g. health, pension insurance), and less by dramatically higher wages and salaries. However, in certain parts of the private sector (especially in retail, and in medium and small manufacturing firms) the sectoral differences were apparent due to the aforementioned reasons. For example, a study has pointed out, that in 1984 the annual salaries of the workforce in some public enterprises (e.g. in Olympic airways) were twice as high as those of the workforce employed in retail, and in certain parts of the manufacturing sector (Theodoropoulos, 7-7-1990, p.35).

In conclusion, the increase in labour costs was firstly modest, particularly with reference to the manufacturing sector. Secondly, it took place in part more by the expansion of standard forms of employment, working hours, and payments that for the first time had included in them a type of social security, health and legal protection, and less by a dramatic increase in the actual incomes of the Greek workforce.

However the development of a free type of regulation similar to a "Fordist" one, with reference to a significant part of Greek labour at that particular period, was not followed by any respective restructuring shifts that could gradually overcome the less advanced "pre-Fordist" patterns of economic activities across all the sectors of Greek economy. Instead it was followed by state and employers' policies that were oriented to retaining capital profitability at a relatively steady level despite some slight fluctuations compensating for those activities' very low profitability by measures that burdened the already weak state budgets, and the financial resources of the National economy.

This process led to the transformation of the Greek capital over-accumulation crisis of the mid 1970s - mid 1980's to a debt crisis of the entire Greek economy in late 1980's and early 1990's.

Let us illustrate in more details such a process by presenting the employer's responses towards the crisis in particular.

The attitudes of Greek employers and economic policies of the Greek state towards the crisis until the mid-1980's:

The challenge to Greek capital's previous direct profitability and competitiveness led to de-industrialization tendencies and by contrast to the reinforcement of middle-range service and commercial economic activities, which after the 1980's were accelerated more than in earlier years.



De-industrialization processes were expressed in the following direct and indirect forms:

1. Abandonment, first on the part of foreign capital, and subsequently on the part of indigenous capital of that which had contributed to the previous development of Greece, namely the more advanced industries (in Greek terms) that had been developed in the 1960's, which after 1974 in particular, had already started to pass into state control. The state took up the management of most of them, interested more in socialising their cost, and securing short-term employment, than in making them a mechanism for supporting the weak economy of that period by modernising their technological, managerial and labour patterns. This is to say, that a significant part even if not all of those industries, according to several economic studies, was neither so "mature" nor so less advanced in Greek economic terms. In fact, these industries required extensive fixed capital investment in order to diversify and improve their organisational and technological patterns, and therefore, lower net profits and higher investment risk in the short term for their owners²⁸ (Giannaros, 1990; Samaras, 1982; Giannitsis, 1983, 1987; Arsenis, 1990; Magliveras, 1987).

²⁸ The fact that the owners of a significant number of these firms were actually large Greek monopoly groups that, after winding up procedures, are going to take over once again these firms, contradicts their assumed lack of competitiveness as industrial activities.

2. Instead preservation after the 1980's, shifts towards the further increase of traditional large, but overwhelmingly, medium and small sized light industries, was encouraged directly or indirectly both by the state and Greek employers, as a defensive but short-term method of indigenous industrial classes saving their profitability, in a recessional economic period (Giannitsis, 1983; Vernardakis, 1989; Doukakis, 1984).

In fact, the preservation of those less advanced industries was based on their increasing resorting to state grants as well as bank and credit loans. This occurred due to firstly, the economic recession (saturated markets, higher costs of material etc.) alongside the lack of capability of Greek firms to be extensively supplemented by old modes of accumulation (flexible work patterns, cheap workforce etc.), and secondly, the lack of willingness on their part to risk their net profits by investing in technological and organisational improvements of their activities, or by diversifying them in new more competitive fields.

According to some scholars, despite slow rates of inflation up until 1980, the re-investment of Greek manufacturing firms' net profits fell from 72.4% of the total of their annual net profits in the period between the mid 1960's and mid 1970's to 48-49% in 1979²⁹. (Vernardakis 1988; p.201).

²⁹ However, according to additional studies, the most important overall difficulty on investment was the unprecedentedly higher cost of investment due to both the international and national recession, and also due to the high dependency of the Greek economy in terms of capital and intermediate products from abroad (Rylmon, 1992).

Instead, the ratio of debt (namely the ratio between net worth and total assets in manufacturing firms) which ranged 31% in the period between 1969 until 1973, it decreased by 26.8% in 1979 and, it reached at 12.6% in 1985, indicating the increasing resort of the firms to credit and bank loans. (Vernardakis 1988; p.202).

Furthermore, from 1980 until 1985, the increase of hourly wages was 22.6%, the improvement of hourly productivity only 1% and the increase of labour cost 28.2%. Despite the fact that the actual increase in labour costs was not distinctive, it was adequate enough to dramatically worsen the competitiveness of those Greek industries, which had solely relied in their past activities on a marginally cheap and intensified workforce (Bank of Greece Report, 1985, in Doukakis 1988, p.108).

Short term protectionist Keynesian state policies of the same period (expressed both by the right-wing in the period between 1970 to 1981, and the first socialist governments in the period between 1981-1989) strongly supported these processes with available credit and bank policies, but also direct state grants. These were particularly oriented to facilitate exports, hoping through them to rally new investments (both indigenous and foreign), and to overcome the low productivity and profitability of the indigenous capital through their quantitative expansion, and more specifically by their penetration to some less advanced external markets. The impacts of those policies were:

a. the burdening of the weak state budget with high deficits (both internal and external);

b. the partial exploitation of those funds in actual direct productive investments (due to the lack of any available state legal framework to guarantee, if not the investment's orientation, at least their actual materialisation) and subsequently the waste of already low national income on a variety of speculative activities of doubtful productivity and competitiveness in middle range manufacturing but mainly in commerce, services, real estate and finance both inside and outside the Greek territory³⁰.

In conclusion, it is a common view among different scholars that in the middle of the 1970's and in the 1980's, indigenous entrepreneurial classes, despite available state policies, exhibited defensive attitudes. These were mirrored in the lack of any risk taking managerial attitudes with regard to continued advanced productive investments by either diversifying their production, or promoting even modest forms of technological and organisational improvements. In addition they exhibited their traditional characteristics - e.g. their short-term interests in increasing or stabilising their capitals' profitability at

³⁰ According to a study, as recent as 1985, 9.5 billion drachmas were expatriated and subsequently exploited either in the form of deposit in foreign banks or in the form of investments in the stock exchange and other financial businesses. In 1989 one billion dollars were expatriated abroad, while according to the same reports Greeks were in the same period one of the most important depositors to foreign banks (IMF reports, in Tokas, 1/7/1990, p. 10).

the expense of the entire worsening of the Greek recessional economy.

The aforementioned attitudes were manifested by the following process: either by abandoning not only advanced industrial businesses, but also several traditional ones, or by exploiting, by contrast, their capital to speculative financial, commercial or other non-advanced service businesses, usually supplemented by a high degree of direct informality both in economic and labour terms (e.g. tax evasion, "black labour", etc).

Since old modes of accumulation, which those industrial capitals needed to retain their traditional productive patterns, had in part been challenged by the workforce's class struggles, the state took up their short-term preservation. The state actually socialised their costs by a redistribution of incomes policies, by increasing taxes, cutting social welfare expenditures from annual state budgets, and so forth, resorting at the same time to continual foreign and internal loans.

However, those policies, rather than reinforcing the revitalisation of the productive basis of the Greek economy, had exactly the opposite effect, producing a less advanced service economy and further de-industrialization, and leading Greece in the late 1980's into an acute debt and further financial crisis, expressed in forms of uncontrolled rates of inflation, staggering foreign debt and tremendous state deficits (Rylmon, 1988; Doukakis, 1984; Greek Federation of Industries, 1988, 1989, 1992)

In conclusion, the crisis of the Greek economy in the late 1980's may be considered to be deeper than that of 1974. On the one hand it has to a great extent diminished whatever previous more advanced productive capacities existed, and on the other hand, it has not developed any new ones, increasing the distance not merely from advanced European regions, but also from those countries that industrialised later than Greece.

Since its previous peculiar protectionist state of relations with the EEC no longer exists, the weak Greek economy has already taken part in the European Unification process that is mainly characterised by 'free market' competition rules, despite being rather incapable of following them at present (Vernardakis, 1989; Roumeliotis, 1980; Simitis, 1992; INE congress on Maastricht Treaty, 1992).

The above-mentioned evaluation has been disputed on the part of some Greek scholars, a topic upon which they hold different views.

More specifically, it has been suggested on their part that current ongoing socio-economic processes in Greece, indicate a kind of adaptability of the Greek economy to the present European and international changes. Further more, these processes are likely to point out a more helpful restructuring attempt and the gaining through it of a more advanced and competitive developmental path for Greece. Such socio-economic processes are summarised as the following:

Firstly: The opening of the Greek economy through the securing of its membership in the E.E.C. and also its participation in the new forms of European and international competition in the 1980's (mainly expressed through the European unification process). Subsequently these processes necessitate trends towards the readjustment and the restructuring of several aspects of the less advanced Greek economy and labour.

Secondly: The fact that through such processes Greece is presented, compared to its other partners, as already having gained a kind of "new specialisation" in its economy, in the 1980's, achieving through it a successful extroversion of a part of its economic activities (by increasing exports and penetration in some European markets). This specialisation of the Greek economy, though less advanced at the moment compared to the other European countries, is manifested in current shifts on the part of a section of both large and medium size firms across all the sectors, expressed in the increase of labour intensive, middle range capital activities (Vergopoulos, 1992 ; Milios, Ioakimoglou, 1990).

As a result, the same views point out that rather than there being an evident "degradation" of Greek capitalism in the 1980's, upgrading trends are evident both in economic and socio-political terms, by and through these restructuring shifts. However, the same views acknowledge that in macro-socio-economic terms the Greek economy and labour's competitiveness has rather been

worsened compared to the progress of its European partners (including the southern Europeans).

Such a straightforward evaluation, as we shall examine in more detail in the following sections, is not merely too premature, but also over-optimistic. It fails to pay enough attention to certain presuppositions that could make possible such an advanced restructuring that so far has not been of a great interest to Greek employers or the state. Such an advanced restructuring is more concerned with internal radical shifts in economy and labour, than merely with external factors, e.g. necessitated by the required materialisation of the European unification targets. So far, these ones have not merely been presented as insufficient to lead the economy out of recession, but it is also a question of how a more advanced restructuring of peripheral economies like that of Greece can be secured solely through such strategies.

Furthermore, such an evaluation is disputable as it has been presented so far for two main reasons.

1. Due to the fact that for a prolonged period (1975-1993) the state and Greek capital's responses towards the crisis have shown neither any distinctive capacity, in actual terms, nor a strong interest towards extensive attempts oriented to an advanced restructuring of the Greek economy and labour. Instead they abandoned whatever already relatively more advanced fields of economic activities had existed in the past (in Greek economic terms), and they continue doing so in favour of just temporarily counterbalancing their acute financial problems (e.g. through the

present forms of privatisation of several public and large private firms that are still under state control).

By contrast the wide range of Greek capitals have been almost exclusively oriented to less advanced middle range labour intensive activities, in traditional manufacturing and overwhelmingly in a non-advanced service sector. Furthermore, this process once again is based, to a great extent, on less advanced productive and labour patterns, characterised by high informality and the deterioration of the workforce's income and work conditions, presenting in this way only short-term defensive attitudes towards the recession of the 1980's.

Therefore, irrespective of whether a certain part of such activities has achieved a temporary retention of their profitability, (e.g. by penetrating in some indigenous and European markets), such a process has not necessarily contributed to any further more advanced type of economic development, nor developed employment opportunities. Instead it has worsened up to a certain point both in quantitative and qualitative terms the long-term competitiveness of the Greek economy and the workforce's capacity at work and social rights, by restoring in part, through informal ways, economic and labour patterns comparable to the "old modes of accumulation" that Greece experienced before the mid-1970's.

2. This is basically due to the fact that through such a process having taken place, in coping with the crisis problems during the 1980's (alongside the broader restructuring shifts on a

European level), the Greek economy has in macro terms, drastically "disarticulated" whatever more advanced indigenous productive, labour and also financial capacities existed without creating new more advanced ones. In addition such a process has in fact increased the real rigidities of the Greek capitals (first of all by increasing its dependency from abroad), and therefore making in this way any more advanced restructuring attempts a much more complex, persistent and long-term task in the early 1990's than it was after the mid 1970's (see Giannitsis, 1992; Karamessini, 1992; Rylmon, 1992).

Therefore, if one part of Greek capital has "upgraded" its position temporarily, through such less advanced restructuring shifts in economy and labour in the 1980s, this process doesn't necessarily reflect any remarkable 'up-grading of its dynamism' in longer socio-economic terms, in the new international division of economy and labour in which it operates.

Let us in the last two sections illustrate these evaluations by firstly presenting in more detail the content and character of economic and labour restructuring attempts from the mid-1980's in Greece, and secondly by exploring their impacts as well as prospects.

THE CHARACTER OF THE RESTRUCTURING SHIFTS IN GREECE IN THE LATE 1980'S AND EARLY 1990'S AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY.

The restructuring policies of the late 1980's in Greece have little to do with the economic and, in part, labour restructuring policies of post-war Fordist economies, promoting shifts in high technologies and more advanced organisational patterns as well as shifts of their interests in international labour markets, and regional or sectoral diversification of their investments (e.g. by relocating Fordist industries to some of the NICS of the 1970's and so forth).

The acute economic crisis in the Greek economy in the mid 1980's, rather than having accelerated any extensive restructuring of previous production and labour patterns, has accelerated withdrawal from previous 'Keynesian state policies' to current neo-liberal ones. These policies are basically oriented to cope with the problems of the debt of the Greek economy, and not with the problems of its further development. In doing so, they have basically aimed at cutting public expenditure, and an extensive redistribution of income (expressed mainly by prolonged austerity measures), while by contrast they have put reliance upon the free market as the steering mechanism for resource allocation.

The exposure of the Greek economy to free market competition, alongside the success of the aim of stabilisation, has been regarded so far as the major mechanism which will define final solutions in the present crisis, as well as the future developmental patterns of the Greek economy and society

(Governmental program, 1990; Plan of Convergence of Greek Economy to European Unification targets Ministry of National Economy, 1993).

By contrast the "restructuring strategies" which have been presented so far seem to be more concerned with the Greek labour regime and not the production one. More specifically they have been orientated to the re-establishment of work, employment and payment patterns, as well as labour relations, similar to the "old modes" of accumulation, which the Greek workforce had partially undermined after the mid-1970's and particularly in the early 1980's, since the indigenous capitalist classes seem once again unwilling to take the risk of participating in new ones.

Such strategies have also included in their agenda the promotion of economic and labour practices which directly attack trade-unionism and Greek labour movements.

Let us first outline the content of these labour policies in Greece at present, and second relate them to the interests that they are likely to satisfy, as well as their impacts on the Greek economy and society so far.

Contemporary labour strategies

The main forms of present labour policies (which have been legalised and put into practice by the Greek state and Greek employers) may be considered as restoring and expanding previously existent patterns of a "numerical" type of employment

and payment flexibility as Atkinson's model has described them (see Atkinson, 1986; Boyer, 1984).

These policies have been put into practice so far, in two ways:

Firstly, by progressively reducing the formal standards and status of employment and payment of the present officially salaried workforce (by undermining the standardisation of them), that had been gained after 1975 with reference to either certain sectors (e.g. the broader public sector, the banking sector) or with regard to several aspects concerning the regime of employment of the officially salaried workforce across all the sectors. Such strategies have taken place through changes in the collective bargaining institutions and several new legislative acts, namely those concerning health insurance protection, the protection of working hours and dismissals regimes, and so on.

Secondly, by expanding the peripheral workforce through processes of re-establishing the "old" forms of employment and payments, which are the dominant "forms" by which any new hiring take place at present (Skifty, 1992; Kravaritou, 1990; Koukiadis, 1991 Legislative act 1876/90).

The first set of policies concerning the "formal" workforce that is predominantly employed by relatively standard forms of employment and payments has aimed 1) at the reduction of annual already low wages and salaries and other work benefits

(insurance, pension, health) as well as collective bargaining as a mechanism for regulating them³¹.

2. At the establishment of a "free" hiring-firing regime drawing back any legal limitations concerning the frequency and the number of dismissals³².

3. At increasing the active work life of both the female and the male workforce.

4. Finally at attempts to abolish existing forms of permanent employment in the public sector and in banks in particular. (To VIMA, 11/4/93).

The second set of policies has included in its agenda so far, not new flexible work and payment patterns, but the repetition of old ones, by their further official legislation, easing the firms' present flexibility needs. Their difference in comparison with the past may be assumed to be that today, more than in the past, they overwhelmingly consist of deliberate strategies for cutting labour costs, intensifying labour, dividing working class people and making their whole conditions of labour more flexibly

³¹ Despite the fact that the collective bargaining system is still existent and partially has been improved in recent years its erosion is taking place 1) by the usual legitimated involvement of the state in the final regulation of payments, and 2) due to the fact that many aspects concerning the workforce such as the more detailed regulation of flexible job forms, the extra benefits towards employers, performance related forms of pay, flexible working hours and shift-work systems, participation schemes and so on, are to a lesser extent or not at all included in such a type of labour regulation (Georga kopoulou, 1993; Kouzis, 1992; Mitropoulos, 1990).

³² A process that has not been put in practice yet officially.

adjusted to the present production and market needs. The new legitimized flexible employment and payment policies that have been put in practice, so far, are the following :

1. Part-time and temporary employment - New industrial legislation (legislative act 1892/90) has legitimized such employment without protecting, to a great extent, these work-forms in terms of definition of working hours, duration of employment, and detailed regulation concerning their use in weekends and night shifts. In addition, it has deprived part-time workers in particular of any further work benefits which the fully employed workforce take advantage of at present (e.g. health, insurance, and pension benefits).

2. The relaxation of the fixed daily and monthly working hours regime. This has applied so far, without any increase in the total official working hours, by legitimating firms' capacity to flexibly adjust daily and monthly working hours to meet their production or market needs, in particular periods.

Firms may decide unilaterally the time and the forms of extending daily or monthly working hours according to their needs. By doing so, however, they can easily diminish their previous use of over-time work, and therefore avoid paying the workforce the legally obligatory extra payments for over-time work and shift work (Kouzis, 1992, Katsouras, 1993).

3. Official legitimation of the institution of extra payments and work performance related pay.

Recently legalised extra-payment forms have been established which can unilaterally be defined according to the employers' choice rather than via any relatively objective criteria being taken into account, e.g. the firms' or labour forces' productivity. Such criteria have not been included in new industrial legislation. By contrast recent industrial legislation has legitimized employers' extra profits by exempting such forms of payment from any kind of taxation (legislative acts 1731/87, 1892/90).

The institution of work performance related pay combined with the weakening of collective bargaining as a medium of bilaterally regulating wages and salaries, and their correlation with economic and productivity schemes, both on a firm and a broader level (e.g. capital productivity, labour productivity, cost of living and so on), has been used until now as a significant method in cutting labour costs, and intensifying labour. It has also been used as a method in dividing the labour force, through the application of these new payment policies by selective and subjective criteria (established by the employers) as well as by the blackmail of dismissal (Union centre of Athens, 1989, study on labour productivity related forms of pay: G, Kouzis; Georgakopoulou, V, 1992; Tjekinis, 1990 study on the relevance of extra pay forms with labour productivity schemes).

In addition traditional flexible work patterns (e.g. domestic work, piece-work, various forms of sub-contracting and also a certain part of self-employment) still taking place to a great extent

in Greek firms, remain to a greater extent unregulated by individual legislation and therefore, similarly to the past, are "identified with ultimately informal" and unprotected forms of employment and payments. Furthermore in the late 1980's particular firms' use of them (overwhelmingly medium and small firms) seems to have increased enhancing not only some manufacturing and almost all the construction activities³³, which traditionally have been based in part on those forms, but also expanding to new ones (e.g. insurance, banks, and public enterprises). According to several studies, together with the part-time and temporary forms, the above mentioned flexible work-forms have reinforced in certain fields of economic activity direct informality both in economic and labour terms by bringing about broader effects that will be discussed later (Stratoulis, 1988, Rylmon, 1992: study on the relation of emigrants to informal forms of economy and labour; Konstandinou, 1988; Karamessini, 1992; Dimou, 1991; Mitropoulos, 1991; KEPE, 1992).

In the light of these accounts, present economic and labour policies, including their flexibility issues, rather than promoting any restructuring of present economic and labour patterns by which the Greek economy still operates, basically reflect trends of

³³ Except for construction activities further economic activities that still present a kind of 'structural' flexibility and a high degree of informality are a) in manufacturing sectors which we used to call sectors of 'diffused industrialisation' (such as garment industries, leather dressing and shoe industries) and in the service sector, (retail, tourism, and navy transportation) (See Karamesini, 1992, intersectoral study on labour flexibility in Greek economy).

restoring or partially modifying "old modes of capital accumulation and economic and labour regulation" that were partially undermined after the mid-1970's.

They have little to do with any "modernised flexible production systems" in Greek manufacturing and services, such as have been conceptualized in some post-Fordist views (e.g. the flexible specialisation school). This is to say that rather than the assumed development of a new offensive flexibly specialised production, through such policies defensive middle range capital activities seem up to a point to have re-emerged at present in Greece, facilitated by the above-mentioned labour and economic strategies.

These types of economic activity, rather than having been necessitated by assumed new fragmented, customary needs of Greek markets, have actually been necessitated by the lack of any extensive capacity and also interest on the part of Greek entrepreneurs, to become sufficiently involved in competitive mass production industries and advanced markets (whether internal or external). (Limberaki, 1988, 1990; Giannitsis, 1992; Karamessini, 1992).

They also have less to do with Atkinson's model of the "Flexible Firm", since they do not seem to be followed by any extensive technological and more advanced organisational improvements of the traditional patterns in the wide range of Greek economic activities, or by the creation of more privileged

work, employment and payment conditions if not to the entire workforce at least to the officially salaried work force³⁴.

Instead they have more to do with an attack on the part of the state and employers on both the "core" and "peripheral" workforces' previous work conditions by expanding to different degrees the "informal" regime of the peripheral workforce and in contrast by reducing the existing officially legitimated and more advanced regime of the existing "core".

In this context, these labour policies may be considered, at least in Greece, as easing a redefinition of relations between capital and labour in favour of the former, putting in practice the past regime of work, employment and payments, as well as arbitrary labour relations, and through them, once again reworking the "old modes of accumulation". Nevertheless these policies exerted both on the part of the Greek state and the Greek capital do not promise that this "new doubtful capital accumulation attempt" will be reinvested in more advanced capitalist terms, and in favour of any national developmental aims. Speaking in more theoretical terms, these policies not merely do not seem to encourage radical shifts in existing modes of accumulation as they do, up to a point, in several Fordist economies, but they are not oriented even towards the

³⁴ Although more privileged work, employment and payment conditions do exist, these concerned very few and selective categories (e.g. top and senior staff) and the over-qualified categories of the workforce in particular sectors of the Greek economy, (e.g. consultancy, finance, computing, marketing and media sector.) (see Rylmon, 1992).

establishment of a more advanced "Neo-Taylorist" model of capital accumulation in contemporary Greece. Of course, more risky and advanced indigenous industrial interests and expectations also exist among entrepreneurial classes. However, they do not seem at present to be dominating in Greece either on the economic or the political scene.

These evaluations need to be reasoned specifically via the exploration of the impacts of those labour policies in the Greek economy and society so far, (see the following section). Also of interest is the observation of the responses of Greek large entrepreneurs towards the crisis of the 1980's in particular, since it is assumed to be the part of Greek capital that has to a greater extent the capacity to promote more advanced restructuring attempts and through them to accelerate more or less similar trends in the wider Greek economy.

THE IMPACTS OF, AND TRENDS FOLLOWED BY, THE STATE AND EMPLOYERS' ECONOMIC AND LABOUR STRATEGIES IN LATE 1980'S AND EARLY 1990'S IN GREECE:

The labour and economic strategies after the mid 1980's seem to have enabled greater "flexibility" of Greek labour, and not of the Greek economy compared to the period between 1960 and 1985, and through them, to have facilitated the following processes to take place so far:

A: The traditional middle-range capital activities and productive patterns (labour intensive) across all the sectors of the economy and particularly in the manufacturing sector (light labour

intensive industries), basically comprised of medium firms (though concentration trends on those capitals were reinforced in the 1980's), were able to rework and retain in part until 1990, their direct profitability but to a lesser extent their actual capital productivity.

Such a process took place by a) the stabilisation or even elimination of employment, particularly that which had been expressed in standard forms; b) their greater resorting not merely to old and new legitimized flexible work practices concerning both the core and peripheral workforce (e.g. such as short-term contracts, part-time etc.) but with regard to a great part of them, to the direct informality of both their economic and also labour framework by which these activities presently operate (tax-evasion, 'black' labour and so on). According to very recent studies such a process has been particularly reinforced in the primary and tertiary sector (e.g. construction, tourism, retail), by a distinctive increase in the late 1980's and early 1990's of foreign emigrants in Greece who constitute, at the moment, 10% of the economically active population and almost 20% of the salaried workforce (INE, 1992 study on Foreign immigrants in Greece, p.22).

It has also been facilitated, in part, by some opportunities that were presented in the late 1980's with regard to one part of these capital activities, being temporarily expanded, by penetrating to some less advanced internal, but mainly external

markets in Europe (particularly in eastern part - Bulgaria, Rumania) (Giannitsis, 1992, Ioakimoglou, 1992).

However, as far as the large part of these activities is concerned, they continued to exacerbate the burdening of an already not merely low productive, but an almost bankrupted economy and a state no longer capable (due to its acute financial problems) of compensating their low productivity and low "quality" patterns by socialising their cost through strict policies of redistribution of incomes and austerity measures that have already taken place for a prolonged period in Greece (namely from 1987 until 1993). Furthermore such state policies have postponed any more advanced developmental attempts and created deeper recessional phenomena in the Greek economy³⁵.

