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Abstract
This article aims to map the ways in which socio-cultural-historical approaches have been employed in Greece during the last three decades. It traces the history of the employment of a variety of socio-cultural-historical approaches to education and psychology in a range of practices, such as translations of original works, university teaching, academic research, educational policy for primary and secondary education, and in initiatives of engaged intellectuals active outside formal university structures. The authors highlight the differences in the employment of socio-cultural-historical approaches and psychological approaches in Greece and in other regions, such as Germany or the US. Taking Greece as an exemplary case, with its specific history of military dictatorship, constitutional change, the democratization of the university, and current neoliberal reforms, the authors outline a broader epistemological frame in order to explore and evaluate the various ways in which socio-cultural-historical approaches have traveled across historical, institutional, political, regional, and, increasingly, globalized contexts.
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Introduction: When Socio-Cultural-Historical Approaches Travel…

Socio-cultural-historical approaches to education and psychology¹ have become popular in different contexts and in different ways since the 1970s. A great variety of scholars, activists, teachers, and educational policy makers have drawn on socio-cultural-historical thinking in extremely diverse settings. To name only a few examples:

• In the 70s and 80s, Vygotsky’s work was employed in the broader context of cognitivism in the US – a version that quickly spread around the world (Stetsenko & Arievitch, in press);
• Socio-cultural-historical approaches inspired capitalism-critical psychological theorizing by university professors who were members of the Communist Party or engaged in other left-wing social movements in West Germany, Denmark, and the Netherlands after May 1968, as well as in Brazil in the post-dictatorship era (Bock, Gonçalves & Furtado, 2002, Markard, 2011);
• Vygotsky’s work has been employed since 15-20 years by grass-root school teachers’ organizations in Japan. They translated Vygotsky from Russian, and often accused Japanese university professors of importing a US-made version of Vygotsky²;  
• Vygotsky’s and Davydov’s writings have been used as a frame for all kinds of curriculum reforms by ministries of education: in the German Democratic Republic during the 60s, in Brazil in the last 15 years, and recently in Russia, Greece, Australia and elsewhere.³

¹ We use this term to refer to all possible versions of works influenced by L.S. Vygotsky, A.N. Leontiev, A.R. Luria, M.M. Bakhtin, and V. Voloshinov. These approaches have often been referred to as socio-cultural (Wertch, 1991), cultural-historical (Hedegaard, 2001), socio-historical (Bock et al., 2002), etc. They are not necessarily limited to psychology and education, but this is the focus we keep here.
² The authors would like to thank Yuji Moro from the Institute of Psychology, University of Tsukuba, Japan for this information.
³ The authors would like to thank Hartmut Giest (Germany), Martin Hildebrand-nilshon (Germany), Erineu Foerste (Brazil), Vitaly Rubtsov (Russia), and Marilyn Fleer (Australia) for this information.
The academic community does not seem to have adequately engaged with the epistemological issues that this “theory-traveling” implies. In the most extreme case two positions are juxtaposed: the “dogmatic” interpretation, which claims that one particular version is the right one as opposed to all others (let’s say that of Engeström, 1987 or Hedegaard, 2001), and an oversimplified “post-modern mosaic” interpretation, which runs the danger of implying that all possible theoretical combinations and interpretations are legitimate. However different these two positions might appear, they both overlook in similar ways the processes and contexts of theory translation, building, traveling, and usage.

Theory-traveling can be seen as a metaphor to describe all the processes involved in the translation, interpretation, usage, and re-usage of theoretical texts. These processes involve mediating devices, technologies, funds, and infrastructures, as well as personal motives and academic or other politics. Science and technology scholars have recently introduced the term “doing theory” in order to emphasize these practicalities and argue that different theories (or different versions of the same theory) enact different versions of the world, i.e. different ontologies (Mol, 2002). Such an approach sheds light on processes that dogmatic interpretations of socio-cultural-historical approaches conceal. A meta-theory of how to do theory then becomes necessary in order to shape and establish criteria of how to evaluate different versions of e.g. Vygotsky’s work. The Marxist point of view that theory is only meaningful to the extent in which it advances practice in the creation of a more equal society could be taken as a point of departure for the formulation of such a meta-theory (cf. Chaiklin, 2011).