³⁵ For more details with reference to the impacts of these state policies see 1) Study of the Economic Intelligence Unit, *ECONOMIST*, 1991; 2) Report of the BANK of Greece, 1993; on the negative role of stabilisation and austerity measures on the present developmental prospects of the Greek economy and 3) the study of Federation of Greek Industries, (SEV), that points out as a main reason for the lack of more advanced and generous investing interests, on the part of two thirds of manufacturing firms, the shrinking internal markets, that followed in part the austerity measures and in part the reinforcement of imports. (Presentation of the S.E.V. study on the technological modernization in Greek manufacturing, by Korfiatis in *TO VIMA* 31-5-1992, p.18)

B: More advanced large entrepreneurial capital activities also rotated in recent years to labour intensive intermediate and mainly consumptionist activities, in manufacturing but basically in the service sector, to compensate up to a point for the high cost of their modest technological modernisation attempts (that seem with reference to one section of them as being underway in the 1990's). However, these modest technological modernisation attempts have not gained, so far, any significant improvement on their capital's productivity despite their heavy resorting at the same time to 1) the elimination and stabilisation of employment (especially of its "standard forms"), 2) taking advantage of both old and new numerically flexible labour practices, towards a significant part of their workforce, 3) no simultaneous further expansion of their production activities in quantitative terms, (a process that alongside the above-mentioned ones, entails the increased intensification of their existing workforce), and finally 4) to current, rather temporary opportunities that those capitals took advantage of, after the mid-1980's, through their penetration in some western and eastern European markets.

In addition it must also be taken into account that according to a recent study of the Greek Employers' Confederation's research institute (IOVE), such moderate technological modernisation attempts are in fact evident within only 1/4 of the total of large and medium manufacturing firms in Greece, while in half of these industries what is evident is the shrinking of their previous fields of economic activities, and counter development

trends. (S.E.V. study on technological modernisation in manufacturing sector in TO VIMA, 31-5-1992, p. 18).

Furthermore the technological modernisation process, whenever it takes place alongside a recessional economy, seems subsequently to discourage through these labour strategies, broader more advanced organisational, sectoral, and labour shifts that combined with the former attempt could make possible similarly more advanced economic flexibilities on the part of these firms. Finally, according to some very recent studies and my empirical study as well, such a process seems to encourage the creation of a similarly "rigid" and, less competitive form of a "Neo-taylorist model"³⁶ having limited its interest to a modest technological modernisation (in terms of mechanical equipment) and still extensively relying on traditional over-centralised authoritarian, low-skilled and badly organised managerial and labour patterns. However, as the experience of other countries has shown, so far it is doubtful if this type of modernisation can work in the long term, in securing a successful restructuring and by it the increase of these capitals' productivity and competitiveness, in a more advanced and flexibly organised European and international environment in which these firms' businesses need to be involved and gaining competitiveness³⁷.

³⁶ (through greater concentration processes of those activities in 1980's)

³⁷ (See Coria, 1990, GeorgaKopoulou, 1991, on recent flexibilities of capital and production, Karamessini's recent empirical study on this topic with reference to the Greek case, 1992).

Furthermore, while such a process is underway, it must be taken into consideration that it is not yet concerned with the large scale of even the large capitals' restructuring attempts in contemporary Greek economy.

C: New labour and economic policies seem not to encourage, for the time being, any extensive increase of direct foreign (or multinational) investment in productive activities in Greece, despite the fact that such an aim has been posited as a central one, within present state policies, since through it a rallying of both production and markets as well as of employment opportunities is expected. What is evident in the late 1980's and early 1990's is:

Firstly, the continuation of foreign capital traditional credit and finance involvement in the Greek economy, which has been facilitated by the acute financial difficulties of both the state and firms and the lack of availability of an extensive resort to indigenous financial markets. This process has become in turn a particular area of finance capital speculation³⁸, exacerbating in the long term the debt crisis that Greece of the 1990's is undergoing.

Secondly, a modest and selective foreign capital investing activity in particular fields of the manufacturing sector, and overwhelmingly of the service sector, as well as some strategically important fields of the broader public sector and some private firms under state control (e.g. such as those of

³⁸ By extremely high interest rates, and deliberately high inflation.

Telecommunication, Electricity, as well as Olympic Airways National Air Navigation Services), (Iliadis 1981; Perrakis 1987; Magliveras 1987; Katsaros; 1991 Vernardakis 1989).

More specifically, this process has taken place in recent years more by the direct organisation (hostile takeovers) by foreign capital of several light manufacturing industries and also of some competitive heavy industries (e.g. cement mills, steel industries), which were previously under state control, rather than by merging firms with indigenous capital, or furthermore by any new establishments on their part. As far as public enterprises are concerned the above-mentioned process has been reinforced by present state policies aiming at the fast privatisation of several strategic fields of those firms' activities mainly in the form of tender offers or public offers having become, at the moment, the terrain of acute struggles between the government and the trade unions of those firms as well as all the opposition parties of Greece (Study of Commercial bank of Greece, Marmagiolis, Paccinos, 1990; Giannitsis, 1992; Report of the Ministry of National Economy, by S. Manos, 1993 to EKOFIN's Commission with regard the convergence of the Greek economy to European Unification targets).

Generalising, the fact that the majority of those still modest foreign investments, in Greece, has been basically oriented so far, either in finance services, or to the service sector (e.g. media, marketing and commerce sectors) and to consumerist

manufacturing activities, brings about two important and closely related further issues with reference to our topic:

Firstly, that foreign, and multinational capital in particular, rather than encouraging by direct productive investments an improvement of the productive capacities of the Greek economy at present seems, as before in the post-war economic history of Greece, to take advantage by speculating on the Greek economy's financial problems, and merely to attempt to penetrate and gain ground in the already fragile and much less competitive markets (for the indigenous products and services). At the same time their great interest in 'taking over' strategic and competitive sections of public enterprises at present seems basically to be oriented to facilitate their broader European and international fields of activity and by contrast to weaken in this way not merely the Greek economy's already advanced and competitive sectors but also sectors with a crucial role for any advanced restructuring at present and finally with reference to one part of them, fields of strategic importance in broader terms (e.g. defence) (Haralambakis, 1993).

Secondly, such a process also makes obvious the broader disadvantages that Greek socio-economic patterns still retain both in economic and broader socio-political terms (for multinationals). This makes the expectation of a revitalisation of the Greek economy by attracting foreign investments, under the present conditions, rather a superficial dream. It also demonstrates that the realisation on a massive scale of even such a scenario in

Greece, also calls for certain broader, more advanced sectoral, organisational, technological and in part labour restructuring attempts, that present state and employers' policies do not actually encourage through their practices.

More specially such disadvantages may be considered as the following: 1) the very small Greek markets, which are not easily capable of generating economies of scale and in which, overall, those foreign activities are involved due to the higher profitability reasons; 2) the lack of a less bureaucratic and more flexible state, legal and further economic infrastructure framework that could facilitate a direct foreign investment process; and finally the structural and sectoral discrepancies that Greek economic patterns still present. Therefore these disadvantages can no longer be compensated by policies that just attempt once again to retain relatively cheap labour costs, and forms of intensified labour, and which leave the "spontaneous mechanisms" of the "free market" to solve these deep structural problems of the Greek economy (Mouzelis 1992).

Furthermore, these policies are more likely to fail due to the fact that from an international point of view, and in the present international recessional and uncertain climate, Greece, although still one of the cheapest European countries in terms of labour cost, is neither cheaper nor more pliant (in terms of their workforce's social and political attitudes) compared to other countries that multinationals have already and more extensively taken advantage of, by the selective relocation of a part of their

productive activities in their territories (e.g. South-east Asian ones) (Giannitsis, 1992; Vernardakis, 1989; Katsanevas, 1990; Tolios, 1990; Papandreou, 1981).

If this is the case, the continuation of these economic and labour strategies, in part seem to permit a capacity only for the more advanced sectors, and fields of activity in which selective sections of Greek and some foreign capital have been involved, and not for the wide range of the Greek economy to regain or retain for a short period their capital's productivity and profitability, by restoring or further expanding a kind of "Neo-Taylorist" model in their businesses.

However, such a process has been deprived so far of any extensive application of new advanced technologies and, further, of any more advanced organisational, sectoral, or labour shifts. Instead it has been basically inclined to penetrate via these less advanced intensive forms of labour, merely some less advanced markets in Europe. Therefore it is neither likely to make possible any way out of the crisis for the wide range of the Greek economy at present, nor any encouragement of more advanced national development by broader restructuring attempts of its low productive economic and labour patterns by which it still operates.

By contrast, the realisation of this process, under the existing state and employers' economic and labour strategies, has exacerbated further recession, and also polarisation of the economy and labour. This has occurred as the result of the continuation, if not expansion, of the old low productive and no

longer competitive modes of "pre-Fordist accumulation", which, if they led Greek attempts at industrialisation in the 1960's to failure, seem to have led Greece of the 1990's to an ultimate developmental deadlock as a country. In addition such a process has increased the distance between Greece and the more advanced and competitive European and international community.

Such an evaluation is in several scholars' views one of great importance, not merely in strict economic terms, concerning, for example, the extent to which Greece as a country will overcome its present recession and will gain development again. It is also of great importance in broader socio-political and cultural terms. These have to do with the extent to which, through such less, or not at all, advanced processes in the economic sphere, Greece can secure for the broad categories of its population further political autonomy and freedom as well as broader harmonious, socio-cultural development, as a society (Giannitsis, 1992; Giannitsis, Kontogeorgis, 1990).

The last chapter of this study has been particularly interested in observing both current economic and labour strategies, as well as responses on the part of the large scale firms towards the recession of 1980's, in a sample that covers their activities in the Greater Attica District. In addition, an attempt will be made to correlate and justify the above mentioned evaluations by additional data through the presentation of my empirical research.

CHAPTER 4

THE ECONOMIC AND LABOUR PROFILE OF LARGE
INDUSTRIES IN THE GREATER AREA OF ATTICA
DISTRICT IN THE 1980's: CURRENT LABOUR POLICIES
AND LABOUR FLEXIBILITY

THE CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE EMPIRICAL
RESEARCH AND SOME METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES:

The empirical part of this study has been particularly concentrated on the economic and labour policies that large Firms of the Greater area of Attica have followed in the 1980's and early 1990's.

The decision to concentrate the research on large industries' economic and labour strategies at present, across all the major sectors of the economy in which these firms have been involved and developed their activities, was mainly demanded:

1. By the leading role that both in the past and also at present, large capital, involved in these activities, has played in the Greek economy as well as its influence on the whole developmental pattern in the shape of the Greek economy in the past, and its likely influence, subsequent to the deep crisis of the 1980's.

2. Due to the fact that labour relations, similarly to other capitalist countries, have been much more fully developed and also more clearly defined in large firms compared to medium and small ones. They have included in more recent years, a strong enough

trade unionism that after the mid 1970's has gained ground and flourished on a firm level.

In this context, the study of the current economic and labour strategies in these firms is likely to manifest up to a point, further trends that are underway with reference to shifts in the economy and labour in early 1990, and also the balance of power between capital and labour as it is expressed through the labour relations in large industries for the same period.

3. Overall, due to the assumption that if any more advanced and qualitative economic and labour restructuring attempts were in fact underway in the 1980's and early 1990's in the Greek economy, such attempts should first of all, and to a greater extent compared to medium and small firms, be reflected in large and more advanced entrepreneurial capitals' current economic and labour strategies.

The economic and labour profile of large firms in the 1980's in the Greater Attica area has been researched by the following methodology:

1. By a sample survey that was carried out in 35 firms covering all the major sectors of the economy in which large firms have developed their activities.

The survey more specifically sought through formal extensive interviews (of both management and Trade Unions in the firms included in the sample) to reveal aspects of the economic and labour strategies that firms have presented in the period

extending from 1988 to 1992, as well as of those which firms are going to, or would like to, address in the future, including qualitative and quantitative labour flexibility issues as defined in Atkinson and Boyer's theoretical descriptive models of labour flexibility. (See Atkinson 1986, Boyer 1988 and also the questionnaire: Appendix 3).

2. The survey, in turn, was supplemented by a further economic study, carried out on my part, that concentrated its attention on the observation of the business trend of these firms throughout the last decade (namely the 1980's) and on the extent and character of the economic dynamics of the large firms, that had already been interviewed, during the same period.

By the use of this additional pool of data on the economic profile of large scale industries within the sample, apart from the opinions and beliefs of the interviewers on the topic under research, what has been attempted is, first, a classification of the group of firms that were presented as more advanced, modernised and, long-term dynamic, in the 1980's as opposed to those firms that had similar features in their business processes during the 1980's, either to a lesser extent or not at all.

The main target of the supplementation of the survey with this economic analysis of the business trends of large industries in whole 1980's was the observation of the differences that these groups of firms were likely to present with reference to their attitudes on current economic and labour policies, as these appeared through the findings of the survey.

By doing so, the study has attempted to focus on the following central questions:

1. To what extent large firms' attempts to increase their capital profitability and further economic efficiency, as well as to cope with the crisis problems in the recessional economic environment of the 1980's, were followed by steps more or less oriented towards a qualitative restructuring of their previous technological, organisational and labour patterns of activity? Labour flexibility policies, whether traditional and already applied, or newly introduced, were also under consideration.

2. What are the features, as well as the character, of such economic and labour restructuring attempts in the late 1980's (if they exist)?

3. What are the impacts as well as prospects of these current labour policies (flexibility issues have also been included), specifically with regard to:

a) the long-term economic productivity and further efficiency of the large firms, as well as the modernisation of their technological, organisational, and labour patterns (e.g. towards more advanced directions assimilated to those of more advanced European economies),

b) the entire situation of the work forces in these firms,

c) the current Greek recessional economy, and more specifically to what extent these policies ease the Greek economy out of its present recession, and facilitate the gaining of more

advanced developmental "paths" in the much more competitive and highly demanding European and international environment, that the European Unification process, in particular, has brought about and in which Greece has to operate at present.

The configuration of the large scale industries' economic and labour profile that was finally revealed is extensively described in the following sections providing for us the context for some broader thoughts on the existing economic and labour trends and the possible forms of capital accumulation in the Greek economy of the early 1990's. These thoughts are presented in the conclusions of this chapter.

Despite the fact that both the size and the breadth of this empirical study do not allow over-generalisations, nevertheless some trends and features of the large firms' current economic and labour strategies are presented, particularly if it is taken into account that over 53% of the total of large and medium/small firms across all sectors is still concentrated in the Greater Area of Attica District.³⁹

³⁹ The methodological issues concerning both the sample survey and the processing of the economic analysis as well as the questionnaire, of this sample survey, are presented in more detail in the appendices: Number 1, 2, and 3).

PREFACE

According to the results of the economic analysis that has supplemented the sample survey, the large industries of the sample can be divided into three basic categories:

The first one predominantly consists of upward, (in terms of their business trends in the 1980's) profitable and long-term dynamic firms, the second seems to exist on an intermediate level and basically includes firms that have maintained relatively constant capital profitability and stable financial situation (e.g. debt obligations), but have to a lesser extent than the first group demonstrated long-term dynamics, while the third category has been to a great extent characterised by a downward trend in the 1980's followed not merely by lower profitability, but also a further worsening of their financial and technological capacities. These firms demonstrate very low or non-existent dynamism compared to the other two groups.

Let us present in more detail the most distinctive economic and labour features that characterised the large Athenian firms of our sample in the 1980's, relating their economic profile to their policies towards labour, including labour flexibility aspects.

The analysis of the results has been heavily based on the Trade Unions' view. However, in most cases it has also attempted to correlate, discuss, compare and interpret the managements' view as well. This, by and large, is presented as similar to or slightly differentiated from that of the Trade Unions in some aspects. In certain cases it uses both views (e.g. on the

expectations and targets of the current managerial policies), while in the case of an insufficient number of final responses for drawing conclusions, (either on the part of trade unions or the employers), the presentation of the results has been merely based on the view that has gathered a satisfactory number of responses. In the case of a distinctive difference between trade unions and employers, I present both views on the topic.

The main findings of both the economic analysis with regard to the economic profile of large firms in the 1980's, and the survey concerning the current labour strategies that are exerted on their part, is presented in two main tables (entitled: A. and B.) in the following pages. The detailed findings of the empirical research are presented in the form of tables at the end of this chapter. (see content of tables of the sample survey and the economic analysis on the Business Trends of the firms of the sample in 1980's).

MAIN TABLES OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY A& B

CODES USED FOR THE PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN TABLES: A, B

a) CODES CONCERNING THE PRESENTATION OF THE ECONOMIC INDICES

- 2 - distinctive improvement/ increase
- 1 -= slight improvement/increase
- 0 - stabilised/steady
- 1 - slight worsening or elimination
- 2 - distinctive worsening or elimination

b) CODES CONCERNING THE LABOUR POLICIES IN CASE OF PRESENTATION OF INDICES BY THE HIERARCHICAL CLASSIFICATION METHOD

- 1 - to a great extent
- 2 - fairly enough
- 3 - to a less extent
- 4 - not at all

Methodology: Hierarchical classification¹

¹For more details on the methodological issues see appendix no 2,3, and the economic tables number 1 - 8

ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE FIRMS IN THE SAMPLE
IN THE 1980'S (1980 - 90) AND LABOUR POLICIES

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION					SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION					
MAIN ECONOMIC INDICES	TOTAL	DOWNWARD	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	MANUFACTURING	COMMERCE	BANKS / INSURANCE	OTHER SERVICE SECTOR	D.E.K.O.	CODE OF TABLES
Annual average variation of gross profits	0	-2	0	2	0	0	1	0	-1	2,3
Annual Variation of capital return	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	2,3
Annual average variation of ratio of debt	0	-1	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0	2,3
Annual average variation of capital intensity	-1	-2	0	0	-1	0	-1	-	0	2,3
Annual average variation of employment rates	0	-1	-1	1	0	1	0	-	-1	2,3
Existence of business cycle fluctuation problem (yes) %	56.7%	71.4%	53.3%	50%	57.1%	33.3%	60%	42.9%	100%	A37
Problem of under utilisation of the mechanical equipment (yes) %	18.5%	16.7%	26%	-	23%	-	-	14.9%	18.5%	A10-13
AGE OF TECHNOLOGY										
More modernised:										
1 - 4 years	29.6%	16.7%	14.3%	28.6%						A14
1 - 9 years	44.4%	50%	36%	57.2%	20%	33.3%	100%	71.5%	25%	A14
Less modernised over 10 years	55.6%	50%	64%	42.9%	80%	66.7%	-	28.6%	75%	A14
MAIN LABOUR POLICIES PERIOD 1988 - 1992										
Existence of surplus personnel in the firm (yes)	9.4%	-	17.6%	-	21.4%	-	-	-	-	A26
Expansion of non standard forms of employment (average)	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	B2-7
Extent of use of non standard forms of contracts (average)	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	B8-12
Extent of use of standard forms of employment & (to a great extent, fairly enough)	56.3%	42.9%	53.2%	75%	78.6%	50%	100%	28.6%	100%	B2

Dismissals in the last three years (yes) %	19.4	28.6%	17.7%	14.3%	21.4%	25%	-	14.3%	25%	B7	
Resort to overtime work (yes due to workload) %	68.8	71.4	76.5	50	71.4%	100%	100%	65.7%	75%	C1	
Existence of flexible working hours systems in the firms (yes) %	21.9%	42.9%	17.6%	12.5%	-	-	-	-	-	C31-33	
Resort to shift work systems (yes) %	77.4%	62.5%	84.6%	80%	-----NO DATA AVAILABLE-----						C21
Existence of problem of lack of skills in the firm (yes) %	43.8%	42.9%	35.3%	62.5%	28.6%	50%	66.7%	57.1%	50%	D1	
Evaluation of the level of skills in the firm	3	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	D12	
Level of training activities in the firm	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	D13	

Evaluation of training activities - results so far

Adequate and proper to the firms needs (yes) %	56.7%	57.1%	47.1%	83.3%	46.2%	50%	66.6%	66.6%	75%	D20-22
Existence of multi skilled personnel in the firm (yes) %	62.5%	71.4%	76.5%	25%	71.4%	50%	66.7%	57.1%	50%	D26
Degree of resort to Multi skilled personnel by the firm	3	3	3	3	2	2	1	2	2	D27
Existence of external mobility of the staff of the firms (yes) %	6.5%	14.3%	-	14.3%	7.7%	-	-	14.3%	-	D24
Payments based on collective bargaining system (yes)	75%	85.7%	82.4%	50%	50%	100%	66.7%	85.7%	75%	E24-26
Degree of expansion of non-standard additional forms of pay (average)	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	E5-10
Degree of expansion of remuneration payments to the firms staff	2	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	4	E5-10

ECONOMIC PROFILE OF THE FIRMS IN THE SAMPLE
IN THE 1980'S (1980 - 90) AND LABOUR POLICIES

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION				SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION						
MAIN ECONOMIC INDICES	TOTAL	DOWNWARD	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	MANUFACTURING	COMMERCE	BANKS / INSURANCE	OTHER SERVICE SECTOR	D.E.K.O.	CODE OF TABLES
Annual average variation of gross profits	0	-2	0	2	0	0	1	0	-1	2,3
Annual Variation of capital return	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	1	0	2,3
Annual average variation of ratio of debt	0	-1	0	1	0	-1	0	0	0	2,3
Annual average variation of capital intensity	-1	-2	0	0	-1	0	-1	-	0	2,3
Annual average variation of employment rates	0	-1	-1	1	0	1	0	-	-1	2,3
Existence of business cycle fluctuation problem (yes) %	40%	50%	66.6%	60%	60%	25%	50%	16.7%	25%	A37
Problem of under utilisation of the mechanical equipment (yes) %	3.6%	14.3%	-	-	-	-	-	20%	25%	A10-13
AGE OF TECHNOLOGY										
More modernised:										
1 - 4 years	18.5%	28.6%	18.2%	44.4%						A14
1 - 9 years	70.3%	57.2%	72.7%	77.7%	54.6%	100%	83.3%	100%	33.3%	A14
less modernised over 10 years	29.6%	42.8%	27.3%	22.3%	45.4%	-	16.7%	-	66.7%	A14
MAIN LABOUR POLICIES PERIOD 1988 - 1992										
Existence of surplus personnel in the firm (yes)	35.5%	50%	23.1%	40%	54.5%	50%	16.7%	33.3%	-	A26
Expansion of non standard forms of employment (average)	3	3	3	3	3	2	4	4	4	B2-7
Extent of use of non standard forms of contracts (average)	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	3	3	B8-12

Extent of use of standard forms of employment % (to a great extent fairly enough)	58.1%	37.5%	69.3%	70%	54.5%	100%	66.7%	50%	25%	B2
Dismissals in the last three years (yes) %	6%	-	15.4%	-	20%	-	-	-	-	B7
Resort to overtime work (yes due to work load)	64.5%	69.5%	61.5%	70%	72.7%	100%	83.4%	66.7%	75%	C1
Existence of flexible working hours systems in the firms (yes) %	19.4%	25%	23%	10%	100%	-	-	100%	59.3%	C31-33
Resort to shift work systems (yes) %	78.1%	71.4%	82.4%	75%	-	-----NO DATA AVAILABLE-----				C21
Existence of problem of lack of skills in the firm (yes) %	45.2%	50%	46.1%	70%	36.4%	25%	16.7%	83.3%	75%	D1
Evaluation of the level of skills in the firm	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	D12
Level of training activities in the firm	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	D13

Evaluation of training activities - results so far

Adequate and proper to the firms needs (yes) %	87.5%	87.5%	76.9%	100%	90.9%	75%	83.3%	100%	75%	D20-22
Existence of multi skilled personnel in the firm (yes) %	74.2%	75%	84.6%	80%	63.6%	100%	83.3%	50%	100%	D26
Degree of resort to Multi skilled personnel by the firm	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	D27
Existence of external mobility of the staff of the firms (yes) %	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	D24
Payments based on collective bargaining system (yes)	56%	50%	59%	50%	30%	50%	60%	33.3%	100%	E24-26
Degree of expansion of non-standard additional forms of pay (average)	3	4	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	E5-10
Degree of expansion of remuneration packets to the firms staff	2	2	2	2	3	1	3	3	3	E5-10

THE CASE OF 'UPWARD' AND DYNAMIC FIRMS

1. Increasing profitability of "upward" firms in the 1980's was combined with: i) the improvement of those firms' autonomous financial capacities (e.g. through the improvement of their ratio of debt in the 1980's) ii) apparent technological modernisation attempts, that have been followed by a slight increase of employment, while in a very few cases in the Trade Unions' view (and not at all in employer's view) has this process lead to the need for extensive dismissals of the personnel of these firms.

The technological modernisation attempt is not merely manifested by the average age of these firms' technological equipment, which is presented by the results of the survey, but is mainly certified by the further economic analysis, and more specifically by the steadiness of capital intensity of 'upward' firms, in relation to the simultaneous increase of their employment rates in the same period (see tables A3, A4, A5 on the economic profile of the firms and A19 on the average age of the mechanical equipment).

2. Furthermore, "upward" firms when compared to the other firms, and in particular compared to "downward" firms, seem to have promoted attempts aiming at the qualitative improvement of their personnel in terms of skills, labour organisation and actual efficiency at work. This process rather manifests the increasing requirements that technological evolution usually brings about, with reference to the improvement of the

labour force's performances (in this sense, it may be interpreted by the fact that the lack of skills is presented to a greater extent as a serious problem on the part of upward firms as opposed to other categories of firms).

The attempts towards the qualitative improvement of "upward firms" personnel have mainly been visible in 1) the much more developed training activities that these firms have promoted towards their personnel (see Table D 13), 2) their greater resort, compared to the rest, to the multi-skilled categories of their staff, and 3) in the apparent satisfaction of those firms, with reference to the actual availability and efficiency of training projects applied so far (table D 20). They are also manifested by both Trade Unions' and employers' responses concerning the impacts that technological evolution has brought about up to a point, to the whole life of those firms. Examples are attempts toward a more advanced organisation of the production and labour process, and a kind of improvement of working conditions, as well as, with regard to a certain part of their personnel, higher payments that have been given mainly in the form of additional pay, motivating in this way this part of the work force for a greater interest and quality at work. (see tables: A17 and E24-26 on payments).

Finally, they are demonstrated by the different 'mentality' that "upward" firms seem to present with reference to their economic and labour problems that is shown by their more apparent awareness that a significant part of their problems in the

recessional period of the 1980's was closely related to the less advanced technological organisational and labour patterns of their firms rather than solely to external factors (e.g. unavailable state policies, the crisis of the Greek economy, the increase of competition etc.), and also in their greater attention to the autonomous initiatives and attempts that should be promoted on their part towards the improvement of these features (see table A 39-A42, on reasons for the existence of fluctuation problems in the firms).

However, it must be taken into account that although 'upward' firms compared to other categories have definitely oriented their strategies toward a kind of broader qualitative restructuring of their economic and labour patterns, the findings of this research also demonstrate that neither all the "upward" firms did this, nor these policies necessarily were oriented towards the whole work force employed in these firms.

3. Instead, technological improvement attempts in "upward" firms have, up to a point, eliminated their resort to solely "old labour practices", namely to intensified forms of labour in terms, for example, of lengthening the working hours of their workforce, and so on, but they seem to be far from abolishing them. Overtime and extensive shiftwork is apparent to a greater extent and supplements those firms' production or service activity. The main reasons for the use of overtime, on the part all the large firms in general, and the "upward" ones in particular are:

i) the cheaper labour cost of overtime work compared to resorting to new hiring, even if these are of temporary and part-time personnel;

ii) the lack of properly skilled personnel in the external labour markets at present, as well as the fact that the skilled work force is usually not as willing to be employed by non-standard forms of employment and payments, and finally

iii) certain disadvantages to which resorting to temporary and part-time forms of employment give rise for the management of the firms, such as low interest and efficiency at work, the increasing need for supervision and training policies towards this part of work force; and less trustworthiness in the quality of work of the temporary staff work (see tables, D1, D12, C15-C17 and C5-C7, B53-B55 and B73-B75 on the problems that have arisen from resorting to temporary and part-time employment).

In this context it might be argued that technological modernisation has reduced, but nevertheless has not eliminated traditional forms of intensified and low skilled labour in 'upward' firms.

4. Employment Policies

Despite the fact that "upward" firms have, to a greater extent compared to other categories, shown capacities, and also actual practices that have encouraged full and permanent forms of employment in new hiring they have, similarly to the other firms, resorted to "numerically" flexible forms of non-standard

employment, in the periods of their "upward" business trend in particular, and more specifically to hiring by short-term contracts and contract work. Furthermore in the view of employers, "upward" firms seem to resort to these forms more frequently than other categories of firms (see tables B8-B12, B2-B6).

By contrast "upward" firms seem to a lesser extent, compared to the rest, also to be flexible in the "downward" period of their businesses, in externalising for instance a part of their activities by undertaking subcontracting work (piecework included) on behalf of third firms or individuals. However, such a process is not necessarily likely to mean less flexibility on the part of 'upward' firms but lack of any economic interest in doing so (see tables A46-A49, in relation to B8-B12).

In this context it might be argued that although technological and organisational improvement is presented as encouraging as well as easing predominantly permanent and full-time employment forms of the work, the supplementation of the 'upward' firms by "quantitative" flexible forms of non-standard employment seems to be still apparent and also necessary to these firms' performances.

5. Payment Policies:

To the Trade Unions' view, "upward" firms, in particular, compared to the other categories seem to have to a lesser extent based their workforce's payments on the existing collective bargaining system. (However in the employers' view this difference is not so apparent among the three categories of firms.

Instead all of them have to a lesser extent based their payments on collective bargaining). Such a process with reference to payments implies that "upward" firms more extensively, and not merely in rhetorical terms but actually, have put into practice flexible forms of payments towards their personnel. Such an evaluation is in part re-confirmed by the fact that "upward" firms have to a greater extent compared to the others applied:

i) forms of additional pay based on the individual assessment of work, but also on market related criteria, (e.g. the demand for the profession in the labour market), and also,

ii) by the fact that although to a lesser extent compared to the former form they have put in practice forms of profit-sharing based pay for their work-force (see tables E5-E10, E12-E17 on the criteria used in defining payments and E24-E26).

In addition, a significant part of "upward" firms are presented, through the application of non-standard additional forms of payment, as giving payments at a higher level than those of the average in the labour market, to a certain part of their personnel (see E24-E26)

5) On the External Mobility of Large Firms' Staff:

External mobility of the staff of "upward" firms, similarly to the two other categories, is rare or non-existent. Such an evaluation is re-confirmed by additional recent empirical studies on the topic (see Karamessini, 1992).

The main reasons for the very low external mobility of the large firms' staff are presented as:

i) the recessionary economic environment alongside the threat of increasing unemployment;

ii) the relative satisfaction of the staff with the whole working conditions that exist in their firms;

iii) the relatively permanent character of their contracts, which, as far as the broader public sector and the banking sector is concerned, are still strictly protected by Industrial Legislation despite the states' and employers' attempts at deregulating them.

This comment is mainly concerned with personnel already employed in standard forms and not with newly hired personnel that in recent years have been predominantly hired by non-standard forms of contracts (see tables D24, D25).

6) Expectations and Targets of the 'upward' Firms

1. The combination of external labour flexibility (namely the capacity to change directly the size and status of the employment of one part of their personnel) with internal flexibility (namely the qualitative improvement of the personnel by more advanced organisation of labour, flexible horizontal or vertical readjustment of work tasks, training, re-training and mainly multi-skilling strategies towards the workforce), followed by the use of both standard and non-standard forms of employment, as is the case with the other categories, is a central target of the employment policies of the "upward" firms in the

future (D28, B37 and B39). However, it must be mentioned that "upward" firms to a lesser extent than the others seem to resort more frequently to the external forms of labour flexibility on their own.

2. From the overall presentation of the "upward" firms' profile it may be argued that, despite the fact of the greater capacities on the part of these firms to increase employment, they don't show genuine willingness or interest in actually doing so. Instead greater attention is drawn to the target of increasing their existing workforce's labour productivity (but not an expansion of it), through the improvement of work organisation, the up-grading of skills, but also through traditional intensified forms of labour as well as through a more close correlation of payments to the increases in individual productivity, as an additional actual means for achieving this target.

Furthermore, while the increase in labour productivity is presented as a central target of the "upward firms" management, it is not presented as directly related to the target of a related increase in the workforce's payments as well. Instead, according to the employers' view in particular, stabilisation of payments has been explicitly declared as a central payment strategy for the future at least in so far as a significant part of the "upward" firms is concerned (see tables E1-E3, E27, E29).

Finally, similarly important targets of the "upward" firms are presented to be:

a) the minimisation of state involvement and regulation attempts, in firms' labour relations - a target that is to a greater extent demanded by 'upward' and 'intermediate' firms rather than "downward" ones;

b) the achievement of a "consensus" on labour relations between the management, the workforce and the trade unions of these firms, and to a lesser extent the encouragement of permanent and officially institutionalised more participatory schemes with the trade unions and the employees.

Nevertheless, the overall profile of "upward" firms seems to have demonstrated interest and also attempts towards the establishment at least of a more "democratised climate" in their firms compared to the two other categories, and to "downward" firms in particular. However this interest has been more selectively concerned with particular categories of employers, and basically with their labour performances, and not with broader issues of labour relations or with the majority of these firms' staff (see tables - E1-E13, E30--E32, and also E16-E19 on who defines the criteria of payments in the firm).

THE CASE OF "INTERMEDIATE" FIRMS

1. The steady profitability that the "intermediate" category of firms presented in the 1980's was combined with policies putting a check on the further worsening of their financial capacities (e.g. see the steadiness of the ratio of debt), but nevertheless this was not translated into any attempt at

technological modernisation. Attempts at technological modernisation on the part of the "intermediate" firms, are visible to a lesser extent, or do not exist, compared to the "upward firms".

Furthermore these processes were followed, similarly to the "downward" firms, by the reduction of employment in these firms. This fact in the case of "intermediate" firms is likely to indicate either a simultaneous partial shrinking of their previous economic activities has taken place, or in the best case, that the continuation of those firms' businesses was supplemented by a greater intensification of the labour of the already diminished workforce. Finally, this process was also combined with dismissals, (however, to a lesser extent compared to those of 'downward' firms). This response is justified on the part of 'intermediate' firms by the fact that the important fluctuation problems (but less compared to 'upward' ones) faced by these firms in their economic activities in the 1980's were followed in turn by the appearance of serious surplus workforce problems (see tables 3, 4, 5, and A37, A26, B7).

2) "Intermediate" firms have demonstrated in the 1980's greater attempts, compared to "downward" firms, but lesser compared to "upward" ones, towards the qualitative improvement of their personnel. These are basically expressed in the development of training activities oriented toward facing the problem of the lack of skills that these firms seem to have, and to a much lesser extent compared to "upward" firms, supplemented

by hiring of properly skilled new personnel. Although to a lesser extent compared to "upward" firms, such policies have also been expressed in attempts to take advantage of the multi-skilled categories of their staff.

As far as a certain number of the "intermediate" firms is concerned, whatever technological modernisation attempts have taken place seem to have led, to a lesser extent than in "upward" firms, to an improvement in the organisation of the labour process and the working conditions of their workforce (see tables: D1, D12, D13, D26, D27 on skills and training activity and A17 on the impacts that technological evolution has brought about in the Trade Unions' view).

3) Modest attempts at technological modernisation alongside the elimination of employment, seem to have led "intermediate" firms similarly to "downward" ones to retaining a great reliance on "old labour practices" of intensification of the work of their existing workforce, in terms of the lengthening of their working hours through an extensive application of overtime. This is similar to "downward" firms, but to a lesser extent compared to the "upward" ones because of the latter's greater resort to flexible working hours systems (which has been recently officially legalised in Greece (see tables C1, C31-C33).

Employment Policies:

"Intermediate" firms, while they have been oriented to a lesser extent compared to "downward" firms to the reduction of

their workforce through extensive dismissals, are presented similarly to "downward" firms as reserved in covering their needs by new hiring, and in turn, if they have done so they seem to have promoted new hiring by overwhelmingly non-standard forms of contracts particularly in the periods that their businesses were 'upward'.

In addition, in the period of the recessional "downward" business trend, "intermediate" firms have shown, similarly to "downward" ones, greater flexibility in externalising part of their economic activities through the undertaking of subcontracting work for third firms or individuals (see tables B2-B7, B8-B12, on the extent of non standard forms of employment, and A46-A48, A42-A44 on the ways of facing the fluctuation problems).

Payment Policies:

While "intermediate" firms are shown, similarly to "downward" firms but to a greater extent than "upward" firms, to have based their pay on collective bargaining (this difference exists in Trade Unions' views), they have similarly to "upward" firms resorted to non-standard pay in the form of additional pay, (particularly, individual additional pay, collective bonuses and forms of additional remuneration packages). Although to a lesser extent than "upward" firms, "intermediate" firms have also applied flexible labour payment policies by using other criteria than those of collective bargaining (e.g. such as individual labour productivity, the demand for the profession in the labour market,

and the career prospects of their personnel in their firms). In addition , the application of forms of additional pay seems to have led, to a lesser extent, to higher payments towards one part of their workforce, compared to "upward" firms.

The supplementation of collective bargaining by forms of non-standard "additional" pay seems to mainly have taken place in "intermediate" firms as a payment strategy due to the fact that a significant number of "intermediate" firms belongs to the broader public sector and banking sector, in which collective bargaining is still strong, and to some degree doesn't allow the management of these firms to apply alternative flexible payment strategies. By contrast, according to the findings of this study, the application of flexible job-forms has to a greater extent been allowed by new available legislative regulations, and actually put in practice towards these firms' new personnel (see tables: E26, E5-E10 and E12-E14).

Expectations and Targets of Intermediate Firms

Generally speaking, "intermediate" firms are presented as asking for similar targets to those of 'upward' firms. However, they are differentiated from these firms and by contrast they are associated with the 'downwards firms' profile, in the following terms:

- 1) in their future payment strategies (see "downward" firms' targets and expectations on the topic under discussion), and

2) in their greater interest compared to 'downward' firms, in a controlled application of the new flexible forms of employment, with the Trade Unions' participation, with reference to their regulation on a firm level.

As has already been mentioned, such a claim on the part of "intermediate" firms rather reflects certain troubles that these firms face at the moment (e.g. in banking and the broader public sector - DEKO). The more extensive application of flexible employment practices, in these firms in particular, is included in broader economic and political strategies which are underway at present, aiming at the abolition of the public character of their ownership and their gradual privatisation (see tables : E27-E29, E30-E37).

THE CASE OF "DOWNWARD" FIRMS:

1) Low profitability in the 1980's was combined in "downward" firms with both the worsening of their autonomous financial capacities (see the worsening of ratio of debt), and the worsening of their technological capacity compared to the rest of the firms. Such a process has been also followed by the decline of the employment in these firms and, to a large extent compared to the two other categories, by the use of dismissals.

The simultaneous worsening both of these firms' capital intensity and of their rates of employment implies that, alongside the worsening of their technological capacities, a significant proportion of "downward" firms must have been led at the same time to a reduction of some part of their previous activities

(production or service ones) in the 1980's (see above tables 3, 4, 5, A14, A37).

This is likely to explain the greater fluctuation problems that, together with the "intermediate" firms, "downward" firms faced in the same period, as well as the serious surplus workforce problem that appeared in these firms as a consequence (Tables A37, A26).

2) As far as their labour policies are concerned, "downward" firms have presented many fewer attempts to improve their workforce's capacities at work in more advanced qualitative terms. Such evaluation is manifested in various aspects

i) by the fact that their training activities are presented as less developed compared to the other categories of firms.

ii) by the extent of their actual resorting to, and taking advantage of, their multi-skilled personnel which was less compared to that of "upward" firms in particular. However, such an evaluation is presented in the employers' View and not the Trade Unions' view.

It is also manifested by the fact that 'downward' firms, compared to the rest, have shown distinctively less interest in, and attempts at, facing the problem of the lack of available skills either by applying proper training projects to their personnel or by hiring new skilled personnel, even in non-standard job-forms, so as to meet their needs (tables D8-D10, D12, D13, D26 & D27).

The above-mentioned evaluation is also confirmed by indirect but reliable additional indicators such as:

i) Whatever technological modernisation attempts have taken place in these firms, they have not been combined with attempts towards more advanced changes of their labour process and organisation of production as well as of their workforces' working conditions (see the degree of dissatisfaction with the positive impacts that technological evolution has brought about in the firms, in Trade Unions' replies in particular (Table A17)).

ii) By the lesser awareness and attention that has been paid on the part of "downward" firms to their own initiatives and attempts to improve their less advanced technological and labour patterns, and by contrast by their more apparent intention, compared to the other categories, to attribute their problems and solutions mainly to external factors (e.g. state policies, the vulnerable economic and political environment, the further economic recession and so on) (see table A39-A41 on reasons for fluctuation problems). In this context, "downward" firms' contradictory greater self-satisfaction with the level and the availability of the skills of their workforce compared to two other categories, is reasonable (Table D12).

iii) Few attempts at technological modernisation, or lack of them, seem to have overwhelmingly encouraged old labour strategies to be preserved. Namely the intensification of their workforce, basically being realised by the lengthening of working hours (see the extent of their resort to overtime work), and

through the greater expansion on some forms of 'flexible working hours'.

4) On Employment Policies

"Downward" firms have to a lesser extent, compared to the two other categories of firms, encouraged new hiring, and if they did so to some extent in a period of their "upward" business cycle, they basically resorted, as did all the other categories, to "numerically flexible" forms of non-standard employment and more particularly to short-term contracts and contract work.

Instead, "downward" firms are to a greater extent presented as having proceeded with dismissals in the period of their "downward" business trend as well as having demonstrated a distinctively greater flexibility, compared to the "upward" firms, in "externalising" a part of their activities, through undertaking subcontracting work on behalf of third firms or individuals (see tables A42-A44, and B2-B7, B8-B12).

In conclusion, "downward" firms have not developed employment opportunities in the 1980's compared to the "upward" firms and, if they did so in a very few cases, they have been heavily supported by non standard forms of employment as have all other firms.

5) Payment Policies

To the Trade Unions' view, "downward" firms are presented to a greater extent, compared to "upward" firms as having based their workforces' payments on collective bargains. They demonstrate in this sense, to a lesser extent, steps towards a more flexible system of definition of payments (to the employers' view), however, such a difference among the three categories is not distinctive).

At the same time, "downward" firms have actually given lower pay compared to the "upward" firms, and this is confirmed overall by the fact that "downward" firms have very few or no applied forms of additional pay, and of remuneration packages for their personnel.

In addition, whenever they have followed work performance related forms of pay these were applied by methods characterised as less meritocratic, compared to "upward" firms (e.g. by the use of the criterion of the close relationships of their personnel to the management of the firms, rather than individual efficiency and productivity at work). Furthermore, they seem to have placed much greater emphasis, compared to the other categories, on the direct adjustment of their workforces' payments to the temporary market capacities, than to their correlation with individual labour productivity criteria.

The orientation of 'payment policies' on the part of the "downward" firms in this sense, rather manifests a whole pattern of economic activities by which these firms operate that is still based on "occasional economic conjuncture" and is to a lesser

extent oriented to the real increase of economic and labour productivity by long-term internal radical attempts at restructuring (see E24-E26, E12-E14).

In conclusion, "downward" firms in the 1980's have demonstrated less interest compared to "upward" firms in actually associating payments with the aim of increasing labour productivity, while they are presented as having not given higher payments (than of those that collective bargaining defines) to a certain part of their personnel as "upward" firms to a certain extent they done.

Expectations and Targets of the downward firms:

By and large "downward" firms present similar expectations and targets as the other two categories. However, they are differentiated compared to the other categories of firms in the following aspects.

First: as far as a significant part of them is concerned, they are presented as much more reluctant to resort solely to forms of "external" flexibility with reference to their employment policies towards their workforce, namely the direct adjustment of the size and the status of their personnel, to the firm or market conjunctures (see tables B37-B39).

Second: "downward" firms seem to be to a greater extent, compared to the other categories, interested in the direct elimination of labour costs, irrespective of the ways in which they will achieve this target. In addition they demonstrate less interest

compared to the other categories towards aims oriented at the elimination of labour costs, through the labour productivity increase in their firms, (not characterised by the direct reduction of the wages and salaries of their personnel). In this way "downward" firms manifest, in part, intentions not merely aiming at the stabilisation of payments, as seems to be the case with "upward" firms, but their further elimination if possible (tables E1-E3).

Third: they seem much more inclined to proceed with measures aimed at the direct elimination of surplus personnel compared to the "upward" firms, and in contrast, less willing to find other creative ways that could enable them to also take advantage of the surplus part of their personnel e.g. by their retraining, or readjusting their work tasks and so on (see table A34-A36 on the ways of facing the surplus workforce problem in the future).

Fourth: a certain number of 'downward' firms, contrary to the two other categories, do not seek the greater elimination of the state's involvement in and regulation of their labour relations. Such an attitude is likely to be explained by the lower negotiating power of the management of those firms compared to that of the workforce, in a certain number of these firms. However it also reflects, to my view, a bizarre kind of state protectionism that one part of large capital has traditionally sought from various aspects of state policies in various aspects (e.g. available labour legislation for particular sectors or fields of economic activity, state intervention and "administrative" ways of solving firms'

disputes with their workforces, by legislative acts, but also through the ability that collective bargaining institutions still give to the state in regulating such disputes, and so on).

Finally: "downward" firms are presented, to a greater extent compared to the others, as being reserved, or in Trade Unions' view even hostile, towards the aim of introducing more participatory schemes for both the employees and the trade unions, while by contrast, they seek the lesser involvement of the trade unions in the labour relations of their firms. From the overall picture that 'downward' firms present it can be argued that:

i) These firms demonstrate a more authoritarian and paternalistic profile of their management, and compared to the other firms, seem to have less actual interest even in securing a kind of minimum social consensus with their workforce and particularly with the trade unions(see E16-E19, on the definition of payments).

ii) The fact that, to a greater extent than the "upward" firms these companies have asked for a controlled application of new flexible forms of employment, with the participation of the trade unions in this procedure, rather demonstrates their greater interest in the further application of such labour policies, and also the problems that they are facing with their workforce in doing so, than any genuine, long-term interest in the encouragement of a greater participation of trade unions in the firms' broader economic and labour strategies or in further problems of labour relations that usually emerge within them (Tables E30-E37, E16-E19 & E1-E3).

CONCLUSIONS

Let us to conclude this chapter by presenting some comments on the broader implications of the survey findings, as well as correlating them with other current empirical studies with reference to the topic as necessary.

1. Despite the fact that large firms have been characterised in other empirical studies as having reacted less flexibly to the recessional phenomena in the early 1980's as compared with small and medium sized industries, the findings of this study point out that a significant number of them demonstrated reasonable flexibility towards their labour force in the 1980's onward.

This was achieved mainly by applying "numerical", or in other words "quantitative" forms of employment, payment and working hours flexibility, and with reference to the majority of the firms that were included in our empirical study, they did so at the expense of the encouragement, and the actual promotion of wider qualitative economic and labour strategies (including flexibility issues) oriented to the modernization of these firms' technological, organisational and labour patterns.

In this context it might be argued that though to a different degree, and having different results from small and medium sized firms, large firms also took advantage of the application of 'quantitative' flexible labour practices that in turn enabled these firms to operate in a defensive rather than an offensive way and so retain some level of their profitability in the 1980's.

2. A second result of the empirical study seems to be that the more dynamic the firms with reference to their business cycle in the 1980's, the more extensive the attempts at technological modernisation they have proceeded with so far. Such an evaluation is also confirmed by another recent study on technological modernisation carried out by the Institute of Economic and Industrial Research (IOVE, 1992). Furthermore, while such a process took place in the more dynamic firms, the same firms, despite their resort to quantitative forms of labour flexibility, have to a greater extent compared to the rest, demonstrated at the same time more apparent attempts towards the broader improvement and modernisation of their organisational and labour patterns in more advanced directions at least with regard to a certain part of their workforce (namely the "core" part).

Such attempts have been expressed in terms of more extensive training and retraining policies towards their staff, greater resort to skilled employees, and partially though modestly by shifts in more participatory and cooperative forms of managing and controlling labour performances as well as by the improvement of their workforce's entire working conditions, and to some extent, their payments too.

Such a combination of both forms of "quantitative" and "qualitative" labour flexibility, in these firms' practices, seems in turn to have emanated from the introduction of new technologies in their production and administration processes, but also from a greater awareness on their part of the necessity of proceeding with

a broader restructuring, not merely of their less advanced technological patterns, but also of their organisational and labour patterns.

Nevertheless, it may be argued that such attempts, although they are more visible in comparison with the two other categories with regard to a certain part of their personnel, are not as radical as they seem to be (e.g. in terms of managerial interest and capacities), nor have they been so extensively applied.

Instead, such policies seem to be very selective at the moment and to have been more concerned with a very few, advanced, categories of these firms' personnel than with the wide range of their workforce. Such selective categories of the staff towards which those policies were oriented seem to be more the senior than junior staff and a particular category of a highly skilled personnel as well as professionals in "core" functional work tasks and roles for these firms operations.

3. A third conclusion that is derived from the study's findings is that the main managerial aim that is commonly presented on the part of the three categories of firms with reference to their policies towards labour, seems to be the increase of labour productivity. This target is expected to be gained by not expanding employment further, at least in the form of the standard, full and permanent types of employment that the Greek workforce had experienced after the mid 1970's in particular.

Instead the central means of achieving labour and economic productivity increase in the 1990's seems to be greater resort to the existing active workforce. In more technologically advanced firms such a process is more likely to be expressed in the achievement of a more rational organisation of labour, training, and retraining policies, the better adjustment of work tasks and planning of work, more extensive use of multi-skilled categories of the personnel and so on. Instead less modernised firms (which constitute the majority) will rather exacerbate the continuation or even expansion of intensified forms of work, by lengthening working hours (e.g. through the application of overtime, shiftwork and flexible working hours system), without at the same time promising any important improvement in the workforce's pay. Such a strategy is going to be put in practice alongside the further relaxation of labour market restrictions, and through them the easier and more extensive supplementation of employment in the large firms by an additional workforce, predominantly contracted by non-standard-flexible forms of employment and payments whenever the firms' needs require them.

In this context, whereas a "labour productivity increase" target is likely to be followed by a kind of modernisation and the achievement of more advanced organisational and labour patterns, as well as higher payments with regard to a certain part of the existing workforce in firms that have already promoted a kind of technological modernisation, in less modernised and also less advanced (in financial terms) large firms, who constitute the

norm, this is more likely to reinforce the resort to intensified, cheap, low skilled and, therefore, in longer terms less efficient labour, eased by the expansion of the "quantitatively flexible" forms of employment and payment.

In addition, even if attempts at technological modernisation will finally be more extensively spread among the greater proportion of large scale enterprises, such a process doesn't promise at the same time any further expansion of employment or any distinctive elimination of the intensification of work. This is due to the fact that the technological modernisation that is underway, in certain but still limited number of large scale firms⁴⁰, is not followed by any important expansion of the firms' existing fields of economic activity. Instead, under the present still deeply recessional economic environment and austerity state measures, it is likely to necessitate the further elimination of employment as a solution to the staggering costs that the technological modernisation process brings to these firms.

The above mentioned comments are likely to explain the basic reason (namely, the target of savings either by stabilising or/and eliminating or even devaluing both the standards and level of employment) that have uniformly led to both more and less advanced firms seeking "labour productivity increase" targets, to be also supplemented by a more extensive application of

⁴⁰ as this study, but also other studies have pointed out, (Ioakimoglou, 1991; Karamesini, 1992; Forecasting on Unemployment and Payments' Future for 1993-94, Vima 29.11.92; Nicolaou, 22.11.92; IOVE: on technological modernisation, 1992)

"numerical" forms of employment and payment flexibility, at least with reference to a certain part of their workforces.

4. A fourth result of our findings, with regard to the main payment strategies of the large firms at present, closely related to the former targets, seems to be that the majority of firms, whether more or less advanced ones, ask in addition for the direct stabilisation or even the elimination, rather than the increase, of their workforces' pay. Such an aim is pursued through a gradual erosion of the collective bargaining institutions and the generation of a system of payments (that has already been put in practice, however not as the exclusive one yet) that overall asks for the close association of pay with individual labour productivity and not with further capital productivity.

This evaluation is derived mainly from a most insightful observation of the criteria and also the main payment strategies and forms of "additional pay" that firms either have adopted so far, or they are going to adopt, as these are presented in the results of this empirical research⁴¹.

Such a payment strategy, although at first sight presented as more modernised, meritocratic and helpful for the workforce, doesn't promise any generous increase in their pay. Instead it

⁴¹ Such an evaluation is also reconfirmed by additional studies on the topic (see ELKEPA, 1990; Information Feb. 1990) and also by the already explicitly declared aims that are pursued on the part of both the state and the Greek Employers' Confederation (see ILO, ELKEPA, 1987: Congress on work related forms of pay and KEDEO - EEEE, 1988, Congress on labour productivity and social control in the broader public sector).

seems to a greater extent to be interested in a 'redécoupage', or in other words a "redefinition" of the existing workforce's pay distribution in more individualistic and arbitrarily regulated terms among the employees, if not their further reduction. At the same time, broader not merely economic but socio-political targets towards the workforce are also included in their agenda (namely the weakening of Trade Unionism).