By exemplarily studying the Greek context of the translation and interpretation of socio-cultural-historical approaches, this article aims to shed light on the processes of translation, implementation, and transformation of socio-cultural-historical approaches in general, and to discuss broader epistemological issues concerning traveling theories that should be taken into consideration in further socio-cultural-historical theorizing. This article traces the history of the employment of a variety of socio-cultural-historical approaches in a range of practices, such as the translations of original works, university teaching, academic research, educational policy for primary and secondary education, and initiatives by engaged intellectuals outside the university. We suggest that each of these sections deserve more attention and could become a separate area for further investigation – which can be seen as work for the
future. Despite their interwoven complexity, we attempt to denote possible interrelations between all the different spaces in which socio-cultural-historical approaches have been used.

It is important for us to make explicit that we consider ourselves a part of what we study – which means that we cannot claim an external or neutral point of view. We all come from Greece, but have studied in very different places (Dafermos in Soviet Union/Russia; Chronaki in the UK; Kontopoulos mainly in Germany). To some extent we have different theoretical and political trajectories, too – so writing this article was itself a process of bringing together each other’s distinct theoretical and methodological tools, ideas, and points of view.

**Arrival Station: Modern Greece**

The Greek national state was first established in the 19th century. Modern Greece, in the words of Stathis Gourgouris (1996), as an imaginary territory, exceeds however narratives about its history, geography, and culture. Greece is located in Southern Europe and has been an important crossroads for different cultures. According to Liakos (2007), Greece cannot also be regarded in isolation from transnational contexts and cultural exchanges that transcend its territorial and intellectual space. During the Post-World-War II period, Greece was gradually encouraged to transform from an agricultural to an urban society (Epitropoulos & Roudomet, 1998), while at the same time many migrant Greek workers moved to Western Europe and the rest of the world. Athens collected half of the whole country’s population.

From 1967 to 1974 Greece experienced a military dictatorship, which was followed by social movements that slowly transformed the dominant political scene from right-wing to social-democratic. Several scholars argue that a Southern welfare model has dominated in Greece, characterized by a strong commitment to preserve traditional familyhood and maximize dependence on the family (Esping-Andersen’s, 1990; Kalogeraki, 2009). At the same time, Greece as a semi-periphery state depends on the major EU and global capitalist centers (Mouzelis, 1986). In this context, over the last 30 years a so-called modernization has taken place in Greece in the context of European Integration. The official policies of this modernization can be characterized as neoliberal and technocratic (the best example of which are the current “measures” against the debt crisis). Liakos (2011), in a recent interview given to the German
*Lettre International*, explains how Greece can no longer be seen as having a unified national identity firmly rooted in its ancient past and external to what might be considered modern Europe. Instead, Greek (and European) identities are fragmented, fluid, and become inscribed simultaneously on dominant myths and stereotypes as well as on emerging and alternative perspectives, due to the increasing complexities of everyday life (i.e. the economic crisis, environmental uncertainty, immigration).

**First Steps… with a Little Bit of a Delay**

The Greek university as an institution played an important role against the military dictatorship of the 70s. For this reason it has, until recently, been considered to be the institution that safeguards democracy and ensures the free development and circulation of ideas – at least on a symbolic level. In this context, private universities have until recently not been recognized by the Greek constitution. Moreover, each university has been responsible for the standards and the quality of its academic programs, although in practice Greek universities “do not have significant administrative and financial independence” (Mattew & Saiti, 2005, p. 5).

Following the constitutional change in the 70s, a reform of higher education took place in 1982 in Greece. The institution of the *academic chair* that represented the kudos of professorship was abolished and replaced by the *department* that represented a specific scientific discipline and played the part of the basic organizational unit of the universities. During the following years, university departments were established, for various political reasons in locations away from the big urban centers. As a consequence, the Greek university system slowly opened, and university departments started employing scientists from various theoretical and research trends and traditions, who had been educated in countries as diverse as the US, Canada, the UK, France, Germany, Sweden, Russia/Soviet Union, Poland, etc.

However, it took until the late 1980s for socio-cultural-historical approaches to be introduced in Greece. During the years of the Cold War (approx. 1945-1991), a lot of prejudice against the Soviet Union and socio-cultural-historical approaches to science appeared in Greece. Socio-cultural-historical research was treated with skepticism and even a conservative bias against all trends and approaches that came from the USSR. The introduction of socio-cultural-historical approaches in Greece was only slowly achieved by Greek scholars trained in countries such as the UK,
Germany, Poland, Russia, etc. – all of course countries with varied cultural and scientific traditions. Returning to Greece, these scholars attempted to develop and apply socio-cultural-historical approaches in the specific contexts of Greek academic research, as well as in the contexts of quite diverse disciplines (psychology, pedagogy/educational science, anthropology, philosophy, art history, linguistics, etc.).