This is due to the following reasons:

Firstly: through the disassociating of the broader economic productivity of the firms, from their workforces' individual payments, even if a certain number of the large firms will increase their capital productivity, this increase will not necessarily be translated into any corresponding increase in the workforces' pay. Instead, it is more likely that any problems of low capital profitability on the part of particular firms will be one dimensional attributed to low individual labour productivity (and therefore used as an 'alibi' for a further restriction of the workforce's pay) and not related to all the other parameters that, as a whole, define the further economic productivity of firms, (e.g. technological, managerial, labour organisation, level and availability of skills and so on).

Secondly: As many other studies on the topic have pointed out, individual labour productivity as a concept is still applied in an arbitrary way in Greek firms without being constituted by any kind of explicit and relatively objective framework of criteria

in defining it (Kouzis, J., Georgakopoulou, 1992; opinion poll carried by DIMEL, 1990).

In this context, a further deregulation of the existing payments system and its replacement by this form of flexible payments is less likely to lead to any actual correlation of the workforce's pay to the real increase in labour productivity. By contrast, experience has already shown that under the present conditions, it is more likely further to weaken the trade unions' negotiating power and to constitute, in this sense, an additional practical political means on the part of the management in reinforcing in broader terms the imposition of their recent economic and labour strategies over their labour force.

In the light of the above mentioned comments, a further implication of flexible employment and payment policies that large firms as a whole ask for, brings about the main interest, as well as intentions on the part of both the more and less advanced and modernised firms in late 1980's, namely to continue to be supported by cheap and more intensified labour forms, compensating through such strategies for the first category the high cost of their technological modernisation attempts, and for the second one their low productive patterns of activity by which these firms still operated in the early 1990's.

5. Another result of this empirical study is that a significant number of the less dynamic and modernised firms (and particularly the "downward" firms) have demonstrated greater flexibility in "externalising" a part of their activities especially in

periods of downward business trends by undertaking forms of subcontracting work on behalf of third firms or individuals (piecework is also included in this form). In the employers' view in particular, more "advanced" firms seem similarly to take advantage of subcontracting with third firms or individuals to improve their own performance (during their "upward" business cycle).

The resort to this form of economic and labour flexibility reconfirms other recent empirical studies on the current 'hidden' flexibilities that large firms take advantage of (especially in commerce, in the other service sector and in DEKO, according to our research).

However, due to the lack of more detailed data it cannot confirm any steady and broader link of subcontracting of large firms with the small and medium ones that could reveal a process of new forms of domination of large capital over small and medium economic activities, through forms of "co-operation" aiming for example, at a "decentralised flexible production" system assimilating to the "flexible" specialisation school's model.

Nevertheless, the resort of large firms to subcontracting in the 1980's is of great interest and its reconfirmation through this study raises the need for more extensive empirical studies in the future. More specifically of interest is the character and extent of association of this flexible economic and labour form to a scenario of "flexible specialisation" restructuring possibly underway in at

least one part of Greek economy, by the redefinition of the traditional relations of large and small firms in Greece, which so far, have, in the main, developed into different sectors and fields of economic activity without having established extensive and close links with each other (Rylmon, 1992; Karamessini, 1992).

6. The final and most important conclusion on our topic might be, that the resorting to quantitative forms of employment and payment flexibility by the large firms of the sample after the mid-1980's seems to have enabled, to some degree, a significant proportion of these firms to retain a kind of short-term profitability, and for others survival. However, the same policies seem at the same time to have deprived less advanced and modernised firms of interests in and also the capacity, in the early 1990's (due to the whole worsening of their position and also the recessional economy in which these firms operate), to seek ways of achieving qualitative restructuring of their less advanced technological, organisational and labour structures similar to those that more advanced European economies have proceeded with, after their crisis in the early 1980's.

Such an evaluation can be supported by the fact that according to the findings of this research, but also of other studies on the topic⁴², what has in fact characterised the majority of 'upward' firms in the 1980's as long term dynamic and

⁴² (Ioakimoglou, 1992; and Greek Employers Confederation's report, 31.5.92 on issues concerning the attempts at technological modernisation at present).

productive firms compared to the others, and has to a great extent differentiated them as a group, seems to be (except for their better financial situation) the following features:

i) the most extensive technological modernisation attempts that have tended to take place in these firms in the 1980's.

ii) the more apparent policies of these firms, compared to the others, aiming at the qualitative improvement of their labour force. These policies have been expressed in various ways on their part, such as 1) more developed training and retraining activities; 2) attempts at improving the level and availability of the skills of their personnel, as well as a greater resort to a multi-skilled workforce; 3) attempts oriented to the readjustment of the work-tasks and the better organisation of the whole labour process through the application of more modern technologies, but also, up to a certain point, the improvement of their workforce's working conditions, including higher payments that have been given to certain categories of their personnel; 4) practices motivating the labour force toward greater efficiency at work; 5) their interest in finding more participatory and democratised ways of coping with their workforces' problems, achieving a kind of social consensus in their firms' labour relations, and in part getting rid of the old fashioned, paternalistic, and authoritarian methods that traditionally characterised the management of Greek firms.

If this is actually the case, an additional conclusion could be that a further release of whatever labour market "restrictions"

exist⁴³, and a more extensive resorting to "quantitative forms of labour flexibility", alongside the current labour strategies that large firms ask for is likely, to a greater extent in the 1990's than in the 1980's, to deprive the wide range of these firms of any capacities and interest in attempting to regain a long term dynamism through steps oriented to the qualitative restructuring of their less advanced patterns of activity as "upward" firms have shown in part, so far.

This evaluation can be supported not merely from our research findings but, in addition, from other recent studies on the same topic.

These have pointed out that in the period of more "rigid" labour policies demanded by the labour movements after the mid 1970's, large enterprises were not motivated towards a kind of technological and organisational modernisation in coping with their low productivity and profitability problems until the mid 1980's, nor in the present period (in which to a greater extent compared to the past, the relaxation of labour market restrictions actually has taken place), were they motivated towards aims at a broad more advanced restructuring of their whole economic technological, managerial and labour structures (see Karamessini, 1992; Giannitsis, 1992; Georgakopoulou, 1991, 1992).

Furthermore, according to the same studies, the greater flexibility that took place in the mid 1980's onward seems, first,

⁴³ (e.g. a free resort to dismissals which is likely to be put into practice)

not to have contributed to long-term economic competitiveness and second, it has discouraged whatever attempts existed towards these broad restructuring shifts, by worsening in the early 1980's the competitiveness and longer-term developmental capacity of the Greek economy as a whole (ibid).

Given the danger of schematically theorising, it might be argued that the configuration of the economic and labour profile of the more advanced, dynamic and modernized large firms that have been included in our research has more or less demonstrated attempts or trends in the late 1980's and early 1990's that to a great extent are assimilated to a "Neo-Taylorist model". This model seems to be supplemented, to some extent, by new more advanced technologies, and also comprised of both capital and labour intensive patterns, including their flexible aspects as we have described them. Furthermore such a model seems to have up to a point the capacity for a longer term dynamism and competitiveness in 1990's. By contrast the configuration of the less advanced and dynamic large firms, which still constitute the majority of them, seems to me to be more closely assimilated to a less advanced type of a Neo-Taylorist model. This "model" is deprived of any extensive application of new technologies and still insists for its main supplementation on predominantly old modes of capital accumulation namely cheap, low skilled, badly organised and intensified labour.

If this is the case this less advanced pattern of activity, that characterises the majority of the large firms, as suggested by

the findings of this study, demonstrates not merely lower productivity and efficiency compared to the first group of firms followed by the further deterioration of the workforce's standards of work, but few hopes therefore to constitute a viable alternative scenario for the overcoming of the Greek economy's present deep recession. In addition, it does not secure any kind of social consensus with the world of labour, oriented to regaining in the early 1990's a kind of new more advanced "developmental path" capable of meeting the much more competitive and highly demanding European and international environment (particularly towards the European unification process), in which Greece as a country has to operate.

CHAPTER 5

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

This study was an attempt at relating the most important aspects of current debate on the restructuring of advanced Fordist economies and labour flexibility as an assumed key-characteristic of such a restructuring, to the case of a peripheral to Fordism, socio-economic pattern, like the Greek one. In the first chapter, Greece was considered as a case of peripheral economy, which challenges to a great extent, several aspects of the "Flexible Firm", "Flexible Specialisation", and NIDL approaches concerning the debate on restructuring and labour flexibility. More specifically, the assumed targets of restructuring shifts on the part of the advanced European economies, in the 1980's aiming at radical and qualitative technological, organisational and labour changes, via their supplementation by a united set of both functional and numerical flexibility strategies (which Atkinson's model of flexible firm has implied), do not correspond with the Greek case. In the case of Greece, the restructuring attempts of the 1980's, were basically accompanied by the defensive means of restoring again past, less advanced, economic and labour patterns, enhancing almost solely forms of "numerical flexibility", in (Atkinson's terminology), in coping with problems of the recession of the Greek economy in the 1980's and not by an offensive set of combined flexible strategies aiming at the long term amelioration of the less advanced technological, organisational and labour structures of Greek society.

The "Flexible Specialisation school's" approach was also challenged both as an adequate interpretive framework of current restructuring shifts, as well as a sufficient scenario for the successful restructuring of peripheral to Fordist countries' economies, like Greece. This is mainly due to the observation that the realisation of such a scenario through the advanced restructuring of medium and small scale economic activities on any account presupposes an already existing and relatively advanced economic and labour environment which will support such a process (disposing e.g. relatively developed industrial experience, state infrastructure, economies of scale in proper sectors, as well as adequate specialisation of the work-force). Such an environment has characterised Fordist economies from which the F.S. approach has drawn its theoretical examples, but not peripheral ones like Greece. Instead the lack of the above mentioned economic environment in Greek economy and labour, had in the 1980's as a result not an offensive flexible restructuring of the middle and small scale firms, but just a defensive restoration of those less advanced economic and labour pattern^{74s}, accompanied by a high degree of informality, in both economic and labour terms, and the retention, up to a point, of their profitability through the worsening of both the Greek economy and the work-force's position.

The Greek case has finally challenged the basic aspects of the NIDL approach concerning the achievement of a new kind of macro-economic and labour flexibilities at a European and

international stage, through the relocation of labour intensive economic activities on the part of multinationals to less advanced economies, like Greece. This is due to the fact that the NIDL approach, apart from the factor of the cheap labour cost that, to a great extent, continues to constitute a "comparative advantage" of peripheral economies (including Greece), has not adequately taken into account other more complex and contradictory economic, socio-political and cultural aspects of those societies that are likely, in both economic and socio-political terms, to differentiate or even to make impossible the realisation of such flexible strategies by multinationals. In the Greek case such aspects were presented as the following : the small international markets, the structural and organisational discrepancies of Greek economy, the lack of adequate state infrastructure , the contradictory interests on the part of different sections of the Greek capital, the lack of socio-political compliance on the part of the work-force, as well as further cultural reasons concerning the life-style that Greek society created through its peculiar participation in the post-war internationalisation process.

Through the observation of the difficulties that the current Flexibility debate has presented so far, this study has stressed the theoretical need of more close relation of the too abstract concepts of this debate with the observation of the needs, interests and capacities that particular modes of capitalist accumulation and socio-economic regulation of different regions and countries present with reference to their restructuring shifts.

In the second and third chapter there was an attempt at highlighting these evaluations, through the exploration of the character of the development, crisis and restructuring shifts, of the particular mode of capital accumulation and socio-economic regulation that characterised Greece in the Post-war era.

Greek Post-war development didn't achieve the generation of Fordist and Taylorist forms, in both the economic and labour sphere, similar to those of other, more advanced capitalist economies. The particular mode of Greek capital accumulation was based on the partial and less advanced industrialisation of the Greek economy, until the mid of 1970's, alongside the development of similar less advanced, expansionist, predominantly based on the intensification of labour. This mode of development never achieved an extensive capital accumulation in Greek territory due to the lack of interest and also capacities for available technological, organisational, structural and labour improvements which would enable such a process to take place. Instead, it was based on a Pre-Fordist type of socio-economic regulation, which for a prolonged period (1950-1975), secured the preservation of a very cheap (actually under paid), both "core" and "peripheral" work-force, on which Greek capital had solely based its profitability. This model was able to retain or increase profitability and less productivity until the mid of the 1970's due to:

First, its prolonged resort to an extensive labour and economic flexibility (of a 'numerical type'), of which Greece not

merely has never been deprived, but on the contrary, which was a basic structural feature of Greek economy derived from the traditional, less developed in capitalist terms, modes of accumulation that predominantly continue to comprise post-war economy and labour. These economic and labour patterns assimilated to the petty commodity production forms or even pre-capitalist forms, though less productive, enhancing possibilities for self-employment and multiple employment, enabled on the one hand the reproduction of both the under-paid and surplus categories of the work-force that such a type of development created. However on the other hand their steady preservation prevented more radical attempts at more advanced forms of industrialisation and further development from taking place.

Second, this type of development was also based on another type of economic and labour flexibility emanating from the particular type of the interweaving of the Greek economy with the Post-war international division of labour. This was in brief the export of a significant part of the surplus work-force in the 1960's, (via its emigration to the flourishing Fordist countries) and as a consequence the transportation of additional incomes and surplus value acquired abroad to the Greek economy. Such a type of flexibility counterbalanced for a certain period the increasing unemployment and financial problems and compensated for the marginalisation of the low paid work-force from any consumption capacities.

The crisis of the Greek economy which commenced in the mid of 1970's was originated in its entire post-war developmental model and not merely in external factors. It was brought about as a result,

First: of the undermining of the sociopolitical balance of power of Post-war Greece (via the fall of Dictatorship) and the subsequent postponing up to a point, of the previous state of the arbitrary and therefore flexibly regulated labour patterns and through them, the preservation of a very cheap work-force on which profitability and productivity of Greek capital had been solely based. This process occurred via acute working class-struggles aiming at a socio-economic regulation similar to that which had characterised Fordist economies in the post-war era.

Second: it was also a result of the obliteration of the "imported" benefits from abroad (transferred incomes and surplus value and exportation of the surplus work-force) of which the Post-war Greek economy had taken advantages, due to the recession of Fordist economies in themselves.

Deindustrialisation trends expressed in the abandonment of more advanced sectors or fields of economic activities and the reinforcement of less advanced traditional medium and small scale labour intensive economic activities, increase of financial speculation and of parasitic activities, especially in the service sector, followed by a high degree of informality in both economic and labour terms, were the main responses on the part of Greek capital towards the crisis of the mid 1970's and the 1980's.

These trends were reinforced basically by neo-liberal oriented state policies in the economic sphere, particularly after the mid 1980's, and subsequent labour strategies that encouraged the restoration of traditional patterns of labour and labour regulation, via the official legitimization of forms of numerical labour flexibility.

In brief state and employers' responses towards the crisis of the 1970's-1980's were basically oriented to the restoration or the partial modification of the old modes of accumulation and economic regulation, (that had partially been undermined after the mid 1970's) and were never combined, as in other European countries with extensive attempts at the qualitative restructuring of the less advanced economic and labour patterns through which Greece had unsuccessfully operated until the 1980's.

In the Greek case, the restoration of middle range capital activities, was not followed by any 'flexible specialisation' restructuring scenario; instead it was necessitated by the lack of interest and also capacity on the part of the Greek state and Greek capital to be sufficiently involved in new competitive forms of mass production and markets too.

The restructuring shifts on the 1980's in Greece, have no relation with the Flexible Firm approach's interpretations since they have one dimensionally stressed numerical forms of flexibility reflecting just short-term adjustments towards the recession and not long term interests in the radical restructuring of the low productive Greek economic and labour patterns.

In addition, even though such a process has eased the preservation of a still relatively cheap work-force in Greece compared to other European countries, by polarising more economy and labour, it has similarly to the past reproduced the previous sectoral organisational technological and labour disparities of the Greek economy, preventing in this way any assumed alternative restructuring attempt assimilated to the NIDL's scenario, by the multinationals. This evaluation is reconfirmed by the still limited involvement of foreign direct capital investments across all the sectors, despite available state and employers' strategies in attracting foreign investment in Greek territory.

Concluding, restructuring attempts of the 1980's in the Greek case, though they enabled greater labour flexibility were not followed by any steps towards the qualitative improvement of the Greek economy and labour both on the part of the large capital and the medium and small one. Instead the impacts of those policies were: 1) The retention of short term profitability for a limited section of large and medium size capital; 2) The discouragement of whatever attempts existed towards qualitative restructuring goals, and through these processes the further worsening of both the workforce's position and the Greek the economy's competitiveness and long term developmental capacity.

In the fourth chapter the above mentioned evaluation was reconfirmed through the observation of the responses of the large

scale firms towards the crisis as well as of their restructuring practices in the 1980's.

According to the findings of the empirical research of this study, but also other recent studies on the topic, the majority of even the large scale and potentially more advanced firms, in several aspects (e.g. financial, managerial, technological, organisational etc) demonstrated great difficulties and also lack of interest in the 1980's in being radically restructured. Instead, just a small category of them proceeded with a moderate technological modernisation, not followed by more advanced changes in their organisation of management and labour, and supplemented similarly to the other firms with forms of intensified work.

If this is the case, an additional assumption may be that these difficulties are incomparably greater with reference to the less advanced production and labour firms of the medium and small size firms. These, however, still constitute the majority of total economic activity in Greece, and by the "restructuring" policies having been exerted so far, they have been actually excluded from any advanced developmental prospects.

In the light of the above mentioned evaluations, let us present some broader implications suggested by the results of the empirical research but also by issues already addressed through this study with regard to the present needs of restructuring of the Greek economy as a whole.

The experience of the restructuring attempts in Greece in the 1980's poses the problem of the advanced restructuring of the

wide range of the Greek economy and labour as being more related to the lack of interest and, up to a point, capacities in available macro-economic and labour strategies through the establishment of a new modern and more flexible but nevertheless active state role, and less as being a problem that can solely be solved on a micro-level (eg on a firm level) by uncontrolled and spontaneous attempts by the producers themselves.

Such state strategies go beyond both the past traditional Keynesian and more recently applied Neo-liberal oriented ones. These on behalf of a new kind of mercantile orthodoxy that has dominated state policies all over E.C. countries have limited their interest to just securing a static public expenditure balance in the financial sphere in isolation from further developmental goals, and with no radical intervention in the production sphere by attempts at the qualitative restructuring of less advanced structures of Greek economy and labour.

In brief, such state strategies should overall include: 1) the promotion of an active industrial strategy for both large and medium scale activities which have never taken place in Greece; 2) the improvement of the still inadequate infrastructure of the Greek economy, through the encouragement of both public and private investments aimed at technological, sectoral and organisational modernisation, the upgrading of the work-force's skills, as well as at research and development, 3) the promotion of short-term economic measures which alongside the former ones could ease developmental steps in the present recessionary

environment such as the currency devaluation, the reduction of the extremely high interest rates, radical changes of the tax system aiming not merely at the combating of tax evasion but enabling the progressive incorporation of the widespread informal economy in a more advanced and controlled framework of economic activities.

Genuinely motivated, state policies towards a radical attempt to restructure the less advanced productive framework of the Greek economy and society, also presuppose active labour strategies. These should primarily target qualitative, rather than short term "quantitative flexible" labour practices, which are only capable of easing temporarily Greek firms' low productivity, and which through the post-war economic history of Greece have proved to have increased the rigidities of the Greek economy by discouraging longer term restructuring and more advanced development. Such "qualitative" policies are, for example, the upgrading of the level and the availability of skills and actual capacities of the Greek workforce and also the improvement of their whole working conditions as well as their standard of living and quality of life.

Overall, there should be an acknowledgment as a part of any restructuring attempt of the need to secure not merely a kind of "social consensus" with the world of labour but the encouragement of the active participation of the work-force in this process.

Such an evaluation is of great importance, due to the following reason: Greece is a European country that, despite the

present recession, has achieved in broad socio-economic and political terms, an improvement of the social rights at work and in life of significant categories of its population in recent years. Therefore, an anachronistic and authoritarian scenario of a non-advanced "Neo-Taylorist restoration" (without any extensive technological, organisational and labour modernisation) which restructuring attempts in the 1980's, to some degree have already promoted, is not only less likely to lead the Greek economy out of its continued recession, but, as the current socio-political experience in Greece demonstrates, will also lead to a new socio-political crisis.

APPENDIX NO. 1

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY

1. The sample survey has been designed in a way which allows the observation of the labour policies and labour flexibility in large industries, of the Greater area of Attica, on a firm level including at the same time a proportionate sectoral distribution, for studying inter-sectoral trends.

The survey was designed, conducted and carried out by me on behalf of the General Confederation of Greek Labour (GSEE) in the period extending from September 1991 to December 1992, and it is still unpublished.

2. The sample was designed according to the following criteria to secure: i) a proportionate distribution of the large industries under study, among all the basic economic sectors in which they have been involved so far, and ii) a proportionate number of cases of firms, to the "real" population of large firms in the greater area of Attica, that are considered to employ over one hundred employees.⁴⁴

The sample consists of 35 cases of firms that are distributed among five basic economic sectors, in the following way, 14 in the manufacturing sector; 4 cases in the commerce sector; 6 cases in the banking and insurance sector; 7 cases in the

⁴⁴ In the new sample, that I created, based on this survey's primary sample, the public administration services have been excluded from it for incompatibility reasons (e.g. these organisations do not operate by market criteria. Therefore their economic situation as well as policies, can not be directly compared with the other sectors.)

miscellaneous service sector and 4 cases in the broad public sector (public utilities). The survey was oriented to the management/employers, and the representatives of the trade unions of the firms. In this context it finally consists of 70 cases that have been interviewed.

3. The methodology of the design of the sample was a result of a combination of random sampling in so far as the sectoral distribution is concerned, and defined sample with reference to the choice of the particular firms that should be interviewed on the topic under research.

More specifically, the particular firms that have been finally included in the sample have been chosen by using the information of Trade Unions' representatives on a sectoral level with regard particular firms which have extensively promoted flexible employment and payment policies in recent years, alongside the criterion of their proportionate distribution, among the basic sectors, that these firms belong to.

4. The questionnaire for the sample survey consisted of both closed and open questions that offered the opportunity for further discussion of the topic under research, with the interviewees. It was given and completed in person and supplemented by further oral discussion.

There were occasions in which the interview was repeated by a second visit to the firm, particularly in cases of problems of incoherence, incomplete replies and so on. Finally, the sample survey data were analysed using the SPSS computer program.

APPENDIX NO. 2

THE METHODOLOGY OF THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS ON THE
BUSINESS TREND OF THE FIRMS OF THE SAMPLE IN
THE 1980'S. (1980-1990)

1. The economic analysis on the trend of the firms of the sample during the period extending from 1980 to 1990, has been based on the elaboration of some primary economic data, by me, presented on an annual basis in the Greek economic directories, of ICAP, (that are the only available published data, by which some economic information for particular firms, can be offered) (see: Greece in Figures, 1980-1990. ICAP publications). These are concerned with the process of the business cycle of the firms in the 1980's as this is presented every year by a variety of indices in the official publication of their annual balances.

2. Among the indices that are included in the directory of the ICAP, have been chosen as more representative and also proper in examining the long term economic dynamics and efficiency of the firms of the sample in the 1980's, the following:

a) The annual average variation of the evolution of total assets that firms presented in the 1980's, assuming that if these data present a relative steady and "upward" trend demonstrate at the same time a kind of broader 'entrepreneurial health' and development trends.

b) The ratio of net worth to total assets (ratio of debt) for every firm and in turn, its annual variation for the whole period under study.

An increasing annual average variation of the ratio of debt, of the firms under study, indicates low autonomous financial capacities, in general, and usually, constrains these firms long term dynamics (e.g. investing capacities).

c) The ratio of the gross profits to the fixed assets (Capital Return) and in turn its annual average variation for the period under study.

A steady increase of the annual capital return that the above mentioned indices represent, not merely constitutes one of the most important indices for presenting trends of capital profitability but also manifests the extent of the financial dynamism on the part of particular firms.

d) In relation to the above mentioned indices also taken into account, the annual average variation of the gross profits in the whole of the 1980's.

Finally, three important additional indices have also been observed.

e) The annual average variation of fixed assets to the annual size of employment of each particular firm, representing in economic terminology, whether or not the firms are/or are oriented to be labour or capital intensive, as well as indirectly manifesting their investing progress (at least in terms of fixed assets - namely:- technological equipment and fixed plants).

f) The annual ratio of fixed assets to total assets (Structure of Capital) represents the extent of the technological capacity of

the capital return, (e.g. the extent of the firms'g financial capacities for investments).

g) Finally, the annual average variation of the rate of employment of each particular firm under study, for the same period (1980's).

In turn, all these indices have been expressed before in current prices, were transformed in constant prices, taking into account the average rate of inflation as this was presented in the decade of the 1980's, and at a following stage, were all expressed in terms of the annual average variation presented in every year of the period under study. Finally, all the indices were presented in graphics in forms of drawing trends.

At the second stage two basic indices were chosen and correlated by the method of hierarchical classification, making possible the grouping of the firms according to their business trend in the 1980's, ("upward", "intermediate", and "downward"). These were the following: the annual average variation of the gross profits (an index that represents the direct profitability of the firms in the 1980's) related to the annual average variation of the ratio of debt (an index that represents the financial situation of the same firms for the same period).

In addition, as far as all the other parameters are concerned they were classified by the hierarchical classification method too, so that through correlated observation, a more detailed configuration of the economic profile of the firms, of the sample, in the 1980's, could be made.

APPENDIX NO. 3

CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE SAMPLE
SURVEY

APPENDIX 3

CONTENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE
OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY

Research project

'Flexible forms of employment and new
labour relations in big enterprises
at the Greater Area of Attica'

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Kind of interview

- Personal
Collective

┌───┐
A1

2. Interviewee

- employer / staff manager
Trade Union

┌───┐
A2

3. Name of the firm:

(in so far as the interview is concerned with particular firms)

4. In which economic sector does the firm belong?

(One choice)

- Commerce
Manufacturing
Construction
Transportation / telecommunications
Banking
Insurance
Other

Give details -----

┌───┐
A5

5. Which is the area of Firm's activities?

Define in brief -----

┌───┐
A7

6. How many employees work, on average, for this firm?

┌───┐
A8

7. If the interview is concerned with the firms Trades Union, or the Federation of Trade Unions on a sectoral level, which categories of employees, or fields, does the Trades Union represent?