University-based pedagogical departments, i.e. Departments of Primary and Early Childhood Education, were amongst the first in the early 90s to adopt socio-cultural-historical theory as a way to scientifically study issues of pedagogy and learning. These departments were established as a political strategy for upgrading the 2-year Pedagogic Academies (i.e. training colleges for primary and early childhood educators), and socio-cultural-historical theory served the need of the academics employed there to create a “new” identity for their respective departments.

Christos Frangos was among the first in the Department of Early Childhood Education at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki to introduce Vygotskian theory and research. In the same time, Yiannis Papamichael at the Department of Education of the University of Patras explored relationships between learning and teaching within the frameworks of neo-Piagetian and Vygotskian approaches, also editing a reader based on a collection of translated papers (Papamichael, 1984). Frangos (1992) tried to develop a European teaching model based on the ideas and methods of Socrates, Vygotsky, and Piaget. He also became quite active in ECERA (European Early Childhood Research Association). At the same time, as we will see below, engaged intellectuals outside the university published the first translations of socio-cultural-historical approaches to psychological works.

Still, the first course devoted solely to the study of cultural-historical psychology took place in 2002 in the Department of Psychology at the University of Crete. Manolis Dafermos’s book *The Cultural-Historical Theory of Vygotsky* [in Greek] was the basis of this course. Students claimed that cultural-historical psychology was a completely different psychology than the dominant paradigm of psychology they had been taught until then. Soon after, *The Development of Children* by Cole, Cole & Lightfoot (2005) was translated and used as a textbook in many departments of psychology and education in Greece, including a graduate course at the Hellenic Open University where tutors with both a psychological and sociological orientation work together.
The Translation and Publication of Major Works in Greek and Related Problems

The translation of major socio-cultural-historical works began in the early 90s. Vygotsky or Leontiev were not the only authors translated, with many others also receiving attention: Bakhtin (2000), Voloshinov (1998, 2009), Luria (1995, 2002), Elkonin, etc. (for a detailed list and timeline of all translations, see Appendix). A few translations (e.g. by Vagenas, 2003) were directly from Russian, while others edited by academics were translated from German or English (for details, see Appendix).

Although this work has been significant, at the same time it should be noted that often translations do not reflect the meaning of the original text. Approaching meaning in any text is a challenge, and to some an unending task. However, it also requires a broader theoretical and philosophical knowledge of the history of concepts employed. More importantly, a deep knowledge of culture(s), both the one that produces and the one that receives the text (Spivak, 2000), is required. This has not always been the case concerning the translations of socio-historical-cultural works, into Greek or other languages (cf. van der Veer & Yasnitsky, 2011).

For example: the title of Vygotsky’s book Myshlenie i Rech was translated to Greek as Σκέψη και Γλώσσα, i.e. “Thought and Language” instead of “Thinking and Speech” (Vygotsky, 1993). Vygotsky used the term rech (“speech”) and not the word iazyk (“language”). It is worth noting that Vygotsky had studied the book by the Russian linguist A. Potebnya Misl i iazyk (“Thought and Language”) and clearly distinguished the concepts of language and speech (Gillen, 2000; Dafermos, 2002). Also, the term myshlenie is better translated as noesis (“thinking”) than as skepsis (“thought”). Such a translation conceals how a thought is merely a component and product of thinking as a process (Dafermos, 2002).

There are also some serious problems with the Greek translation of Leontiev’s book Activity, Consciousness, Personality. The translation of Leontiev’s book was done without using the specific terminology of the original text. In many cases, scientific terms were misunderstood. The phrase “changing man’s consciousness” (izmenenie soznanija scheloveka) (Leontiev, 2004, p.28) has been translated in Greek as τροποποίηση της συνείδησης (“modification of consciousness”), (Leontiev, w.d., p.45). “Changing man’s consciousness” is not the same as “modification of consciousness.” “Modification of consciousness” refers to changes caused by external
forces, while “changing man’s consciousness” is connected to deep transformations and the transition from one mode of organizing consciousness to another, which takes place both intrinsically and extrinsically.

There is a significant misunderstanding of the differences between Vygotsky’s and Leontiev’s research programs. We will give here just one example. According to Vagenas,

A.N. Leontiev (1903 – 1979) distinguished in Vygotsky’s theory a fundamental idea, the idea of activity, and he attempted to develop and concretize it. From this perspective, activity theory is a continuation of the cultural historical school, which was founded by Vygotsky (Vagenas, 2003, 18, translation from Greek by M. Dafermos).

However, Vygotsky rarely used the term “activity” in his works and gave it a different meaning than Leontiev. As Veresov pointed out, in Vygotsky’s texts between 1924 and 1927 the term deyatelnost was used not in the sense of Tätigkeit, i.e. as “the practical, socially organised, object-related, goal-directed activity of an individual… but in that of Aktivität, in line with typical and traditional usage in the physiology and psychology of the time.” “Vygotsky used this term in the same sense as Ivan Pavlov (“higher neural activity” – vysshaya nervnaya deyatelnost).” (Veresov, 2005, pp. 40-41)

It becomes clear that although the translation and employment of socio-cultural-historical approaches began around 1990 in Greece, i.e. much later than in Germany, the US, the UK, etc., the Greek translations have been very problematic. In many cases (worldwide), the translation is based on already translated texts in English, German, or French, not taking the original text(s) in Russian into serious consideration. However, currently, access to all possible resources (as well as the problematization of translation itself) has become much easier, and historiographical and etymological/philological knowledge is increasingly available.

**Contexts, Trends, and Directions in Socio-Cultural-Historical Approaches in Greece**
Moving beyond the level of translation of original texts, one can identify at least four distinctive trends of how socio-cultural-historical approaches to psychological theory have since been employed in the Greek context:

1) within formal university practices, one trend aims explicitly to promote cognitivist science and make it available to a wider educational audience, both in research and pedagogy. Although the works in this trend do not relate explicitly to any discussion of the political implications of socio-cultural-historical approaches, they have been directed to policy-making and, specifically, agendas of curriculum reforms.

2) within the formal university structures, another trend aims explicitly to develop theory in critical ways (here referring to epistemology, social critique, political critique, etc.). Although the works in this trend have been critical, theorization has not been practiced dogmatically and takes a very broad interdisciplinary and cross-theoretical spectrum of perspectives into account.

3) outside the formal university context, a third trend formulates very explicit, but sometimes narrow, political and ideological aspirations. Often, the aim has not been to develop theory for changing practice, but to use theory for promoting, at a symbolic level, political ideology.

4) outside formal university structures, the last trend is still directed towards the context of state educational policy-making in curriculum reform, teacher training, or textbook authoring. Very often, theory becomes utilized in fragmented and opportunistic ways so as to safeguard the promotion of certain practices.

The first trend is represented in the works of Stella Vosniadou, initially with the Department of Primary Education at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and currently at the Department of Methodology, History, and Theory of Science at the Kapodistrian University of Athens; and in the work of Anastasia Kostaridou-Efkleidi, currently at the School of Psychology at the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Stella Vosniadou and Anastasia Kostaridou-Efklidi have played an important role in framing discourses on cognitive (and socio-cognitive) development, school learning, and educational psychology through their internationally acknowledged research work. It is important to mention that both scholar, back in the early and middle 90s, placed attention on sociocultural work and become active towards editing the
translation of major works such as *Mind in Society* (1997) and *Cognitive Development: Its Cultural and Social Foundations* (1995). Vosniadou (2004) has also edited a collection of essays in the foundation of cognitive science and was a founding member of the newly convened journal, *Noesis* (see noesis). As series editor of “Psychology” with Gutenberg publishing house, she has promoted the publishing of books on socio-cognitive aspects of learning (e.g. dialogical perspectives on learning, Karagiannopoulou, 2007, or on the zone of proximal development in Vygotsky’s theory, Papadopoulou, 2009, etc). Kostaridou-Efkleidi is the chief editor of *Psychology*, the journal of Greek Psychological Society, where she acts as honorary president.

Second, in a broader, interdisciplinary, critical, and cross-theoretical spectrum, Marios Pourkos at the University of Crete (initially in the Department of Psychology and since 2000 at the Department of Early Childhood Education) and, later on, Manolis Dafermos (Department of Psychology, University of Crete) and a series of other university-based scholars have focused on the advancement of theoretical aspects of Vygotskian and Bakhtinian studies with an emphasis towards discussing epistemological and philosophical issues, as well as a focus on qualitative research methodology. Pourkos edited a series of volumes that present original research by Greek and international scholars who have been inspired by socio-cultural-historical approaches. These volumes resulted from an equivalent number of conferences that took place in a particular dialogical atmosphere at the University of Crete, and a few of them also include Greek versions of previously untranslated Vygotsky works (Pourkos, 2006, 2007, 2008a, 2008b).