8. The mechanical and technical equipment of the firm is

	VERY	FAIR	LESS	NOT AT ALL	
modern	1	2	3	4	[]
models made in the last 5 years					A9
inadequate	1	2	3	4	[]
for the firm's present needs					A10
efficient	1	2	3	4	[]
functional to the firm's needs					A11
under-worked	1	2	3	4	[]
non existent	1				A12
					A13

9. What is the average age of the mechanical equipment of the firm?

[]
A14

10. The technological development of the firm keeps pace with...

[]
A17

	YES	NO	
More advanced organisation of the production process	1	2	[]
Changes in the organisation of labour	1	2	A17
The improvement of working conditions	1	2	[]
The increase of wages and salaries of the personnel	1	2	A18
More advanced methods of business administration	1	2	[]
Dismissals	1	2	A19
The training of a significant part of existing staff	1	2	[]
The hiring of new skilled personnel in occupations suitable to the firm's needs	1	2	A20
			[]
			A21
			[]
			A22
			[]
			A23
			[]
			A24

1. Is there any surplus personnel?

	YES	NO	
in the firm	1	2	[]
in the economic sector to which the firm belongs	1	2	A25 [] A26

If YES,
 What are the main reasons for the existence of surplus personnel in the firm/ economic sector? (Please mention up to three areas)

- (a) _____ []
- (b) _____ A27
[]
- (c) _____ A28
[]
A29

2. How have you coped with the past and how are you thinking to confront the problem of surplus personnel in the future?

(Please mention up to three areas)

- (a) _____ []
- (b) _____ A34
[]
- (c) _____ A35
[]
A36

3. Was there any serious fluctuation problems in the business cycle in the last three years?

	YES	NO	
On a firm level	1	2	[]
On a sectoral level	1	2	A37 [] A38

If YES,
 What are the main reasons that caused this problem?
 (Please mention up to three areas)

- (a) _____ []
- (b) _____ A39
[]
- (c) _____ A40
[]
A41

14. If there have been fluctuation problems in the business cycle of the firm or of the economic sector in which the firm belongs in which ways, of the following, are those problems usually resolved? (Please select up to three responses)

In the period of an upward business cycle

By taking advantages from reclassification/ realignment of existing personnel

By resorting to overtime working

By sub contracting with third party firms

By sub contracting with professional (other than household workers) 1st
A42

By contracting to household workers on a piece work basis 2nd

By hiring new personnel on a full employment basis occasionally/temporarily A43

By hiring part time personnel 3rd

In other ways A44

Please give details ----- other
A45

In the period of a downward business cycle

By dismissals of parts of the permanent and full time personnel

By laying off parts of the permanent and full time personnel just for the period of the 'recession' 1st
A42

By undertaking sub contracting work on behalf of third party firms 2nd

By dismissals of temporary or part time personnel A43

By temporarily suspending the personnel 3rd

By under employing part of the existing personnel A44

In other ways
Please give details ----- other
A45

SECTION 2

Specific questions on the flexible forms of employment

1. To what extent have the following forms of employment been applied by the firm in the past three years when hiring new personnel?

- Permanent and full employment
- Full employment on a seasonal/temporary basis
- Part time employment on a long term basis
- Part time employment on a temporary basis
- Other
- Please give details _____

[]
 B1
 []
 B2
 []
 B3
 []
 B4
 []
 B5
 []
 B6

The firm has not hired any new personnel in the past three years. Instead it has proceeded to dismiss members of existing personnel

2. To what extent on a sectoral level have firms hired or sub contracted with the work force using the following forms of employment in the past three years?

- Short term contracts
- Contract work
- Piece work
- Sub contracting with third firms or individuals
- Other form of contract
- Please give details _____

[]
 B8
 []
 B9
 []
 B10
 []
 B11
 []
 B12
 []
 B13

3. Which specific contracts, besides the standard ones are used by the firm for the following categories of staff:

- Top staff []
- Senior staff B18
- Skilled personnel []
- unskilled personnel B19
- Form of contracts []
- Short term B20
- Contract work []
- Part time permanent B21
- Seasonal contracts []
- Piece work B22
- Part time temporary contracts []
- Other B23
- Please specify _____ []
- B24

4. Which of the following forms of employment are better adjusted to the present market needs and should be adopted by the firm?

Please rank up to three choices

- Part time employment on a long term basis 1st []
- Part time employment on a long term basis B37
- Short term employment on a 'full time' basis 2nd []
- Contract work or sub contracting work B38
- 'Piece work' employment 3rd []
- Permanent employment on a full time basis B39
- Other form of contract other []
- Please give details _____ B40
- choices 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____

4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of temporary/occasional employment?

For the firm

Advantages	Disadvantages
(a) _____	B41(a) _____ B44
(b) _____	B42(b) _____ B45
(c) _____	B43(c) _____ B46

For the employees

Advantages	Disadvantages
(a) _____	B47(a) _____ B50
(b) _____	B48(b) _____ B51
(c) _____	B49(c) _____ B52

5. What are the main problems that have emerged from the application of temporary/occasional employment in the firm?

Please mention up to three areas, in priority order)

- (a) _____ B53
- (b) _____ B54
- (c) _____ B55

7. What are the advantages and disadvantages of part time employment?

For the firm

Advantages

Disadvantages

(a) _____	B61(a) _____	B64
(b) _____	B62(b) _____	B65
(c) _____	B63(c) _____	B66

For the employees

Advantages

Disadvantages

(a) _____	B67(a) _____	B70
(b) _____	B68(b) _____	B71
(c) _____	B69(c) _____	B72

SECTION THREE

QUESTIONS ON THE SYSTEMS OF WORKING HOURS AND SHIFTS IN THE
FIRM

How often does the firm resort to overtime working?

- a permanent basis
- frequently
- only temporarily
- (only due to an occasional work load)
- rarely
- never

C1

Could you mention up to three problems and benefits
which are related to the application of overtime working in
your field?

Problems	Benefits
a) _____	C4 (a) _____ C11
b) _____	C5 (b) _____ C12
c) _____	C7 (c) _____ C13

3. Despite the introduction of new legislation concerning the firms freedom to resort to flexible forms of employment in the summer of 1990, firms still prefer to take advantage of overtime working of their existing personnel.

Do you agree with this statement?

YES

NO

C14

IF YES,

Please explain why firms continue to resort to overtime working rather than other forms of work.

(Please mention up to three reasons)

(a) _____ C15

(b) _____ C16

(c) _____ C17

4. Is there any shift work system in use within the firm?

YES

NO

C18
C20
C21

5. Please mention the problems and the advantages which the existing system of shift work has created in the firm

Advantages

Disadvantages

(a) _____ C22(a) _____ C28

(b) _____ C23(b) _____ C29

(c) _____ C24(c) _____ C30

6. By which form of working hours is the personnel of this firm used to working? Please indicate in priority order.

Uninterrupted and continuous

Interrupted (split into two sessions daily)

Flexible

[]
C31
[]
C32
[]
C33

7. If the firm has introduced flexible working systems.

What system of working hours are the basic form?

Please mention up to three systems in priority order

- (a) _____ C34
- (b) _____ C35
- (c) _____ C36

QUESTIONS ON THE SKILLS OF THE PERSONNEL AND TRAINING/RETRAINING POLICIES OF THE FIRM.

1. Is there any apparent lack of skilled personnel in the firm

YES

NO

[]
D1

If YES

In which of the following categories of employees is the lack of proper skills apparent?

(Please mention up to three groups in priority order)

1st

[]
D3

Top staff

2nd

Senior staff

[]
D4

Skilled blue collar workers

3rd

Skilled white collar workers

[]
D5

Other

Please give details _____

2. By what means has the lack of skilled personnel been faced by the firms management?

By training/retraining the existing personnel

[]
D6

By hiring properly skilled personnel on a permanent and full employment basis

[]
D7

By sub contracting with professional from within the external labour market (individuals or firms)

[]
D8

By co operating with professionals on a short term contract basis when necessary

[]
D9

Other

[]
D10

Please give details _____

[]
D11

3. What is the level and availability of skills within the present personnel of the firm compared with the present demands of the firm? Make one selection ONLY

- It is low, below the needs of the firm
- Fair
- Adequate, it corresponds to the present needs of the firm
- Higher than the existing needs of the firm

D12

4. Do you believe that the activity of the firm concerning the training/retraining of personnel is:(make upto two selections)

- Very developed
- Relatively developed
- Less developed
- Totally absent

D13

5. In so far as training/retraining activities are within the firm, which of the following categories of employees are concerned?

Please make one selection

- All of the personnel
- Broad parts of the personnel
- Very few categories of personnel

D14

Please make up to three choices

- Top staff
- Senior staff
- Junior staff
- Unskilled white collar workers
- Unskilled blue collar workers

D15

10. What is your opinion of the training/retraining projects which have already taken place in the firm:

- They were adequate and proper to the needs of the firm
- They were very efficient
- They have no significant result

D19
 D20
 D21
D22

Please briefly explain your reply _____

11. The top and senior staff of the firm is usually recruited from: Please make one choice

- From the existing personnel of the firm
(The internal labour market)
- From the external labour market
- Equally from both

D23

12. The majority of staff
Please make one choice

- Work in the firm for more than three years
- Has changed employers many times

D24

Please briefly explain your reply _____

D25

9. Are the personnel multi skilled and easily adaptable to different work tasks within this firm?

YES

NO

D26

If YES

To what extent does the management take advantage of this multi skilling by giving the employees concerned responsible work positions?

Please make one choice

- To a great extent
- Fairly/enough
- To a less extent
- Not at all

D27

10. Which of the following must be seen as the most important need of the firms at present?

Please make one choice

- The firms ability to fluctuate the size of the workforce without any limitation or in accordance with the demands of the market
- The firms ability in taking advantage of existing personnel by flexibly placing them in new positions and work roles as necessary

D28

Please briefly explain you reply _____

D29

SECTION FIVE

FURTHER QUESTIONS ON THE PRESENT ECONOMIC AND LABOUR
PROCESSES OF THE FIRMS

1. As far as the personnel is concerned which of the following aims is the management of the firm getting at?

Please make up to three selections

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------|
| More cooperation with the trade unions | <input type="checkbox"/> | [] |
| Less involvement of the trades unions in the labour relations of the firm | <input type="checkbox"/> | [E1]
[E2] |
| Higher payments to personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> | [] |
| Adjustment of the employment status of personnel to the needs of the firm | <input type="checkbox"/> | [E3]
[E4] |
| Qualitative improvement of the personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Elimination of labour cost | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Improvement of the working conditions in the firm | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Correlation of the payments to (labour/economic) productivity | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Promotion of more participatory schemes/motives to the personnel | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

Please give details _____

2. To what extent does the firm use the following forms of payments to personnel

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|
| Collective bonuses and further forms of additional pay | <input type="checkbox"/> | [] |
| Forms of additional pay on an individual basis | | [E5] |
| Profit sharing | <input type="checkbox"/> | [] |
| Offer of various remuneration packages | <input type="checkbox"/> | [E6]
[E7] |
| 'Piece work' payments | <input type="checkbox"/> | [E8]
[E9] |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> | [] |

Please give details _____

[E10]
[]
[E11]

Which of the following are the most important criteria defining the level of payments to personnel?

Please select up to three answers in priority order

- hour productivity on an individual basis
- official credentials of personnel
- closed relationships within the firms management
- career prospects of employees in the firm
- demand of the particular profession in the labour market
- existing system of collective bargaining
- her

Please give details _____

Who normally defines the criteria and the level of the personnels payments in this firm?

- management of the firm (staff management office) E16
- management in cooperation with the personnel on an individual basis and without the involvement of a trade union E17
- management in agreement with the trades union and staff of the firm
- her

Please give details _____

5. Which of the following were the main payment policies that the firm has followed so far in relation to its personnel and which of them should be adopted as more suitable to the firms current needs?

Please select up to three answers, in priority order, in each category

- 1..Definition of the payments level in accordance with the existing collective agreements
- 2..Establishment of payments bargaining on a firm level
- 3..On any account limitation of labour cost
- 4..Payment systems flexibly adjusted to the occasional market capacities or needs
- 5..Payments higher than the average of those in the market
- 6..Elimination of the labour cost through the increase of labour and economic productivity and not by the shrinking of wages and salaries
- 7..Other

Please give details _____

The firm HAS the following

E24 E25 E26

The firm SHOULD ADOPT the following

E28 E29 E30

6. How would you face a state policy aiming at:

	<u>+ively</u>	<u>-ively</u>	
The complete release of the labour market regulations			[] E30
The stabilisation of work force payments			[] E31
The complete indexation of salaries and wages			[] E32
The extensive introduction of new technology in the firm			[] E33
The correlation of wages/salaries with 'labour productivity' criteria			[] E34
The strengthening of the trades unions participation in the process of decision making on a firm - sectoral - national basis			[] E35
The controlled application of flexible forms of employment under the bilateral agreement of both the trades unions and management of the firm			[] E36
The minimisation of the state involvement and regulation of the economic policies of the firm			[] E37

LIST OF THE TABLES OF SURVEY AND THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF THE FIRMS OF THE SAMPLE IN THE 1980'S

- Impacts of the technological evolution in the firms (A.17.).....p.219
- Reasons for the existence of surplus workfoure in the firm. (A.27, A.28, A.29).....p.220
- Policies for copying with excess labour in the Firm (A.34, A.35, A.36).....p.221-222
- Reasons for fluctuation problems in the firm (A.39-A.41).....p.223-224
- Ways of facing fluctuation problems in the upward business cycle of the Firms (A.42 - A.44).....p.225
- Ways of facing the fluctuation problems in the downward business cycle by the Firms (A.46-A.48).....p.226
- Most favourable non-standard forms of employment and frequency of their resort on new hirings (B.2 - B6).....p.227-228
- Most favourable non-standard contracts and frequency of Firms resort on new hirings (B.8-B.12).....p.229-230
- Which especific contracts (besides the full employment and permanentones) are used to be applied by the firm to the following catefories of staff? (B.18-B.23)..... p.231
- Forms of employment that present market needs impose (B.37 -B.39).....p.232
- Advantages of temporary employment for the firm (B.41 - B.43).....p.233
- Disadvantages of temporary employment for the firm (B44 -B46).....p.234

- Advantages of the use of part-time employment for the firm (B61 - B63).....p.235
- Disadvantages of the use of the part-time employment for the firm (B64 - B66).....p.236
- Problems derived from the application of part-time employment in the firm (B.73, B.74, B.75).....p.237
- Problems related to over-time working (C.5, C.6, C,7).....p.238
- Advantages of over-time employment (C11,C12,C13).....p.239
- Justification of the preference of Firms to resort to overtime as opposed to other forms of flexible working (C15, C16, C17).....p.240
- Advantages of shift work systems for the firm and the staff (C28, C30).....p.241
- Advantages of flexible working hours for the Firm (C37, C38, C39).....p.242
- Disadvantages of flexible working hours adoption in the firm (C40, C41).....p.243
- By which ways has the lack of skilled personnel been faced by the firms so far?(D6 - D10).....p.244-245
- The training activity is more concerned (D14).....p.246-247
- Evaluation of the results of the training activites in the Firms (D19 - D22).....p.248-249
- Reasons for the low external mobility of the firm's staff (D25).....p.250
- Evaluation of the preference to the resort on external and /or internal forms of labour flexibility (D28).....p.251

- Factors which influence the Firms resort to Forms of internal and external labour flexibility (D29).....p.252
- The main aims that the management of the firm is getting at (E1 - E4).....p.253
- The most favourable non-standard forms of additional pay and frequency of resort on them by the firm (E5- E10).....p.254-255
- The most important criteria in the definition of payments of the staff by the firms (E12 - E14).....p.256-257
- Who defines the criteria and the level of payments to the staff in the firm (E16 - E19).....p.258-259
- Main payment policies that have been applied by the firm so far (E24 - E26).....p.260-261
- Main payment strategies that should be adopted by the firm (E27 - E29).....p.262
- Most favourable state policies to the firms present needs (E30 - E37).....p.263

List of the Tables of the Economic Analysis

- Degree of dynamism of the firms in the sample in 1980's (Table 1).....p.264
- Analytical profile of the business trend of the firms in the 1980's (Table 2).....p.265
- Indices and results of the business trend in the 1980's (Table 3)..p.266-267
- Analytical table of Consumerist and intermediate industries (Table 4).....p.268
- Field of the economic activity of the firms of the sample

besides the manufacturing sector (Table 5).p.269

- Main indices of the economic analysis on the business trend of the firms in the 1980's (Table 6,7,8).....p.270-272

TABLES OF THE SAMPLE SURVEY AND THE ECONOMIC
ANALYSIS

TABLE
A17

IMPACTS OF THE TECHNOLOGICAL EVOLUTION
IN THE FIRMS

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNION VIEW

FIRMS	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
More advanced organisation of production (no)	-	-	-	11.6	3.6	50	71	-	40.3
Changes in labour process (no)	14.3	14.3	8.3	-	6.9	42.9	33.3	33.3	35.7
Improvement of working conditions (no)	-	-	-	-	-	29	27	16.7	25.7
Increase of wages and salaries (no)	14.3	14.3	18.2	20	17.9	33.3	71.4	50	57.7
More advanced business administration (no)	-	-	8.3	10	6.9	20	21.4	28.6	23.1
Dismissals (yes)	-	-	16.7	-	7.1	33.3	21.4	50	30.8
Training projects (no)	-	-	-	-	-	28.6	7.1	-	11.1
Hiring of new skilled personnel (no)	-	-	45.5	30	28.6	83.3	61.5	50	64
CASES		7	11	10	28	6	13	6	25

TABLE
A27, A28, A29

REASONS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF SURPLUS
WORK FORCE IN THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS VIEW		TRADE UNIONS VIEW	
1. Recession, downward trends of business, strikes	7	1. Recession, downward business trends	5
2. Vulnerable economic and political internal and external environment	2	2. Not advanced organisation of labour, Old technology	5
3. Lack of competitiveness. No meritocratic ways of arrangings, no available to the firms needs skills bad organisation and planning of worktasks	6	3. There is no surplus work- force in the firm	2
4. Technological development	3		
5. Fluctuation problems on a permanent basis	4		
TOTAL OF CASES	22		12

-225-
POLICIES FOR COPING WITH EXCESS LABOUR
IN THE FIRM

TABLE
A34, A35, A36

(open question)

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Elimination of the personnel, motives for retirements, dismissals help in finding a job elsewhere as necessary	10	1. Elimination of the personnel. No paid leaves	2
2. Re skilling, more advanced planning and development of the personnel's work efficiency	9	2. Skilling, more advanced planning of work. Adjustment of the personnel to new work tasks	10
3. Need of help from the state	3	3. No solutions yet	1
4. There is no problem	1	4. There is no problem	2
		5. No employment of immigrant workers	2
TOTAL	23	TOTAL	17

BY BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

TABLE
A34, A35, A36

EMPLOYERS VIEW

DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD
No new hirings. Dismissals if necessary by state help <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>	Retraining in new skills. Placing of the surplus personnel in new work tasks <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>	Better readjustment of the tasks & organisation of the personnel. Placing them in new work tasks & also the further economic developemnt of the firms is an available solution <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>
Readjustment, better division of labour & organisation of work performance <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>	Motives for early retirements. Elimination of existing personnel if possible <p style="text-align: right;">6</p>	No problem <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>
CASES <p style="text-align: right;">8</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">9</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">7</p>

REASONS FOR FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS
IN THE FIRM

TABLE
A39 - A41

By not hierarchical classification of the responses

EMPLOYERS VIEW		TRADES UNIONS VIEW	
Crisis in the sector in which the firm belongs	2	1. <u>Problems in the firm</u> (such as low technological improvements, lack of available training projects no motivation of the personnel low prices bad marketing and advertising, bad managerial behaviour, financial problems by participation in the stock markets)	11
Not available state policies (such as available system of working hours & terms of employment, ease of banking system nationalisation of the firms in the past, free market competition. Lack of consensus with the trades unions in the firm)	5	2. <u>Problems of labour relations and of labour policies</u> by the firms management. (lack of motives at work, lack of training, no participatory schemes for the staff, bad conditions of work	7
Vulnerable political climate (both European & internal)	3	3. State policies and intervention of political parties	3
Low quality of organising planning managing of our work force, not suitable to the firms needs existing policies	3	4. Recession of Greek economy no investments lack of markets and financial weakness	11
		5. Vulnerable political and economic climate in Europe	7
		6. Problems derived by new technologies introduction	3
Total of responses	13	Total of responses	42

TABLE
A39 - A41

REASONS FOR FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS
IN THE FIRM

TRADE UNIONS VIEW *

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

DOWNWARD		INTERMEDIATE		UPWARD FIRMS	
Market problems such as saturated markets and also low incomes of the consumers	4	State policies	2	State policies	1
Low technological developments	2	Low technological developments	4	Bad business administration & labour organisation lack of skilled staff	
State policies and political parties involvement in the firms management	3	Vulnerable international environment	3	low labour productivity & efficiency not motives towards the staff for higher quality at work	6
International vulnerable environment	3	Bad administration & management by the firm & not improvements of labour	4	Increase of the international competition by the release of markets	2
Crisis of Greek economy, lack of further economic infrastructure increase of international competition	4	Crisis of Greek economy. Increase of international competition	5	Vulnerable political internal & international environment	1
Total of responses	16		18		10

Employers view has not gathered sufficient number of responses in this question

TABLE
A39 - A41

REASONS FOR FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS
IN THE FIRM

TRADE UNIONS VIEW *

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

DOWNWARD		INTERMEDIATE		UPWARD FIRMS	
Market problems such as saturated markets and also low incomes of the consumers	4	State policies	2	State policies	1
		Low technological developments	4	Bad business administration & labour organisation lack of skilled staff low labour productivity & efficiency not motives towards the staff for higher quality at work	6
Low technological developments	2	Vulnerable international environment	3		
State policies and political parties involvement in the firms management	3	Bad administration & management by the firm & not improvements of labour	4		
Vulnerable international environment	3	Crisis of Greek economy. Increase of international competition	5	Increase of the international competition by the release of markets	2
Crisis of Greek economy, lack of further economic infrastructure increase of international competition	4			Vulnerable political internal & international environment	1
Total of responses	16		18		10

Employers view has not gathered sufficient number of responses in this question

WAYS OF FACING FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS IN THE
UPWARD BUSINESS CYCLE OF THE FIRMS

Business trend distribution
by no hierarchical classification

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
1. Reclassification of the personnel		25	15.4	30	22.6	57.1	41.2	37.5	43.9
2. Hiring of temporary & part time staff		25	7.6	40	22.6	28.6	35.3	25	31.2
3. Overtime resort		25	15.4	20	19.6	43	53	50	22.9
4. Sub contracting with third party firms or individuals		12.5	7.6	-	6.5	-	35.3	12.5	9.5
5. Sub contracting with household workers on a piece work basis		12.5	-	10	6.5	14.3	12	12.5	4.3
CASES		8	13	10	31	7	17	4	22

WAYS OF FACING THE FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS
IN THE DOWNWARD BUSINESS CYCLE BY THE FIRMS

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Underemployment of the personnel		25	7.6	30	19.4	28.6	23.5	25	25
Dismissals of the permanent and temporary personnel		12.5	7.7	10	9.7	85.8	17.7	--	30.1
Laying off the personnel temporarily		25	-	-	6.5	-	-	12.5	19.1
Sub contracting for third party firms or individuals		25	7.6	-	9.7	43	29.4	12.5	28.1
CASES		8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

TABLE
A46 - A48

WAYS OF FACING THE FLUCTUATION PROBLEMS
IN THE DOWNWARD BUSINESS CYCLE BY THE FIRMS

TABLE
A46 - A48

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW		2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW							
	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Underemployment of the personnel		25	7.6	30	19.4	28.6	23.5	25	25
Dismissals of the permanent and temporary personnel		12.5	7.7	10	9.7	85.9	17.7	-	30.1
Laying off the personnel temporarily		25	-	-	6.5	-	-	12.5	12.5
Sub contracting for third party firms or individuals		25	7.6	-	9.7	43	29.4	12.5	29.1
CASES		8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

MOST FAVOURABLE NON - STANDARD FORMS OF
EMPLOYMENT & FREQUENCY OF THEIR RESORT
ON NEW HIRINGS

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

to a great extent, fairly enough	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Short term contracts on a full employment basis		37.5	15.4	40	29	21.4	25	-	57.2	50	31.3
Part time contracts on a long term basis &/or temporarily		-	23.1	20	16.1	-	50	-	28.6	-	13
Other *1		-	10	16.7	10	9.1	-	50	16.7	-	12.5
CASES		8	13	10	31	14	4	3	7	4	32

31-

*1 Other forms,

IN EMPLOYERS VIEW;

No paid work											
due to training period	-	2									
Sub contracting	-	5									
Short term contracts	-	1									
Full employment on a permanent basis	-	2									
TOTAL	-	10									

IN TRADE UNIONS VIEW

No Paid work	-	1
Sub contracting	-	3
Short term contracts	-	2
Other	-	1
TOTAL	-	7

TABLE
B2 - B6

MOST FAVOURABLE NON STANDARD FORMS OF EMPLOYMENT
AND FREQUENCY OF THEIR RESORT ON NEW HIRINGS

EMPLOYERS VIEW SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEWS

	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
to a great extent, fairly enough	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Short term contracts on a full employment basis	18.2	75	16.7	33.3	25	29	42.9	23.6	37.5	31.3
Part time contracts on a relatively long term basis &/or temporarily	-	100	-	-	-	16.1	14.3	18	-	12.9
Other	10	-	-	-	25	10	16.7	16.6	-	12.5
CASES	11	4	6	6	4	31	7	17	8	32

Codes for the sectors	
1	Manufacturing
2	Commerce
3	Insurance / Banks
4	Other service
5	D.E.K.O. (broader public sector)

TABLE
B8 - B12

MOST FAVOURABLE NON STANDARD CONTRACTS AND
FREQUENCY OF FIRMS RESORT ON NEW HIRINGS

EMPLOYERS VIEW

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

degree of resort: to a great extent, fairly enough	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Short term contracts on full employment basis	43	50	16.7	50	-	34.6	38.5	66.6	-	28.6	66.6	38.5
Contract work	43	25	16.7	33.3	-	27	16.7	-	50	28.6	33.3	22.2
Piece work contracts	25	25	-	-	-	11.1	8.3	-	-	-	-	13.3
Sub contracting with third party firms or individuals	25	-	16.7	16.7	33.3	19.2	7.7	33.3	-	14.3	33.3	14.3
Other forms	14.3	-	16.7	-	-	9	-	-	50	-	-	4.3
CASES	7	4	6	6	3	26	13	3	3	7	3	26

Codes for the sectors

- 1 Manufacturing
- 2 Commerce
- 3 Insurance/ Banks
- 4 Other service
- 5 D.E.K.O.
(broader public sector)

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

Degree of resort: to a
great extent fairly enough

	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Short term contracts on full employment basis		37.5	22.9	44.4	34.6	33.3	50.1	14.3	40
Contract work		13	11.1	55	27	20	19	33.4	22.2
Piece- work contracts		-	20	11.1	11.1	-	6.3	-	3.8
Sub contracting with third party firms or individuals		29	20	11.1	19.2	16.7	19	-	14.3
Other forms		16.7	-	-	4.5	-	7.1	-	4.3
CASES		6	7	9	22	6	16	6	28

to the following categories of staff?