Third, major socio-cultural-historical works were translated by engaged political groups and public intellectuals outside the university interested in utilizing theory for ideological reasons. Michalis Kouvelas, member of the Greek Communist Party, and Elissaios Vagenas are amongst the main intellectuals who edited and published translations of classic works and collections of various classic texts (Kouvelas, 2007, 2009, Vagenas, 2003). We consider this trend as distinct from the two mentioned above, because it does not primarily concern a research program aimed at generating new texts and knowledge, but aims to enable access to the socio-cultural-historical approaches to psychological and educational thinking for purposes of political critique, political activism, and intervention.
As a fourth trend, in recent years, attempts have taken place to integrate Vygotsky’s theory into the Greek national educational policy. For example, the former president of the Greek Pedagogical Institute, which determines curriculum content, argued that

The art of teaching and of learning – an adaptive constant reflection on the following parameters: the learning environment, learning methods, and pedagogical principles – can be applied for example on verbal or audiovisual learning in accordance with the conclusions theory of the *programmed learning* of behaviorist approaches (Skinner), active and constructive learning, and the sociocultural context (Piaget, Vygotsky, Bruner) (Allahiotis, 2007, pp. 108-109, translation from Greek by M. Dafermos).

The point here is that distinct learning theories can be unproblematically combined to organize the educational process. To mention another example: in Greece, in order to be employed as a secondary education teacher, a candidate must pass a state examination. In the context described above, teachers must answer to questions about Vygotsky’s theory as in the following example:

According to Vygotsky, the ZPD:

a) Is mainly associated with the assessment of teaching for the future academic performance of students.

b) Is a central concept for understanding the links between development and learning.

c) Refers to estimating the abilities of the student when the student is under the guidance of the teacher at school.

d) Is associated with theories of multiple intelligence and strengthens the student’s psychomotor skills


A limited, formal interpretation of socio-cultural-historical approaches dominates in the official pedagogical discourse, and the ZPD is presented only as a psychological unity and not as a socio-historical unit of study (cf. Newman & Holzman, 1993). Vygotsky’s theory becomes a particular didactic model and a recipe for teaching and

---

4 We note here that in his work “The Historical Meaning of the Crisis of Psychology” (1997), Vygotsky criticized such eclecticism, the easy borrowing from a variety of theories with contradictory epistemological and philosophical backgrounds, and their mechanical combination.
the ZPD is presented as a fixed, stable cognitive scheme that can be associated with other schemes from other pedagogical and psychological theories.

These four trends of employing socio-cultural-historical approaches in Greece are clearly distinct from each other, involving different motives for using theory, epistemological beliefs, and political and ideological values. On a macro-level these four trends can be respectively linked to four processes, namely:

a) The first trend can be linked to the globalization of university research in Greece. For example, Greek universities have in the late 90s increasingly reproduced the dominant North Atlantic scientific paradigm of research assessment exercise.

b) The second trend can be linked to the opening of the Greek university to new ideas and paradigms in the post-dictatorship era, as briefly referred to above.

c) The third trend can be related to the opening of Greek society to new ideas and paradigms in the post-dictatorship era, as briefly referred to above.

d) The fourth trend can be related to the Europeanization of educational policy concerning all educational levels in the 2000s. Following EU guidelines, the Greek Ministry of Education and Research uses a jargon of Vygotskian key-terms in order to institutionalize a pedagogic discourse for curriculum reform and teachers in-service education.

Instead of an Epilogue: Towards a Broader Epistemological Frame

According to Daniels, Cole, and Wertsch, studying Vygotsky in context means that we should define two different historical eras and multiple social milieus – the context of the Soviet Union in the first half of the 20th century and different parts of the world of the 21st century (Daniels, Cole & Wertsch, 2007). As outlined above, not only are more than two spaces and temporalities involved (cf. Bhabha, 1994): one needs to closely document, analyze, and meta-theorize a series of processes that make a theory “travel.”

Although the above analysis is brief, it becomes clear that it is important to differentiate between two quite independent activity domains involved in theory-traveling: a) the translation of original texts and historiographical work, and b) the employment of concepts and use of theory in research practices, academic networks,
educational interventions, national policy making, and other settings. Translation and historiography in a certain sense can *cumulatively* – i.e. almost *objectively* – always become richer, more detailed, and “better.” However, when referring to the uses of theory, complex meta-theoretical tools are needed in order to explore, distinguish, and eventually evaluate them. Better, richer, and more detailed translation and historiographical work is a presupposition of, but itself does not lead to “proper” theory uses in any linear way. The context of use is not only textual/semiotic, it might also involve micro-political strategies for academic or other recognition, material needs and resources, ideological values, etc.