Employer

contracts	B18 short term contracts	B19 contract work	B20 part time on permanent basis	B21 seasonal contract	B22 Piece work	B23 part time & temporary contracts	B24 Other forms	TOTAL OF CASES
administrative employees	25	25					50	18
top staff	16.7	16.7					66.7	17
senior staff	28.6			28.6			42.9	13
skilled personnel	66.7	11.1		22.2				19
unskilled personnel	40		10	40			10	24

Trade Union

administrative employees	57.1	14.3					28.6	18
top staff	36.4	36.4					27.3	17
senior staff	20	20					60	13
skilled personnel	20	20	10	10			40	19
unskilled personnel	50	7.1		21.4			21.4	24

B23 - Open question : other

employer (1)	trade union (2)
1. sub contracting - 1	4. full employment - 3
2. short term contracts - 1	0. others - 2
3. others - 1	
Total - 3	Total - 5

BUSINESS TRENDS DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

FIRMS (YES)	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Standard employment		62.5	69.2	80	71	100	88.2	100	93.8
Short term contracts		50	23.1	60	42	57.1	29.4	-	28.1
Part time on a long term basis		25	53.8	50	42.5	28.6	11.8	12.5	15.6
Part time on a temporary basis		25	23	30	26	-	5.9	12.5	6.3
Sub contracting work		25	38.5	30	32.3	14.3	11.8	-	9.4
Piece work		-	15.4	-	6.5	-	-	-	-
CASES		8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

PRESENTATION OF THE QUESTION IN SHORT FORM

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

average	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Standard contracts (yes)		62	69	80		100	88.2	100	
Non standard contracts (yes)		25	31	42.5		33.3	15	12.5	
CASES		8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

2. TRADES UNION VIEW

TABLE
B41, B42, B43

ADVANTAGES OF TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT
FOR THE FIRM

(by not hierarchical classification)

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES		TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	
More flexibility & direct adjustment of firms to the occasional / temporary market or production needs with no additional cost (labour cost mainly)	15	1. Higher flexibility, direct adjustment to the production & market needs without problems	1
Reduction of labour cost & ease of limitations derived from the full & permanent employments regime' (eg avoiding in this way taxes, insurance pension and other benefits towards the employees	11	2. Elimination in various terms of the cost of labour (insurance, pension leave and other requirements of benefits towards the personnel of the firm	5
Higher productivity & efficiency of the personnel also better control of work	5	3. Biting of trade unions by dividing & abolishing in this way the possibility of strike action	2
No positive impacts	1	4. Other (eg ability of employees to be on leave for holidays by the firms resort to temporary workers	1
No answer	2		
TOTAL OF RESPONSES	34	TOTAL OF RESPONSES	9

TABLE
B44, B45, B46

-238-
DISADVANTAGES OF TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT
FOR THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Training & supervision problems as well as lack of experience adaptability. Also problem of low availability of skills to the firms needs	12	1. Training problems due to lack of experience & skills that would be available to the firms needs	12
2. Lack of skilled personnel available to work by this form of employment	8	2. Lower efficiency due to insecurity. Lack of long term career in the firm	10
3. Lower efficiency & control over work due to insecurity & temporary nature of this category of employee	6	4. Increasing labour cost & negative image of the firm due to the resort to those forms of employment	2
4. Increase of labour costs eg expense of training & supervision	1	6. No negative impacts	2
5. Increase of trade unions reactions	2		
6. No negative impacts	1		
0. No opinion	1		
TOTAL	31	TOTAL	27

TABLE
B61, B62, B63

ADVANTAGES FOR THE USE OF PART TIME
EMPLOYMENT FOR THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
flexible adjustment of firms to the production or market needs with lower cost (in production labour)	19	1. Direct flexible adjustment of the firms to production or market needs without problems	10
Facing, in part, the problem of unemployment	2	2. Elimination of the costs of labour	9
Increase of the productivity & the interest of the employees at work. It is a good method of motivating the efficiency of the employee before being hired by the firm on permanent basis	5	3. Threats to the trade unions	8
There are no advantages	1	4. Other	1
No opinion	1		
Other	3		
TOTAL	31	TOTAL	28

DISADVANTAGES OF THE USE OF PART TIME
EMPLOYMENT FOR THE FIRM

TABLE
B64, B65, B66

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Lack of skilled personnel available to be employed in this form	5	1. Problems of part timers adaptability, interest, efficiency, training & control at work	11
2. Increasing needs of supervision, training & new organisation of work. Low efficiency of the part time employees	18	2. No problems	3
		3. Other Mainly economic & trade union threatening by the management	4
3. No problems	3		
4. Other	2		
TOTAL	28	TOTAL	18

TABLE
B73, B74, B75

PROBLEMS DERIVED FROM THE APPLICATION
OF PART - TIME EMPLOYMENT IN THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Low skills, efficiency interest at work (problems of organising & supervising those categories of employees	11	1. Low skills, efficiency interest & quality of work (also higher labour cost sometimes)	6
2. Legal limitations reactions on the part of trade unions	2	2. Dismissals, redundance of the permanent & full employed personnel. problems in labour relations (intensification of work, lack of definite working hours etc)	9
3. It has not yet been put into practice	3	3. It has not been put into practice (due to technical problems & Trade Unions reactions	7
4. No reply	1	4. No problems	1
5. No problems	1		
6. Dismissals	1		
TOTAL	19	TOTAL	23

TABLE
C5 , C6 , C7

PROBLEMS RELATED TO OVERTIME WORKING

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Low efficiency and productivity due to the intensification of work	12	1. Low efficiency and productivity during over - time working (work accidents)	12
2.No adequate payments of overtime work	4	2. Higher labour cost	5
3. Not hiring of new personnel, perpetuation of the unemployment problem	3	3. Division, intensification and competition among the work force and also low payments for overtime work	11
4. Higher cost (eg by the increase of supervision)	3	4. Not hiring of new personnel by the use of overtime work	3
5. Bad competition and division among the employees	3	5. Other	3
6. No problems	3	6. No problems	2
7. Other	1	7. There is no overtime working in the firm	2
TOTAL OF RESPONSES	29	TOTAL OF RESPONSES	38

ADVANTAGES OF OVERTIME EMPLOYMENT

TABLE
C11, C12, C13

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Economic reasons. It is more profitable both for the firm and the employees	11	1. Better adjustment of the existing personnel to the firms needs than of the temporary workers	15
2. Covering of the temporary work load needs of the firm without the use of additional personnel	6	2. Economic reasons: It is profitable both for the employers and the personnel as well	11
3. Avoiding of hiring new personnel in general	6	3. Avoiding of hiring new skilled personnel & also difficulty in finding available skilled employees in the external labour markets	8
4. There is no overtime in the firm	1	4. Other	3
TOTAL	25	TOTAL	37

TABLE
C15, C16, C17

JUSTIFICATION OF THE PREFERENCE OF FIRMS TO
RESORT TO OVERTIME AS OPPOSED TO OTHER FORMS
OF FLEXIBLE WORKING

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Avoidance of higher costs of hiring new staff	4	1. No hiring of new personnel due to the higher labour cost	4
2. Economic reasons: more profitable both for the firms and the employees	10	2. Higher efficiency at work on the part of the existing personnel	10
4. Lack of interest of finding other means of facing the problem	4	3. Lack of interest in finding other ways of facing the problem	3
5. Rarely resort to overtime	3	4. Economic reasons both for the employer and the employees	6
3. Higher efficiency on the part of the existing personnel (high skills not easily available in the external labour market)	7	5. Other	3
6. Other	4		
TOTAL	32	TOTAL	26

TABLE
C28 , C30

ADVANTAGES OF SHIFT WORK SYSTEMS
FOR THE FIRM AND THE STAFF

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Full utilisation of the fixed plans and the mechanical equipment better services to the customers	9	1. Highers profits and further economic benefits to the firm due to full utilisation of the fixed plants by the existing personnel (and better adjustment to the market demands as well)	
2. The nature of production imposes the application of this work form	10	2. The nature of production imposes the application of this work form	9
3. It gives work to the surplus work force in the firm	3	3. Increase of employment	1
4. It gives the opportunity for new hirings	2	4. Extra economic benefits in part for the employees	1
		5. It facilitates in part some problems of the staff (free time in the morning, easier transportation)	2
TOTAL	23	TOTAL	16

TABLE
C37, C38, C39

ADVANTAGES OF FLEXIBLE WORKING HOURS
FOR THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Better planning of work and more proper services towards the customers. Increase of labour productivity without loss of time	11	1. More adaptable & suitable to some categories of employees	9
2. Adaptable to particular categories of employees (ie mothers) it solves social problems	5	2. Higher labour productivity without any loss of time plus lower labour cost	6
3. No advantages	1	3. No opinions	1
TOTAL	17	TOTAL	16

TABLE
C40, 41

DISADVANTAGES OF FLEXIBLE WORKING
HOURS ADOPTION IN THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Lessening of the work control. Unreliability & low efficiency at some times	7	1. Lower payments, loss of free time (less holidays free weekends and leaves)	10
2. Isolation of the employees, tiredness & in part low payments towards the personnel	5	2. Isolation estrangement among the employees and weakening of trade unionism	6
3. No disadvantages	2	3. If the staff are willing to work in this way, No problem	1
TOTAL	14	TOTAL	17

TABLE
D5 - D10

BY WHICH WAYS HAS THE LACK OF SKILLED PERSONNEL
BEEN FACED BY THE FIRM SO FAR?

Presentation of answers not by hierarchical classification

	1. EMPLOYERS VIEW						2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW						
	YES %	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
by training the personnel		37.5	92.3	90	74.2	29.6	70.6	50	56.3				
By hiring properly skilled personnel on full employment basis		37.5	61.5	50	51.6	14.3	41.2	50	27.5				
By short term contracts with professional &/or by subcontracting with professionals or third firms		37.5	7.7	10	16.2	-	17.7	25	15.7				
CASES		6	13	8	27	4	14	7	25				

TABLE
D6 - D10

BY WHICH WAYS HAS THE LACK OF SKILLED PERSONNEL
BEEN FACED BY THE FIRM SO FAR

PRESENTATION ONLY OF THE FIRST CHOICE IN PRIORITY ORDER

EMPLOYERS VIEW

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	Yes	%	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
By training / retraining the personnel	88.9	75	100	20	25			66.7	81.8	66.7	66.7	-	50	66.7
By hiring properly skilled personnel on a full employment basis	11.1	25	-	60	50			25.9	-	33.3	-	50	25	16.7
By short term contracts with professionals or by sub-contracting with professionals or third party firms	-	-	-	20	-			3.7	9.1	-	-	25	-	8.9
Other ways	-	-	-	-	25			3.7	9.1	-	33.3	25	25	16.7
CASES	9	4	5	5	4			27	11	3	3	4	4	25

Codes for the sectors

- 1 Manufacturing
- 2 Commerce
- 3 Insurance / Banks
- 4 Other service
- 5 D.E.K.O.
(broader public sector)

TABLE
D14

THE TRAINING ACTIVITY IS MORE CONCERNED
BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

	1. EMPLOYERS VIEW				2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW			
	Yes %	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD
All other personnel	25	30.8	50	35.5	-	29.4	25	21.9
Broad categories of the staff	62.5	46.2	50	51.6	71.4	23.5	50	40.6
Very few categories of the personnel	12.5	23.1	-	12.9	28.6	47.1	25	37.5
CASES	8	13	10	31	7	17	9	32

TABLE
D14

THE TRAINING ACTIVITY IS MORE CONCERNED

EMPLOYERS VIEW

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	Yes	%	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
All of the personnel	45.5	25	50	-	50	35.5	35.7	-	33.3	-	25	21.		
Broad categories of the personnel	36.4	50	33.3	100	50	51.6	28.6	75	-	57.1	40.			
Very few categories of the personnel	18.2	25	16.7	-	-	12.9	35.7	25	66.7	42.9	37.			
CASES	11	4	6	6	4	31	14	4	3	7	4	32		

Codes for the sectors	
1	Manufacturing
2	Commerce
3	Insurance/ Banks
4	Other service
5	D.E.K.O. (broader public sector)

TABLE
D19 - D22

EVALUATION ON THE RESULTS OF THE TRAINING
ACTIVITIES IN THE FIRM

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW				2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW					
	yes %	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
They are adequate and proper to the firms needs	87	77	98	87.3	57	47	84	52.5	
Very efficient	62	69	71	66.6	43	37.5	66.7	49	
Not of important results	-	8.3	10	6.1	29	37.5	11	31	
CASES	8	10	10	31	7	17	6	30	

TABLE
D19 - D22

EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE TRAINING
ACTIVITY IN THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS VIEW SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	Yes %	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
They are adequate and proper to the firms needs	90.9	75	83.3	-	75	87	46.2	50	66.6	66.6	75.	56	
Very efficient	63.6	75	50	83.3	75	67.7	33.3	25.3	33.3	50	50	37	
Not of important results	9.1	25	-	-	-	11.3	31	25	33.3	33.3	33.3	31	
CASES		11	4	6	6	4	31	13	4	3	6	4	30

Codes for the sectors	
1	Manufacturing
2	Commerce
3	Insurance / Banks
4	Other service
5	D.E.K.O. (broader public sector)

TABLE
D25

REASONS FOR THE LOW EXTERNAL MOBILITY
OF THE FIRMS STAFF

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Relatively satisfactory payments, good working conditions, satisfaction from the work positions & better career prospects	12	1. Relatively satisfactory work conditions, career prospects & payments. Work experience in the same firm is important for satisfactory incomes as well as for a better career.	11
2. Due to unemployment threatening	4	2. Due to unemployment threatening	6
3. Due to the relatively permanent character of the contracts (this happens more to the public enterprises/banks)	10	3. There is external mobility of staff due to temporary character of the profession or skills in some cases.	2
		4. Due to the relatively permanent character of contracts (most of them belong to the public/ banking sectors)	10
TOTAL	26	TOTAL	29

TABLE
D28

EVALUATION ON THE PREFERENCE TO THE RESORT ON
EXTERNAL &/OR INTERNAL FORMS OF FLEXIBILITY

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW		2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW							
FIRMS	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
<u>External flexibility</u> The ability of the fluctuation of the size and status of employment without limitation according to the market demands (yes)		38	-	11.1	13.5	-	23.1	12.5	14.3
<u>Internal flexibility</u> The ability in taking advantage of multi skilled personnel by flexible readjustments in new positions and work tasks (yes)		62.5	84.6	66.7	73.3	57.1	69.2	62.5	64.3
Both of them are necessary (yes)		-	15.4	22.2	13.3	42.9	7.7	25	21.4
CASES		8	13	9	30	7	13	8	28

TABLE
D 29

FACTORS WHICH INFLUENCE THE FIRMS RESORT TO
FORMS OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL LABOUR FLEXIBILITY

EMPLOYERS RESPONSES	CASES	TRADE UNIONS RESPONSES	CASES
1. Due to the demand of high skilled personnel & the higher efficiency & interest that permanent personnel show at work	7	1. The occasional fluctuation of the size and status of employment, is better than the firms resort to dismissals	3
2. Due to the temporary (fluctuation problems) of the production & market demands the flexible adjustment of the firms labour force is more suited to the firms needs	11	2. Due to the surplus workforce, fluctation problems and the demands for 24 hour daily plant operation	6
		3. Due to the demands for highly skilled personnel & also due to the efficiency of the permanent personnel at work that is usually higher	17
3. Due to the legal limitations no flexible adjustment can take place in massive terms	4		
4. No reply	2	4. Both policies are not proper	2
5. Both two policies are proper to the firms needs	2		
6. Both policies are unsuitable to the firms needs	1		
TOTAL	27	TOTAL	28

TABLE
E5 - E10

THE MOST FAVOURABLE NON STANDARD FORMS OF
ADDITIONAL PAY AND FREQUENCY OF RESORT ON
THEM BY THE FIRM

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW						2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW					
To a great extent, fairly enough	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL		
Collective bonuses		14.3	30.8	60	35.7	14.3	19.8	12.5	16.2		
Forms of additional pay on an individual basis		16.7	23.1	40	27.5	14.3	40	38	33.5		
Profit sharing		14.3	-	20	10	-	-	12.5	3.2		
Piece work pay		-	9.3	-	3.6	-	-	-	-		
Other		-	28.6	12.5	15.8	-	-	16.7	4.8		
CASES		7	13	10	30	7	16	8	31		

TABLE
E5 - E10

THE MOST FAVOURABLE NON STANDARD FORMS OF
ADDITIONAL PAY AND FREQUENCY OF RESORT TO
THEM BY THE FIRMS

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

EMPLOYERS VIEW	EMPLOYERS VIEW					TOTAL	TRADE UNIONS VIEW					TOTAL		
	To a great extent, fair enough	%	1	2	3		4	5	1	2	3		4	5
Collective bonuses			36.4	100	50	-	-	36.7	21.4	25	-	14.3	-	16.
Forms of additional pay on an individual basis			36.4	66.7	16.7	16.7	-	27.5	43	75	-	-	25	23.
Profit sharing			9.1	25	16.7	-	10	10	-	-	50	-	-	3.
Piecework payments			9.1	-	-	-	3.6	3.6	-	-	-	20	-	4.
Others			22.2	-	-	-	10.5	10.5	-	-	-	20	-	4.
CASES			11	4	6	6	4	30	14	4	2	7	4	31

Codes for the sectors

1	Manufacturing
2	Commerce
3	Insurance/ Banks
4	Other service
5	D.E.K.O. (broader public sector)

TABLE
E12 - E14

THE MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA IN THE DEFINITION
OF PAYMENTS BY THE FIRMS

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION
Presentation only of the first choice
in priority order

EMPLOYERS VIEW

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	%	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Individual labour productivity	45.5	75	50	33.3	33.3	46.7	21.4	25	-	-	14.3	-	17.
The demand of the profession in the labour market	18.2	-	16.7	66.7	-	23.3	-	-	-	-	28.6	-	6.
The collective bargaining system	18.2	-	33.3	-	66.7	20	42.9	50	100	28.6	28.6	33.3	41.
The career prospects of the employee in the firm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
The official credentials	9.1	25	-	-	-	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	33.3	3.
The closed relationships with the management	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.1	25	-	28.6	33.3	17.	17.
Other	9.1	-	-	-	-	3.3	28.6	-	-	-	-	13.	13.
CASES	11	4	6	6	3	30	14	4	1	7	3	29	29

Codes for the sectors

- 1 Manufacturing
- 2 Commerce
- 3 Insurance/ Banks
- 4 Other service
- 5 D F R O

TABLE
E12 - E14

THE MOST IMPORTANT CRITERIA IN THE DEFINITION
OF PAYMENTS BY THE FIRMS

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION
NOT BY HIERARCHICAL CLASSIFICATION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Individual labour productivity	75	61.5	60	64.5	14.3	29.4	12.5	21.9	
The demand of the professional in the labour market	50	42	60	51.6	-	17.6	12.5	12.5	
The collective bargaining system	50	61.5	40	51.6	71.4	58.8	50	59.4	
The career prospects of the employee in the firm	37.5	23.1	50	35.5	-	17.6	12.5	12.5	
The official credentials	37.5	23.1	20	25.8	42.9	23.5	-	21.9	
The closed relations with the management	12.5	-	20	9.7	85.7	23.5	25	27.5	
Other	-	-	10	3.3	-	13.3	28.6	12.5	
CASES	8	12	10	31	7	17	8	22	

TABLE
E16 - E19

WHO DEFINES THE CRITERIA AND THE LEVEL OF
PAYMENTS TO THE STAFF IN THE FIRM

EMPLOYERS VIEW

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	to a great extent/ fairly enough	%	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
The management of the firm		54.5	50	60	66.7	-	50	50	35.7	75	-	71.4	-	40.
The management in cooperation with the personnel on an individual basis and without the Trade Unions involvement		9.1	-	-	33.3	-	10	10	7.1	-	-	14.3	-	6.
The management in agreement with the Trade Unions and the staff of the firm		36.4	50	-	-	50	26.7	26.7	50	25	33.3	14.3	25	34.
Others		-	-	40	-	50	13.3	13.3	7.1	-	66.7	-	75	18.
CASES		11	4	6	6	4	30	30	14	4	3	7	4	32

Codes for the sectors

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Manufacturing |
| 2 | Commerce |
| 3 | Insurance/ Banks |
| 4 | Other service |
| 5 | D.F.K.O.
(broader public sector) |

TABLE
E16 - E19

WHO DEFINES THE CRITERIA AND THE LEVEL OF THE
PAYMENTS OF THE STAFF IN THE FIRM?

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNION VIEWS

	To a great extent, fair enough	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
The management of the firm			62.5	38.5	55	50	71.4	29.4	37.5	40.6
The management of the firm in cooperation with the personnel without the Trade Union participation			25	-	11.1	10	14.3	-	12.5	6.3
The management in agreement with the Trade Unions			12.5	30.8	33.3	26.7	14.3	41.2	27.5	24.4
Other *			-	20.9	-	13.3	-	29.4	12.5	18.9
CASES			8	13	9	30	7	17	8	22

Others:

	In Employers view	In Trade Unions view
	7	5
The existing collective bargaining systems		
The state	5	5

TABLE
E24 - E26

MAIN PAYMENT POLICIES THAT HAVE BEEN APPLIED BY THE
FIRM SO FAR

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

by no hierarchical classification

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEWS

-264-

	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Payments based on collective bargaining	50	50	69	50	58	85.7	82.4	50	75
Bargaining on a firm level	37.5	37.5	30.8	20	29	14.3	11.8	12.5	12.5
Payments flexibly adjusted to the market capacities	50	50	7.7	30	25.8	57.1	17.6	25	28.1
Payments higher than those in labour market	37.5	37.5	23.1	30	29	-	11.8	50	19.8
No elimination of the payments but increase of labour productivity of staff	50	50	38.5	30	38.7	14.3	17.6	12.5	15.6
Elimination of labour cost on any account	12.5	12.5	15.4	10	29	71.4	17.6	-	25
CASES	8	8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

TABLE
E24 - E26

MAIN PAYMENT POLICIES APPLIED BY THE FIRM SO FAR

SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION
Presentation of the first choice in priority order

EMPLOYERS VIEW

TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	%	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
Payments based on collective bargaining		30	50	60	33.3	100	48.3	50	100	66.7	85.7	75	68
Bargaining on a firm level		20	25	-	16.7	-	13.8	7.1	-	-	-	-	3
Payments flexibly adjusted to the market capacity		20	-	-	50	-	17.2	7.1	-	-	-	-	3
Payments higher than those in labour markets		10	-	40	-	-	10.3	14.3	-	33.3	-	-	9
No elimination of the payments but increase of the labour productivity of the staff		20	25	-	-	-	10.3	14.3	-	-	-	25	9
Elimination of the labour cost on any account		-	-	-	-	-	-	7.1	-	-	14.3	-	6
CASES		10	4	5	6	4	28	14	4	3	7	4	32

Codes for the sectors

- 1 Manufacturing
- 2 Commerce
- 3 Insurance/ Banks
- 4 Other service
- 5 D.E.K.O.

TABLE
E27 - E29

MAIN PAYMENT STRATEGIES THAT SHOULD BE ADOPTED BY
THE FIRM

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

	1. EMPLOYERS VIEW				2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW					
	FIRMS (YES)	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Payment based on collective bargaining			12.5	7.7	-	6.5	14.3	35.3	12.5	25
Payment bargaining on a firm level			25	31	10	22.6	14.3	11.8	12.5	12.5
Payments flexibly adjusted to labour market capacities			25	-	30	16.1	28.6	-	25	12.5
Payments higher than those in the labour market			25	-	30	16.1	28.6	-	25	12.5
Elimination of the labour cost through the labour productivity increase			50	69.2	50	58.1	57.1	35.3	-	31.3
On any account elimination of the labour cost			-	7.7	20	9.7	-	-	-	-
CASES			8	13	10	31	7	17	8	32

TABLE
E30 - E37

MOST FAVOURABLE STATE POLICIES TO THE FIRMS
PRESENT NEEDS

BUSINESS TREND DISTRIBUTION

1. EMPLOYERS VIEW

2. TRADE UNIONS VIEW

	YES	%	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL	DOWN	INTERMEDIATE	UPWARD	TOTAL
Complete release of the labour market			71.4	100	80	85.7	20	6.7	12.5	10.7
Stabilisation of payments			18.2	36.4	45.5	40.7	20.2	6.3	14.3	10.7
Complete indexing of wages & salaries			16.7	33.3	33.3	29.6	80	94	100	93
Introduction of new technology in the firms			100	100	100	100	100	94	100	96.4
Correlation of payments to labour productivity criteria			100	100	100	100	66.7	73.3	50	66.7
More participatory schemes for the employees			50	50	85.7	61	80	94	99.6	93.1
Controlled application of flexible forms of employment by the management in co-operation with the Trade Unions			66.7	53.3	20	57.7	20	62	75	58.2
Elimination of the involvement of the state in labour relations of the firms			50	67.7	71.4	63.6	66.7	15.4	33.3	27.3
CASES			7	11	10	28	5	16	18	29

TABLE 1

-268-

DEGREE OF DYNAMISM OF THE FIRMS IN THE SAMPLE IN 1980's

UPWARD	INTERMEDIATE	DOWNWARDS	
MANUFACTURING			
1. 3E 2. INTRACOM 3. VIAMAX 4. FAGE	1. PIRCAL 2. BRISTOL 3. TRIUMPH 4. AEEXP (fertilisation) 5. PALCO 6. GIOULA 7. ETMA	1. SKALISTIRIS 2. FYROGENIS 3. (ARGYPOS) spinning mills of Attica	
COMMERCE			
5. SKLAVENITIS	8. LAMBROPOULOS 9. INTERSPORT	4. MINION	
BANKS - INSURANCE			
6. ERGO BANK 7. CITY BANK 8. INTERAMERICAN (insurance)	10. IONIAN BANK 11. EMPORIKI (insurance)	5. ETVA	
OTHER SERVICES			
9. HRA 10. IG&IA	12. TITANIA 13. MITERA	6. BULL SA 7. INTERCONDINENTAL 8. LEDRA MARRIOT	
DEKO (PUBLIC ENTERPRISES)			
-	14. OTE 15. ILPAP 16. OA (Olympic Airways)	9. OSE	
total	10	16	9

BRIEF SECTORAL DISTRIBUTION

a)

FIRMS	manuf	comm	banks	other svc	DEKO	total
upward	4	1	3	2	-	10
intermediate	7	2	2	2	3	16
downward	3	1	1	3	1	9
total	14	4	6	7	4	35

SECTORS	secondary	tertiary	total
upward	4	6	10
intermediate	7	9	16
downward	3	6	9

TABLE 2

ANALYTICAL PROFILE OF THE BUSINESS TREND OF THE FIRMS IN THE 1980's

-269-

	VCR ₂	VRD	VGR	VCI	V.EMPL	CR ₁	CC
UPWARD FIRMS							
1. 3E	0	1	2	-2	-2	2	2
2. INTRACOM	1	2	2	2	2	1	-1
3. VIAMAX	1	0	2	2	-2	-2	0
4. FAGE	0	0	2	2	2	-1	2
5. SKLAVENITIS	-1	0	2	-1	2	2	-2
6. ERGO BANK	0	0	2	-2	2	2	-2
7. CITY BANK	-	0	2	-	-2	-	-
8. INTERAMERICAN	-2	0	2	0	2	-2	-1
9. HRA	1	2	2	-	-	-2	1
10. IGEIA	2	0	2	-	-		0
	0	1	2	0	1	0	0

INTERMEDIATE

1. PIRCAL	2	1	2	2	-2	-1	0
2. BRISTOL	-1	-1	0	0	2	2	-2
3. TRIUMPH	-1	2	-2	-2	-1	1	-1
4. AEEXP	-1	1	-2	-2	-2	-2	2
5. PALCO	-1	-1	1	0	-2	2	-1
6. GIOULA	0	-1	1	-2	2	-2	1
7. ETMA	0	1	-2	-2	-2	-2	1
8. LAMBROPOULOS	0	-1	0	0	-2	0	2
9. INTERSPORT	-2	1	0	2	2	2	-2
10. IONIAN BANK	-1	0	1	1	0	2	-2
11. EMPORIKI	0	1	-1	0	-2	-1	-1
12. TITANIA	-2	2	-2	-	-	-2	1
13. MITERA	2	-1	2	-	-	-2	1
14. OTE	1	2	-2	2	-2	-2	2
15. ILPAP	1	-2	2	2	0	-2	2
16. OA	-2	2	-2	-1	-1	0	2
	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0

DOWNWARDS

1. SKALISTIRIS	-2	-2	-2	-	-	-2	-1
2. FYROGENIS	2	0	-2	-2	1	-2	0
3. ARGYROS	0	-2	0	-2	-2	2	-2
4. MINION	-1	-2	-1	-2	2	0	0
5. ETVA	0	1	-2	-2	-2	-2	1
6. BULL SA	0	-1	-2	-2	-2	0	0
7. INTERCONDINENTAL	-1	-2	-2	-	-	-2	0
8. LEDRAMARRIOT	1	0	-2	-	-	-2	0
9. OTE	-1	-2	-2	-2	-1	-2	1
	0	-1	-2	-2	-1	-1	0

Footnotes

A/ Methodology: Hierarchical classification

B/ Coses; 2=distinctive improvement/increase

1=slight improvement/increase

0=stabilised/steady

-1=slight worsening/elimination

-2=distinctive worsening/elimination

TABLE 3

INDICES AND RESULTS OF THE BUSINESS TREND IN THE 1980's

Sectoral distribution	CI	CC	CR1	CR2		R.D		VGP	VCI	VEM	VRD by VGP codes of business trend
					VCR		VRD				
MANUFACTURING											
IIRCAL	-1	0	-1	-1	2	-1	1	+2	+2	-2	0
SKALISTIRIS	-	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-2	-	-	1
3E	1	2	0	2	0	0	1	+2	-2	-2	2
BRISTOL	-2	-2	2	2	-1	-2	-1	0	0	2	0
TNTRACOM	-1	-1	1	0	1	0	2	+2	2	2	2
TRIUMPH	-2	-1	1	0	-1	0	2	-2	-2	-1	0
AEEXP	2	2	-2	-2	-1	0	1	-2	-2	-2	0
VIAMAX	2	0	-2	-2	1	0	0	+2	2	-2	2
PALCO	0	-1	2	0	-1	0	-1	+1	0	-2	0
FAGE	1	2	-1	1	0	0	0	+2	2	2	2
FYROGENI	0	0	-2	-1	2	0	0	-2	-2	1	1
GIOULA	0	1	-2	-1	0	0	-1	1	-2	2	0
ETMA	0	1	-2	-1	0	0	1	-2	-2	-2	0
ARGYROS	-1	-2	0	-2	0	0	-2	0	-2	1	1
COMMERCE					0		0	-0.2	-1	-0.3	
LAMBROPOULOS	-1	0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	0	-2	0
MINION	-1	0	0	-1	-1	0	-2	-1	-2	2	1
SKLAVENITIS	-2	-2	2	2	-1	-1	0	2	-1	2	2
TRIOUMPH	-2	-2	2	2	-2	-1	1	0	2	2	0
BANKS/INSURANCE					-1		-1	0.2		1	
IONIAN BANK	-2	-2	2	-1	-1	-1	0	1	1	0	0
ERGO BANK	-1	-2	2	0	0	-1	0	2	-2	2	2
ETVA	2	-2	-1	-2	2	-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	1
CITY BANK	-	-	-	2	-	-1	0	2	-	-2	2
EMPORIKI INSURANCE	2	-1	-1	-2	0	0	1	-1	0	-2	0
INTERAMERICAN	0	-1	1	0	-2	1	0	2	0	2	2
OTHER SERVICES					-0.2		0	1	-1	0.3	
BULL SA	0	0	0	0	0	0	-1	-2	-2	2	1
INTERCONDINENTAL	-	0	-2	-2	-1	0	-2	-2	-	-	1
LEDRA MARRIOT	-	0	-2	-2	1	0	0	-2	-	-	1
TITANIA	-	1	-2	-2	-2	1	2	-2	-	-	0
IRA	-	1	-2	-2	1	1	2	+2	-	-	2
MITERA	-	1	-2	-2	2	1	-1	+2	-	-	0
IGEIA	-	0	-2	-2	2	1	0	+2	-	-	2
DEKO					1		0	0	-		
OTE	2	2	-2	-1	1	0	2	-2	+2	-2	0
OSE	0	1	-2	-2	-1	2	-2	-2	-2	-1	1
ILPAP	-2	2	-2	-2	1	-0	-2	2	2	0	0
OA (Olympic Airways)	2	2	0	2	-2	0	2	-2	-1	-	0
		1			-0.2		0	-1	0.2	-1	

Methodology: Hierarchical classification

eg

$(CI) < 1/2 \text{Average} = -2$ distinctive worsening

$1/2 \text{AV} < CI < 3/4 \text{AV} = -1$ slight worsening

$3/4 \text{AV} < CI < 5/4 \text{AV} = 0$ stabilised / steady

$5/4 \text{AV} < CI < 3/2 \text{AV} = 1$ slight improvement

$> 3/2 \text{AV} = 2$ distinctive improvement

considerably $> 3/2 \text{AV} = +2$ highly improved

(AV = average)

CODES OF MAIN INDICIES

CI = capital intensity fixed assets/ rate of employment

CC = structure of capital fixed assets/total assets

CR1 = capital return = gross profit/fixed assets (technical capacity)

CR2 = capital return = gross profit/net worth (financial capacity)

RD = ratio of debt = $1 - \text{net worth/total assets}$

VGP = annual average variation of gross profits

VCI = annual average variation of capital intensity

VEM = annual variation of employment

VRD = annual average variation of ratio of debt

Code of the B.T.: 2 = upward, 0 = intermediate, 1 = downward

(VRD by VGR)

TABLE 4

-172-

ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONSUMERIST (C) CAPITAL AND INTERMEDIATE INDUSTRIES (C1)

A) CONSUMERIST INDUSTRIES	B) CAPITAL INTERMEDIATE INDUSTRIES
1. TRIUMPH International SA (garment industry)	1. CHEMICAL PRODUCTS & FERTILIZER CO SA
2. SE Hellenic Bottling Company SA (Drinks, beverage industry)	2. BRISTOL MYERS SQUIBB (Pharmaceutical products)
3. GIOULA CLASS WORKS SA	3. INTRACOM SA (electrical & electronic materials)
4. ETMA RAYLON & NYLON MANUFACTURES SA (textile industry)	4. VIAMAX SA (agent for farm tractors & machinery, road construction trucks, spare parts, repair & maintenance services)
5. ATTICA SPINNING MILLS SA (garment industry)	5. PIRCAL GREEK POWER AND CARTRIDGE COMPANY SA
6. FAGE SA (food industry)	6. FYROGENIS CHRIS AND V SA (heating & solar energy equipment)
7. SKALISTIRISSA	7. SKALISTIRISSA
TOTAL 7	TOTAL 7

2. MANUFACTURING SECTOR

business trend distribution

Manufacturing	down	interim	up	total
consumerist firms	1	4	2	7
intermediate/ capital firms	2	3	2	7

TABLE 5

FIELD OF THE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY OF THE FIRMS OF THE SAMPLE
EXCEPT THE MANUFACTURING SECTOR

2. COMMERCE SECTOR

- LAMPROPOULOS SA (Chain/departmental store)
- MINION (Chain/departmental store)
- SKLAVENITIS (supermarket)
- INTERSPORT SA (Agents, importers and distributors of athletic clothing and footwear)

4. OTHER SERVICE SECTOR

- BULL SA (computer services)
- INTERCONDINENTAL (hotel)
- LEDRA MARIOT (hotel)
- TITANIA (hotel)
- MITRA (Hospital - maternity clinic)
- MITERA (Hospital and maternity clinic)
- IGGIA (Hospital)

5. DEKO (BROADER PUBLIC SECTOR)

- OLA (Olympic Airways - public air navigation services)
- OSE (De Shemins de fer Helleniques SA)
- OTE (Hellenic Tele-communications SA)
- ILRAP SA (Civil transportation utilities)

3. BANKING SECTOR AND INSURANCE

- IONIAN AND POPULAR BANK SA
- ERGO BANK
- ETVA BANK (Hellenic Bank of Industrial Development)
- CITY BANK
- EMPORIKI (Insurance services)
- INTERAMERICAN (Insurance services)

TABLE 6

MAIN INDICES OF ~~THE~~ ²⁷⁴ ECONOMIC ANALYSIS,
ON THE BUSINESS TREND OF THE FIRMS IN 1980's (1980 - 1990)

	X2	X3	VGP	VCI	VEM	VCR	VRO
PYRKAL	1	1	40.37%	10.32%	-5.90%	0.593	
SKALISTIRI	1	1	-30.27%			-0.034	-0.033
3E	1	2	14.11%	3.09%	0.55%	0.120	0.154
BRISTOL MYERS	1	1	7.89%	5.89%	5.62%	0.053	-0.027
INTRACOM	1	1	78.88%	46.05%	39.57%	0.208	0.021
TRIUMPH	1	2	3.22%	1.42%	2.10%	0.036	-0.050
AEXP/LIPASMATON	1	1	-2.72%	0.52%	-1.80%	0.004	-0.041
BIAMAX	1	1	15.77%	19.43%	-10.67%	0.336	-0.004
PALCO	1	2	9.61%	7.67%	0.55%	0.034	0.005
FAGE	1	2	22.69%	10.87%	5.35%	0.082	0.057
FIROGENIS	1	1	-4.57%	2.15%	4.41%	8.073	0.015
GIOULA	1	2	9.47%	-5.20%	6.66%	0.131	0.014
ETMA	1	2	3.33%	-1.28%	-0.43%	0.093	0.041
KLOSTIRIA ATTIKI	1	2	6.11%	1.98%	4.90%	0.131	-0.022
LAMBROPOULOS	2	3	6.42%	6.60%	-2.11%	0.113	1.059
MINION	2	3	4.27%	-0.06%	7.06%	0.061	0.054
SKLAVENTIS	2	3	11.58%	4.42%	8.80%	0.007	0.371
INTERSPORT	2	3	6.97%	14.57%	7.30%	-0.034	0.001
IONIAN & POPULAR BANK	3	3	8.55%	7.99%	3.92%	0.024	-0.003
ERGO BANK	3	3	18.94%	2.67%	7.50%	0.101	0.002
ETBA	3	3	-8.38%	-2.18%	1.44%	0.455	0.001
CITY BANK (DRS)	3	3	14.54%		1.26%		0.024
EMPORIKI	3	3	3.61%	5.98%	-1.09%	0.087	0.100
INTERAMERICAN	3	3	10.33%	7.33%	8.60%	-0.020	-0.028
BULL	4	3	-1.11%	-10.12%	-1.05%	0.134	0.012
INTER CONTINENTAL	4	3	-13.65%			0.068	0.057
LEDRA MARIOTT	4	3	-7.09%			0.240	0.128
TITANIA	4	3	-45.30%			-5.240	0.012
HRA	4	3	12.05%			0.307	-0.063
MHTERA	4	3	30.59%			0.553	-0.079
YGEIA	4	3	20.58%			0.409	0.025
OTE	5		-1.18%	29.45%	-1.10%	0.198	0.018
OSE	5		-2.71%	-3.37%	1.72%	0.000	-0.046
LIPAP	5		22.76%	12.44%	3.14%	0.289	0.038
OA	5		-13.81%	3.95%	2.09%	-0.064	0.125
							-0.102
average			7.20%	6.75%	3.51%	0.222	0.052
			19.88	10.92	9.13		

TABLE 7

- 2 -

MAIN INDICES OF ~~THE~~ ECONOMIC ANALYSIS,
ON THE BUSINESS TREND OF THE FIRMS IN 1980's (1980 - 1990)

	X2	X3	Capital Intensity	Capital Structure	GP/FA Capital Return (1)	GP/NW Return (2)	Ratio of debt
			IC	CC	CR1	CR2	RD
PYRKAL	1	1	1651.6	0.509	0.194	0.944	0.896
SKALISTIRI	1	1		0.388	-0.609	1.079	1.219
3E	1	2	3141.9	1.069	0.528	2.958	0.809
BRISTOL MYERS	1	1	960.4	0.158	1.361	4.726	0.955
INTRACOM	1	1	1322.5	0.394	1.060	1.239	0.663
TRIUMPH	1	2	739.4	0.374	1.148	1.203	0.643
AEXEP/LIPASMATOM	1	1	3647.9	1.037	0.158	0.402	0.594
BIAMAX	1	1	7075.5	0.586	0.204	0.270	0.556
PALCO	1	2	227.2	0.298	1.600	1.332	0.642
PAGE	1	2	3042.6	0.912	0.543	1.990	0.751
FIROGENIS	1	1	1771.6	0.627	0.360	0.843	0.732
GILOLA	1	2	2671.5	0.773	0.361	0.806	0.654
ETMA	1	2	2217.2	0.831	0.300	0.736	0.661
KLOSTITIA ATTIKI	1	2	1197.0	0.195	0.586	0.621	0.816
LAMBROPOULOS	2	3	1168.7	0.623	0.921	1.204	0.523
MINTON	2	3	1374.0	0.543	0.713	0.843	0.541
SKLAVENTIS	2	3	198.0	0.225	3.121	10.769	0.935
INTERSPORT	2	3	293.4	0.075	6.953	3.297	0.841
IONIAN & POPULAR BANK	3	3	1139.8	0.021	1.689	0.788	0.956
ERGO BANK	3	3	1382.3	0.032	1.648	1.000	0.948
ETRA	3	3	5458.6	0.031	0.467	0.100	0.853
CITY BANK (DRS)	3	3				3.413	0.961
EMPORIKI	3	3	4314.9	0.398	0.404	0.384	0.581
INTERAMERICAN	3	3	2728.8	0.341	0.498	1.565	0.892
BULL	4	3	2583.6	0.519	0.802	1.138	0.634
INTER CONTINENTAL	4	3		0.612	-0.241	-0.586	0.749
LEDRA MARIOTT	4	3		0.688	-0.135	-0.334	0.722
TITANIA	4	3		0.799	0.036	0.048	0.398
HRA	4	3		0.774	0.274	0.365	0.419
MITERA	4	3		0.801	0.131	0.168	0.377
YGETA	4	3		0.591	0.163	0.151	0.363
OTE	5		4353.5	0.956	0.257	0.868	0.717
OSE	5		2650.8	0.746	0.160	0.164	0.271
HLPAP	5		962.5	1.224	0.339	0.211	0.962
OA	5		3811.9	0.860	0.660	2.639	0.785
Average			2.300	0.539	0.784	1.353	0.660
			1.643	0.315	1.970	1.964	0.344

TABLE 8

MAIN INDICES OF THE ECONOMIC ANALYSIS,
ON THE BUSINESS TREND OF THE FIRMS IN 1980's (1980 - 1990)

		Constant prices						
				Assets F.	Assets	Gross Profit	Networth	Employment
				TA	FA	GP	NW	EM
		X2	X3					
ARKAL	I01TA	1	1	11300830	5753787	1114322	1180493	3484
ALISTIRI	I02TA	1	1	6755176	2618869	-1593930	-1477882	
AE	I03TA	1	2	3456522	3695467	1950807	659429	1176
BRISTOL MYERS	I04TA	1	1	1708122	269359	366464	77548	280
FRACOM	I05TA	1	1	1408061	555435	588823	475085	420
TRIUMPH	I06TA	1	2	650620	243392	279518	232302	329
CEXP/LIPASMATOM	I07TA	1	1	11350554	11765492	1854007	4613627	3225
AMAX	I07TA	1	1	5529683	3241851	661402	2453960	458
ALCO	I09TA	1	2	163544	48739	77980	58527	215
AGE	I10TA	1	2	1164769	1062129	577034	290038	349
ROGENIS	I11TA	1	1	909152	570448	205446	243621	322
LOULA	I12TA	1	2	1268173	979712	353935	439279	367
MA	I13TA	1	2	2872684	2388505	717042	974646	1077
PROSTITIA ATTIKI	I14TA	1	2	1844671	360179	211122	339731	301
AMBROPOULOS	C01TA	2	3	1412935	880771	810758	673632	754
ANION	C02TA	2	3	1721874	935589	667009	791163	681
LAVENITIS	C03TA	2	3	1172238	264122	824428	76556	1334
FTERSPORT	C04TA	2	3	182758	13735	95509	28970	47
ANIAN & POPULAR BANK	B01TA	3	3	151959380	3151553	5321846	6756816	2765
ARGO BANK	B02TA	3	3	46588866	1472183	2425971	2425180	1065
BA	B03TA	3	3	126682673	3984780	1862823	18598895	730
TY BANK (DRS)	B04TA	3	3	9950686		1337919	392037	584
OPORIKI ASFALETA	B05TA	3	3	935999	372655	150444	392014	86
ETERAMERICAN	B06TA	3	3	4924148	1677485	835355	533876	615
ELL	A01TA	4	3	410276	212792	170675	150006	82
ETER CONTINENTAL	A02TA	4	3	1643730	1006124	-242054	413327	
EDRA MARIOTT	A03TA	4	3	5449896	3751438	-506470	1514728	
TANIA	A04TA	4	3	592813	473799	17137	356619	
TA	A05TA	4	3	219299	169714	46485	127414	
TEFA	A06TA	4	3	448958	359442	47002	279578	
TEFA	A07TA	4	3	655548	387116	63000	417755	
TE	D01TA	5		136071453	130038069	33388167	38471069	29870
TE	D02TA	5		48931592	36493667	5851802	35651813	13767
ADAP	D03TA	5		1674867	2049785	694252	3286544	2130
A	D04TA	5		46819571	40248837	26545458	10057327	10559

REFERENCES⁴⁷

Books

- Aglietta, M (1979) , A theory of Capitalist Regulation,
London: New Left Books.
- *Alexander, A (1964), Greek Industrialists - an economic and social analysis, Athens: Centre of Planning and Economic Research (KEPE).
- *Apostolidis, I (1984), Contemporary problems of Labour Movements, Trade Unions and Socialist Transformation, Athens: Aehmi Publishers.
- Armstrong, P (1988), 'Labour and Monopoly Capitalism' in R. Hyman and W Streeck (eds.), New Technology and Industrial Relations, Oxford: Blackwell.
- *Babanasis, St. (1986) Peculiarities of the development in Southern Europe, Athens: IMM
- *Babanasis, St and Sioulas, K (1976) Greece in the Periphery of Developed Countries, Athens: Themelio Publishers.
- Berger, S and Piore, M (1982) Dualism and Discontinuity in Industrial societies, Cambridge University Press.
- Blyton, Morris (1990): A Flexible Future: Aspects of the Flexibility debate and some unresolved issues, London: De Gruyter Publishers.
- Boyer, R and Mistral, J (1978) Accumulation, Inflation, crises. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Boyer, R and Coria, B (1986) 'Technical Flexibility and Macro-stabilisation, 17-21.3.1986, Paris: CEPREMAR publishers.

⁴⁷ The Books, Articles and Reports that have been published in Greece are distinguished from the others by an asterix at the beginning of each entry.

- Boyer, R (1986) 'La Flexibilites defensives on offensives?' in Boyer's (eds.) La Flexibilite due travail en Europe Paris: La decourerte.
- Braverman, H (1974) Labour and Monopoly Capital. The degradation of work in the Twentieth Century. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brusco, S and Sabel, C (1981) 'Artisan production and economic growth' in Wilkinson, F (eds), The dynamics of Labour Market segmentation, London: Academic Press.
- Buitelaar, W (1988) 'Technology and work, labour studies in England, Germany and the Netherlands', TNO, Centre for Technology and Policy Studies, Apeldoorn: The Netherlands.
- Christensen, T (1992) Developments of employment in the Manufacturing sector in Greece: 1973-1988, University of Roskilde, Denmark, 1992.
- *Christodoulou, D (1989) Political Economy of post-war Greece, Athens: Paratiritis Publishers.
- Cohen, R (1981) 'The new international division of labour, multinational corporation and Urban hierarchy' in M. Dear and A. Scott (eds), Urbanisation and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, New York, Methuen.
- *Coria, B (1985) L'atelier et le chronometre, Athens: Commouna Publishers.
- Coria, B (1990) L'atelier et le robot, essai sur le Fordisme et la production de masse a l'agede, L'electronique, Paris: Ch. Bourgois 1990.
- *Delivani, M (1979) Analysis of the Greek Economy, Athens: Papazisis Publishers.
- *Delivani, Negrepodi, M (1991) The economy of the informal economy in Greece, Athens: Papazisis Publishers.

- *Dimou, A. (1991) Flexible forms of employment dualism in labour markets and crisis of the welfare state, Nov. 1991, Athens: Congress of Karagiorgas Organisation.
- Doeringer, P. B. and Piore, M. J. (1971) Internal labour markets and manpower analysis, London: Heath, 1971.
- Dore, R (1977) Taking Japan seriously. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- *Doukakis, D (1984) La modernisation industrielle en Greece, Athens: IMM.
- *Doukakis, D (1988) Labour Relations. Economy and Institutions, Athens: Odysseas Publishers.
- *Elefsinioti, M (1991) Deindustrialisation and Crisis of Regional Economies in Greece, Two case studies: The case of Lavrion and Madouthi, Athens: DIMEL.
- *Faciolas, T (1974) Labour markets and structure of labour payments in Greek manufacturing, Athens: KEPE Publishers.
- Freedman, A, L (1977) Industry and Labour: Class Struggle at Work and Monopoly Capitalism, London: Macmillan.
- Freeman, C and Perez, C (1986) The Diffusion of Technical Innovations and Changes of Techno-economic Paradigm, Venice, Conference on Innovation Diffusion.
- Froebel, F, Heinrichs, J and Kreye, O (1980) The New Industrial Division of Labour: Structural Unemployment in Industrialised Countries and Industrialisation in Developing Countries, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galkin, J (1988) Capitalism at the end of 20th Century, Moscow, Progress Publishers.
- Georgakopoulou, V (1986) Le debat Italien sur les dualismes, des structures productives et de l'emploi: 1950-1985, des

discours dualiste aux en eux des issues 'flexibles actuelles, thesis de Doctora, Paris 2, 2, volumes.

- *Georgakopoulou, V (1991) Mass production, New Technologies and Flexibilities of the Firms, Athens: Sept. 1991, INE, GSEE.
- *Giannitsis, T (1982) Differences in the productivity between Greece and the NICS, Athens: KEPE publishers.
- *Giannitsis, T (1983) The Greek Manufacturing Development and Crisis, Athens: Gutemberg Publishers.
- *Giannitsis, T and Vaitzos, K (1986) Technological Transformation and Economic Development, Athens: Gutemberg Publishers.
- *Giannitsis, T (1992) The Position of Greece in the International Division of Labour compared to the other Southern European countries, Athens: EKEM, Papazisis Publishers.
- Harvey, D (1990) The post-modern condition, Oxford: Basic Blackwell Limited.
- Hyman, R (1988) 'Flexible specialisation: Miracle or Myth?' in Hyman, Streeck, W., New technology and industrial relations, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- *Ioakimoglou, I (1992) Model of Capital Accumulation and cost of labour in Greece: 1960-1990, Athens: GSEE INE.
- Jessop, B (1987) The Welfare State in the Transition from Fordism to Post-Fordism, Department of Government, University of Sussex.
- Kaplinski, R (1989) Technological Revolution and the IDL. A Place for the Third World, IDS, Sussex, July 1987.
- *Karabelias, G (1989) State and Society after the fall of Dictatorship in Greece, Athens: EXADAS Publishers.

- *Karagiorgas, S, Kasimati, K, Pantazidi (1988) A Survey on Multiple Job-forms in Greece, Athens: EKKE publishers.
- Karamessini, M (1992) Flexibilite due travail et restructuration de capital: la crisis de model de development et regime de la felxibilite, Thesis de Doctora, Universite, Paris 7, 1992, vol. 1,2.
- *Kasimati, K (1980) Labour Mobility Trends in Greek Manufacturing, Athens:EKKE.
- Katsanevas, T (1980) The Greek Trade Unions, Ph.D. Thesis, London School of Economics, London.
- Katsanevas, T and Papavasiliou, M (1981) Industrial Relations in Small Industry in Greece, London: ILO.
- *Katsanevas, T (1983) The Labour Relations in Greece, Athens: KEPE Publishers.
- *Katsoulis, Nikolinakos, Philiass (1986) Economic History of Modern Greece, Athens: Papazisis Publishers.
- Kelley, M R (1989) 'Unionisation and Job Design under Programmable Automation in USA Manufacturing', in S Wood (ed), The Transformation of Work, Unwin Itimay.
- *Kioulafas, K and Zarangas, L (1990) European Unification and the Greek Labour Market, Athens: IOVE Publishers.
- *Kordatos, J (1978) The History of Labour Movements in Greece, Athens: Sinhroni Epohi Publishers.
- *Koukoules, J (1984) 'Collective Bargaining in Greece', Trade Union Review, March 1984, vol. 36.
- *Koukoules, J (1984) Greek Trade Unions, Economic self-independency and Dependency: 1938-1984, Athens: Odysseas Publishers.
- *Kravaritou, Manitaki, J (1986) 'The Labour Relations in Greece', In Les Tempts Modernes, Athens: EXADAS.

- *Lianos Th, Dogas D, Gaglia E (1990) The Fluctuations of the Greek Economy: 1955-1985, Athens: IMM Publishers.
- Lipietz, A (1983) 'Sur les Fordismes peripheriques de l'Europe du Sud', Paris, CEPREMAR, No. 8319/83.
- Lipietz, A (1985) Fordisme, Fordisme Peripherique a Metropolisation, Paris, CEPREMAR, No. 8514.
- Lipietz, A (1986) 'New Tendencies in the International division of labour. Regimes of accumulation and modes of regulation', in A Scott and M Storper (ed), Production, Work, Territory: The Geographical Anatomy of Industrial Capitalism, Boston: George Allen and Unwin.
- Lipietz, A (1987) Mirages and Miracles, London: Verso.
- *Liberaki, A (1991) Flexible Specialisation, Crisis and Restructuring in Small Scale Industry, Athens: Gutenberg, Publishers.
- *Magliveras, S (1987) The Public Sector of the Greek Economy in Crisis, Athens: Sinhroni Epohi Publishers.
- *Malios, K (1978) The Development of State Monopoly Capitalism in Greece, Athens: Sinhroni Epohi Publishers.
- *Marmagiolis, J and Paxinos, I (1989) The Phenomenon of Mergers and Acquisitions in Greek Economy, Athens: Commercial Bank of Greece.
- *Milios, J (1988) The Greek Socio-economic Formation: from the expanded commodity production to the capitalist development, Athens: EXADAS Publishers.
- *Milios, J and Ioakimoglou, I (1990) The Internationalisation of Greek Capitalism and the Balance of the account, Athens: EXADAS Publishers
- *Mitropoulos, A (1991) Neo Liberalism and the Degradation of Labour, Athens: Tolidi Publishers.

- *Mosconas, J (1986) Traditional Middle-class Strata, Athens: IMM.
- *Mouzelis, N (1986) Politics in the Semi-Pheriphery. Early Parliamentaryism and late Industrialisation, in the Balkan and Latin American Countries, London:, Macmillan.
- Murray, F (1987) Benetton Europe: What is New in Europe?, School of European Studies, University of Sussex.
- *Pacos, T (1980) Concentration in Greek Manufacturing Ph.D. Thesis in Salford University.
- Pakow, T (1983) Industrialisation: Structural Change and Policy: The Case of Greece, Ph.D. Victoria University of Manchester.
- *Papageorgiou, A (1988) Methods of evaluation and work positions of the staff, Athens: ELKEPA Publishers.
- *Papandonakis, K (1983) Greece: The Structure of Dependency, Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University.
- *Papandoniou, J (1979) Distribution of Income and Capital Accumulation, Athens: Papazisis Publishers.
- *Papandreou, V (1981) Multinational Enterprises and the Developing Countries: The Greek Case, Athens: Gutemberg Publishers.
- *Paulopoulos (1987) The informal economy in Greece, Athens: IOVE Publishers.
- Penn, R (1990) Atkinson and Meager's Model of the Flexible Firm, BSA Conference, University of Surrey, April 1990.
- *Pepelassis, A (1963) Problemes du developement economique dans les pays mediteranees, Athens: KEPE.
- Petras, J (1984) La Social Democracia del sur Europa, Madrid: Ediciones Revolution.

- *Petrinioti, X (1985) State and Labour Relations, The political Economy of Labour Relations, Athens: Papazisis Publishers.
- Piore, J and Sable, S F (1984) The Second Industrial Divide? Possibility for Prosperity, New York: Basic Books.
- Pollert, A (1991) Farewell to Flexibility, Oxford: Basil Blackwell..
- Rainnie, A (1989) Industrial relations in small firms, small is not beautiful, London, Routledge.
- *Roumeliotis, P (1980) Economic Crisis and Greek Membership in the EEC, Athens: Papazisis publishers.
- *Roussos, P (1958) The Modern History of Greece, Athens: Synhroni Epohi.
- *Rylmon, P (1992) Labour payment and capital accumulation in post-war Greece, Athens: EXADAS publishers.
- *Rylmon, P (1992) The immigrant workforce in Greek Labour Market, Athens: INE, GSEE (A collective study).
- Sabel, C (1989) 'The re-emergence of regional economies' in P Hirst and J Zeitlin (eds), Reversing Industrial Decline?, Leamington.
- *Samaras, J (1982) State and Capital in Greece, Athens: Synhroni Epohi Publishers.
- Schoenberger, E (1986) Japanese Manufacturing Techniques, New York: The Free Press.
- Scott, A and Storper, M (1988) 'The Geographical Foundation and Social Regulation of Flexible Production Complexes' in J Wolch and M Dear (eds), Territory and Social Production, Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Storper M and Walker R (1988) Capitalist Imperative: Territory, Technology and Industries Growth, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- *Svoronos, N (1978) The Concise History of Modern Greece, Athens, Themelio Publishers.
- Thompson, K (1990) The Nature of Work, London, Macmillan, 1990.
- Thompson, P (1984) Work, Employment and Unemployment, London, Open University Press.
- *Tjekinis, Ch. and Rodopoulos, K (1989) Problems and Prospects of the Forms of part-time employment, Athens: OAED.
- *Tjekinis, Ch. (1991) A survey on labour relations and pay forms related to productivity in Greek manufacturing, Athens: ELKEPA.
- Tolliday, S and Zeitlin, J (1986) 'Introduction: Between Fordism and Flexibility', in S Tolliday and J Zeitlin (eds) Between Fordism and Flexibility, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- *Tsoukalas, K (1986) The State and Society in Post-war Greece, Athens: Themelio.
- *Tsoukalas, K (1986) 'Labour and Workforce in the Capital Questions and Assumptions', in Les Temps Modernes, Athens: EXADAS publishers.
- Urry, J and Lash, S (1987) The end of Organised Capitalism, London: Polity Press.
- *Vamvoukas, G and Petrinioti X (1988) An attempt at the observation of the informal economic activity and the Employment in Greece, Athens: PAPAISIS publishers.
- *Vavouras, J; Koutri (1991) The informal economy: The expansion of the phenomenon in Greece and Abroad, Athens, Papazisis publishers.
- *Vavouras, Karaviti, Tsouclou (1990) The production process in the public sector and the increase of public

- expenditure: The case of Greece, Athens: KRITIKI publishers..
- *Vergopoulos, N (1978) State and economic policies in the 19th century, Athens: EXADAS.
- *Vergopoulos, N (1979) The European Common Market and Southern Europe: The Case of Greece, Sussex, Brighton: IDS.
- *Vergopoulos, N (1986) 'Economic crisis and Modernisation of Greece and of Southern Europe', in Les Tempts Modernes, Athens: EXADAS.
- *Vergopoulos, N (1990) Nationalism and Economic Development Athens: 'EXADAS' Publishers.
- *Vernardakis, N (1989) The Train of Development and the Greece of Fifth Condratiev, Athens: Papazisis publishers.
- Wallerstein, J; Appight, G and Keyder, C (1983) Southern Europe in World Economy in the 20th century, Political and Social Transformation, Napoli: UNITAR Congress.
- Williams, A (1984) Southern Europe transformed: Political and Economic change in Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain, London: Harper and Row.
- Wood, S (1988) "The Degradation of Work?", London: Hutchinson.
- Wood, S (1989) The Transformation of Work? Skill, Flexibility and the Labour Process, London: Unwin Itymay.
- Wood, S (1988) 'Between Fordism and Flexibility: The case of the US Car Industry', in Hyman, P; Streeck, W (eds), Technology and Industrial democracy, New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Wood, S (1988) 'From Braverman to Cyberman: A critique of the flexible specialisation thesis', in W. Buitelaar (ed)

Technology and Work, Debates from England, Germany and Holland, Aldershot: Avebury.

Yamamoura, K; Yasuba, J (1987) Political economy of Japan, Stanford : Stanford University Press, vol 2.

Zeitlin, J (1989) The Third Italy: Inter-firm cooperation and technological innovation, Brighton Southeast Economic Development Conference.

Zolotas, C (1975) Our Economic Problem, Athens: Bank of Greece, publishers.

Articles

- Aglietta, M (1982) , 'World Capitalism in the Eighties', NLR, November, December.
- Aoki, M (1990), 'Towards an economic theory of the Japanese Firm', Journal of Economic Literature, March 1990.
- *Arsenis, G (1990), 'On the new bill, concerning the Developmental planning and the changes of Industrial legislation', TA NEA, 7.7.90.
- *Arsenis, G (1993) 'Under which terms EEC adopted the Greek governmental plan of convergence of Greek economy to European Unification goals', TO VIMA, 21.3.93.
- Atkinson, J and Gregory, A (1986), 'A Flexible Future. Britain's dual labour force', Marxism Today, April, pp.12-17.
- *Babanasis, St. (1981) 'The creation of Poverty in Greece in 20th century (1900-1981)', Review of Social Research Athens, 1981, vol. B and C.
- Boyer, R (1987) 'Labour Flexibilities: Many forms uncertain effects', Labour and Society, Vol 12, No 1.
- Boyer, R (1979) 'La crise actuelle: une mise en perspective historique', Critiques de l'economie politique, vol 7-8a.
- Brown, R K (1990) 'A Flexible Future in Europe? Changing patterns of employment in the United Kingdom', British Journal of Sociology No 41, Issue No 3, September 1990.
- Brusco, S (1982) 'The Emilian model: Productive Decentralisation and Social integration', Cambridge Journal of Economics No 3.
- Cohen, R (1987) 'A labour process to nowhere', NLR Vol 155.

- Cooke, P (1988) 'Flexible integration, scope economies and strategies alliances, Social and spatial mediations', Environment and Planning: Society and Space, vol 16.
- *Doukakis, D (1985) 'The labour relations and the forms of salaried employment in the post-war development and in the present crisis', The Greek Review of Social Research, Athens, vol 59.
- *Doukakis, D (1992) 'Unemployment, a dynamically developing dimension in the mechanisms of labour force mobility', Review of INE GSEE, Athens, Feb-March 1992.
- *Drettakis, M (1990) 'On the new bill concerning the development in Greece', RIZOSPASTIS; 15.7.90
- *Georgakopoulou, V (1986) 'Informal labour patterns and informal economy' The Greek Review of Social Research, Athens vol 63.
- *Georgakopoulou, V (1991) 'A neo-liberal pollaric restructuring: An authoritarian scenario of copying with the crisis problems', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Oct-Nov 1991.
- *Georgakopoulou, V and Kouzis, J (1992) 'Pay related to productivity; Forms, problems and conditions for implementation', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, vol 12-13, Feb-March, 1992.
- *Giannaros, J (1990) 'On the new bill concerning the development plan in Greece', RIZOSPASTIS, 11.8.90.
- *Giannitsis, T (1992) 'Deindustrialisation and productive rigidities of Greek economy', Review of GSEE, INE, Athens, vol 12-13, February-March, 1992.
- *Giannitsis, Katsoulis, Kazakos (1990) Greece towards 2000: Politics, Economy and Society, Athens: Papazisis Publishers

- Hakim, C (1987) 'Trends in the Flexible Workforce,' Employment Gazette, 95(11).
- Hakim, C (1988) 'Self-employment in Britain. A Review of recent trends and current issues' Work, Employment and Society, 2(4).
- Hakim, C (1990) 'Core and Periphery in employers' workforce strategies', Work, Employment and Society 4.2.90.
- Hantzimichalis and Vaiou (1987) 'Changing patterns of uneven regional development forms of social reproduction in Greece', Environment and Planning, D: Society and Space, 1987, vol 5.
- Harvey, D (1987) 'Flexible accumulation through urbanisation: reflection on Post-modernism in the American City', Antipode, 19, p.260-286.
- *Hletsos, M (1990) 'State of self-employed people and the salaried workforce in Greece', Review of Social Sciences, Athens, No. 76.
- Hudson, R (1989) 'Labour Market changes and new forms of work in Old Industrial Regions: maybe flexibility for some but not flexible accumulation', Environment and Planning: Society and Space, 1989, vol 7.
- *Iliadis, T (1981) 'The dependency of Greece on the International Credit Capital', Scientific Thought, Athens, October, 1981.
- *Ioakimoglou, I (1993) 'Increase of the Fixed Investments in technological equipment in manufacturing,' Review of INE GSEE, Athens, Feb 1993.
- *Ioakimoglou, I (1992) 'Convergence of Southern Europe with the Average Growth in European Community', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, May 1982, vol 15.
- *Ioakimoglou, I (1992) 'The International Economic Conjunction', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Dec. 1992, vol 22

- *Ioakimoglou, I (1992) 'Economic Crisis and the Crucial Factors for the Development of the Greek Manufacturing Sector', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, April 1992, vol. 26.
- *Ioakimoglou, I (1992) 'Unit Labour Cost and Competitiveness: an ambiguous relationship', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb 1992, vol. 12.
- *Ioanidou, S (1988) 'Labour Flexibility and Flexibility of the European Community Law. Part-time Employment and Short-term Contracts', European Community Review, Athens, 1988/13.
- *Karanika, M (1985) "The Female Domestic Labour in Greece", Communist Review (KOMEPE), Athens, November 1985.
- *Katsaros, N (1991) 'Increase of Foreign Capital's inputs in Greek Economy', TO VIMA 15.12.91.
- *Katsouras, St. (1993) 'The piece-work in Greece', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Jan 1993, vol. 23.
- *Katsouras, St. (1993) 'The Shift-work systems in Greece', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb 1993, vol. 24.
- *Katsouridas, D (1992) 'The unemployment increase affects mainly young people and women', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb 1992, vol. 12.
- *Kavounidou, J (1983) 'Capitalist Development and Female Employment in Manufacturing', Modern Themes, Athens, 14.3.83.
- Kern and Schumann, M (1987) 'Limits of the Division of Labour' in Economic and Industrial Democracy, Vol 18.
- *Konstadinidou, D, Gajoura, E, Bouranda, D (1990) 'To which degree Greek employees are motivated at work?', Information, Athens, Feb 1990, vol 65.

- *Konstadinidou, N (1986) 'New Forms of Capital Exploitation in Greece', in Trade Union Review, Athens, February 1986, vol 23.
- *Korfiatis, Chris (1992) 'Presentation of the SEV study on the technological modernisation in th Greek manufacturing', TO VIMA, 14.6.92.
- Korfiatis, Ch. (1992) 'Turn over in Greek manufacturing', TO VIMA, 14/6/92.
- *Koukiadis, J (1990) 'The Transformation of Industrial Relations', Review of Labour Low, Athens, Vol 50, 1205.
- *Kouzis, J (1990) 'On the new labour policies and the changes of industrial legislation', RIZOSPASTIS, 15.7.90.
- *Kouzis, J (1992) 'The new Framework of Collective Bargainings', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb-March, 1992.
- *Kouzis, J (1992) 'The Employment in the Galaxy of Flexibility: Issues on Pay related to Productivity', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb-March, 1992, vol. 12-13.
- *Kravaritou, Manitaki, J (1990) 'New Forms of Hirings and the Temporality of the employment', Review of Labour Low Athens, vol 6-7.
- Lane, C (1988) 'Industrial Change in Europe: The pursuit of Flexible Specialisation in Britain and West Germany', Work, Employment and Society, vol. 2.2.
- Leborgne, D and Lipietz, A (1988) 'New Technologies New Modes of Regulation: Some Spatial Implications.' Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 1988, vol.6.
- Lipietz, A (1982) 'Towards Global Fordism?', NLR, March-April, No. 132.

- Lipietz, A (1986) 'Behind the Crisis: The Tendency of the Rate of Profit to Fall, A Regulation School Perspective on some French empirical works', Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 18.
- *Maniatakis, S (1990) 'Comments on Reports of ICAP concerning the situation of Greek Manufacturing in 1989-1990', Economikos Tahydromos, 24.5., vol 615
- Meulders, D and Wilkin, L (1987) 'Labour Market, Flexibility Critical Introduction to the Analysis of a Concept', Labour and Society, June 1987, vol 12, No 1.
- *Mouriki, A (1991) 'Flexible Job Forms: A Blessing or a Curse?', TOPOS, Athens. vol. 3.
- *Mouzelis, N (1992) 'The Twilight of the Monetarism. Recent deadlocks of the Monetaristic State Policies', TO VIMA, 8.11.92.
- Murray, F (1987) 'Flexible Specialisation in the 'Third Italy'', Capital and Class, vol 19.
- *Nicolaou, N (1992) 'Urgent need of national Industrial Strategy', TO VIMA, 22.11.92.
- *Nicolaou, N (1993) 'Public debt and Rantiers', TO VIMA, 10.1.93.
- *Papadimitriou, A (1993) 'Under which terms EEC Commission adopted the Greek state program of Convergence of Greek economy to European Unification aims?', TO VIMA, 21.3.93.
- *Perrakis, C (1987) 'Foreign Capital's Activities in Greece and prospects in Greek Economy', Scientific Thought, Athens, March, vol 32.
- Pollert, A (1988) 'The Flexible Firm; Fixation or Fact, Work, Employment and Society, 2, 3.
- Pollert, A (1988) 'Dismantling Flexibility', Capital and Class, No 34.

- Rubery, Tarling, Wilkinson (1987) 'Flexibility Marketing and the Organisation of Production', Labour and Society, Jan. 1987, vol 9.
- *Rylmon, P (1988) 'Post-war Greek Economy: The Dynamics of Capital Accumulation and the Dynamics of Crisis', Economikos Tahydromos, Athens, vol 9.
- *Rylmon, P (1993) 'Industrial restructuring in Greece: Problems and critics on state measures', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, Feb 1993, vol. 24.
- *Rylmon, P (1992) 'The Economic and Monetary Unification in Europe from the perspective of the Greek workforce', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, December 1992, vol. 10.
- Sabel, C and Zeitlin, J (1985) 'Historical Alternatives to mass production: Politics, Markets and Technology in 19th century industrialisation', Past and Present, No108.
- Sayer, A (1986) 'New Development in Manufacturing: The just in time system', Capital and Class, Sept., vol 39.
- Sayer, A (1989) 'Fordism in Question', International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, vol. 13.
- Schoenberger, E (1988) 'From Fordism to Flexible accumulation: Technology, competitive strategies and international location', Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 1988, vol 6.
- Scott, A (1987) 'The semi-conductor industry in South-East Asia: Organisation, Location and the International Division of Labour', Regional Studies, v.21.
- Scott, A J (1987) 'Industrial Organisation and Location: Division of Labour, the Firm and Spatial Process', Economic Geography, vol 67.

- *Simitis, K (1990) 'Paths without imagination, without risk and therefore without prospects', Economikos Tahydromos, Athens, 19.7.90.
- *Simitis, K (1990) 'Five Suggestions for the Future', TO VIMA, 22.11.92.
- *Simitis, K (1992) 'Comments on the Maastricht Treaty', TO VIMA, 26.8.92.
- *Skifti, Z (1992) 'Changes in Employment Structure and new Labour Relations', Review of INE GSEE, Athens, Feb-March, 1992 vol. 12-13..
- Storper M and Christopherson (1987) 'Flexible Specialisation and Regional Industrial Agglomerations', Annal of the Association of American Geographers, vol 77, No 1.
- *Stratoulis, D (1988) 'New Labour Institutions and Collective Bargaining in Greece,' Scientific Thought, Athens, Sept, 1988 vol. 41.
- *Stratoulis, D (1988) 'The Restructuring of Labour Relations in Greece', Scientific Thought, Athens, June 1988 vol.38.
- *Theodoropoulos, S (1990) 'Comments on the Situation of Incomes in the Public and Private Sector of the Greek Economy', Economikos Tahydromos, Athens, 7.7.90.
- *Tokas, L (1990) 'Comments on IMF reports concerning capital expatriation from Greece and investments', RIZOSPASTIS, 1.7.90.
- Tomaney, J (1990) 'The reality of workplace flexibility', Capital and Class, No 40.
- *Tsekouras, Th (1984) on Coria, B: 'Crise et electronisation de la production critiques d'economie politique', Thesis No 26-27.
- *Tsoukatou, P (1993) 'The Social Security System in the Banking Sector in Greece', Review of INE, GSEE, Athens, January 1993, vol 23.

- *Vergopoulos, N (1983) 'The special role of the state in the Greek economy, Monthly Review, Athens, Sept 1983, vol. 66.
- *Vergopoulos, N (1990) 'The Dark Side of Modernisation: Review of the Last Decade', Thesis, Athens, April-June, 1992, vol. 39.
- *Vergopoulos, N (1992) 'The Burden of the Maastricht Treaty', TO VIMA, 15.11.92.
- Williams, K; Cutler, T; Williams, S J and Haslam, C (1987) 'The end of mass production?', Economy and Society, vol 16, No 3.
- * 'Presentation of the EKKE's study on multiple employment', ELEFTherOTIPIA, 18.5.92.
- * 'Presentation of the OECD survey on the relevance of skills to the production needs in the OECD countries', ELEFTherOTIPIA, 6.9.92.
- * 'Return to Poverty: Presentation of EKKE survey on Poverty', ELEFTherOTIPIA, 29.11.92.
- * 'Plan of Convergence of Greek Economy to Monetary and Economic Unification Goals', presented in EKOFIN Commission, EXPRESS, 21.3.93.
- * 'The abolishment of the 'obligatory settlement' in Collective Bargaining in banking sector', TO VIMA, 11.4.93.
- * 'Evolution of wages and salaries from 1982 until 1992. A comparative study between public and private sector', TO VIMA, 29.11.92.
- * 'The threat of unemployment in Europe: Comments on the Zean Zucques Delor's speech in the European Commission', TA NEA, 22.2.93.
- * 'In the galaxy of flexibility: Post-Fordist systems of industrial organization and the Flexible Specialisation', Theses, No 32.

- * 'The Greek Trade Union Movement in the perspective of the Unified Europe' after Maastricht' conference of INE-GSEE, 7-9 May 1992, Review of GSEE-INE, Athens, July 1992, vol. 16-17.

Reports - Surveys - Pumphlets

- 1) Atkinson, I. (1984), Flexibility, Uncertainty and Man-power Managment, Institute of Manpower Studies, Report No. 89, University of Sussex.
- 2) Atkinson, I. and Gregory, A (1986), New Forms of work organi-sation, Institute of Manpower Studies, Report No. 121, University of Sussex.
- * DIMEL (1990): The modern Greek Manual and White collar workers, oppinion poll, Athens, Dec. 1990.
- *E.S.Y.E. (1975) Survey on the labour cost in Manufacturing sector ,Athens.
- * E.E.C. (1985) Social Developments, Paris.
- *E.S.Y.E. (1989) Development in employment in manufacturing sector in the district of Attica (1981 - 1989), Athens.
- *E.S.Y.E. (1989) The economically active population of Greece, (1951 - 1981), Athens.
- *E.S.Y.E. (1991) Survey on part-time employment in Greece, Athens.
- *EUROSTAT REPORTS (1984) Development of a nnual labour cost in Greece, Athens.
- *Federation of Greek Industries (1989) Annual reports on Development in Greek Manufacturing, Athens, SEV.
- *Federation of Greek Industries (1970) Study on the labour force's payment, Athens, SEV.

*K.E.D.E.O. - E.E.E.E. (1988) Productivity and social control in the broader public sector, Athens, KEDEO-E.E.E.E., 14/15 September 1988.

*ICAP (1982), Greece in Figures, Athens, ICAP.

*ICAP (1984), " " Athens, ICAP.

*ICAP (1986), " " Athens, ICAP.

*ICAP (1988), " " Athens, ICAP.

*ICAP (1990), " " Athens, ICAP.

*ICAP (1992), " " Athens, ICAP.

*Institute International D'etudes BANCAIRES: (1988) Banking is changing, but what about men? Athens, May 1988, Commercial Bank of Greece.

*ILO, ELKEPA (1988) Correlation of Pay to Labour Productivity, Athens, ILO- ELKEPA 12-14, May 1988.

*IOVE (1985), The Greek Textile and Clothing Industry, Athens, IOVE.

*IOVE (1987), The competitiveness of Greek Industry (Part A: The Food and Beverages Industries, Part B: The Textile and the Clothing Industry, Part C: The Footwear Industry, Part D: The Cement Industry, Part E: Ceramic Products, Part F" The Pharmaceutical Industry), Athens, June 1987, IOVE

*IOVE (1992) Greek Manufacturing in 1992, Athens, IOVE.

Mc Donald, R (1991). Greece in the 1990's taking its place in Europe, The Economist Intelligence Unit, special report No. 2099, Athens.

OECD (1983) Labour Force statistics 1970-1981, Paris OECD

OECD (1983) Experimental studies of analysis of outputs, Paris, OECD.

*OECD (1984) Manpower policy and problems in Greece, Athens, OECD.

OECD (1984) Historical statistics, Paris, OECD.

OECD (1986) Employment Outlook, Paris, OECD.

*OECD(1986) Flexibility in the labour Market: The current debate, Athens, OECD.

OECD (1987) Industrial Investment in Greece, Paris OECD.

OECD (1990) Historical statistics, Dec. 1990 Paris, OECD.

OECD (1991) Employment Outlook, July 1991, Paris, OECD.

*Halkias, D(1985): The productivity of Greek Economy, report of Bank of Greece.