On both levels, that of translation/historiography and that of theory development and implementation, the work is collective and distributed: even if in the end one editor or author is praised or criticized for his/her translation or interpretation, and however “situated” in a particular context this translation/interpretation might be, there is always a whole community of scholars, spread over times, languages, and places that has worked for this particular version of translation or interpretation to be possible. This dimension is important and complicates even more the investigation and assessment of processes of translation, implementation, and transformation of theories.

Socio-cultural-historical approaches do not form a random theoretical sample, but have initially been explicitly developed for political purposes. These political aspirations have been varied and heterogeneous since the very beginning, and are further subjected to traveling, translation, and re-contextualization, as is the theory itself. It is thus impossible to adhere to the initial political aspirations as such. At the same time one needs to reflect on and explicitly account for one’s political aspirations when using the theory in one way or another. Even if one uses this highly politicized theoretical corpus in “neutral”/“non-political” ways, this is still a political act.

Comparing different versions/uses of socio-cultural-historical approaches can only happen by establishing a point of reference that is external to all of these version/uses. Following the argumentation presented above, this reference point cannot be the “original” text or the “original” context because of the two-level distinction we introduced above, between a) the translation/historiography work and b) the uses/implementations of theory. Instead of referring to the past and trying or pretending to achieve “fidelity” to it, one can take the future as a reference point – which is in line with the emphasis on practice by socio-cultural-historical approaches.
Thus, when comparing the cognitive approach of Vosniadou or Euklidis with the interdisciplinary approach of Pourkos, the following set of questions emerges: What do these approaches define or construct as a problem? What is seen as a problem through the lenses of the one and the other approach? To which extent does what is seen as a problem in theory correspond to what the problem is in practice? Are the theory and the practice mutually transforming and developing each other? How? What are the future implications of this mutual transformation and development, and do we agree with them?

Answering these questions is not based on scientific, but on political, aesthetical, ideological, or other criteria. This includes uncertainty, which renders the whole undertaking very difficult. Thus, we have no easy and general solutions to suggest here; we can only claim that transparency and dialogue concerning these political, aesthetical, and ideological criteria are required in all interpretation work and further theory-building. New challenges are currently emerging in Greece and all over the world, to name a few: the environmental crisis, the economical crisis and break-down of health and social security systems, the privatization of education vs. new forms of learning and schooling based on digital technologies and environments, the centralization vs. decentralization of political organization, or immigration (both from Greece and to Greece). The open question for the future is how the existing theoretical discussions, endeavors, and works inspired by socio-cultural-historical approaches will flourish and deepen in order to address these challenges.

Note
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Appendix: Timeline of the Translation and Publication of Major Socio-Cultural-Historical Works in Greek

Without date: A.N. Leontiev’s Activity, Consciousness, Personality was translated and published in Greek (by Xenopoulos).
1990: K. Levitin’s book One is not Born a Personality was translated and published in Greek.

In this book, profiles and works of major socio-cultural-historical approaches and
educational psychologists are presented (Vygotsky, Leontiev, Luria, Meshcheryakov, Davydov) (Transl. English to Greek by L. Karsera).

1993: *Thought and Language* was translated and published in Greek (Transl. German to Greek by A. Rodi, Ed. P. Kondylis).

1995: Luria’s *Cognitive Development* was translated from English by M. Terzidou (Ed. Kostadidou-Eukleidi) and published in Greek. According to A. Kostadidou-Eukleidi (1995), evidence that Piaget’s theory of cognitive development is inadequate has been accumulated and Vygotsky’s theory has provided a new theoretical framework to explain cognitive development in terms of a cultural-historical approach.

1997: Vygotsky’s *Mind in Society* was translated and published in Greek (Transl. English to Greek by A. Bibou (Ed. S. Vosniadou).

1998: Voloshinov’s *Marxism and Philosophy of Language* was translated and published in Greek by V. Alexiou.

2000: Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* was translated and published in Greek (Transl. from English A. Ioannidou).

2002: Luria’s *The Man with a Shattered World* was translated and published in Greek (Transl. English to Greek by N. Aggelopoulos).

2002: Dafermos’s *Cultural-Historical Theory of Vygotsky: Philosophical, Psychological and Pedagogical Aspects* [in Greek]. This is the first systematic investigation of Vygotsky’s theoretical legacy in Greece.

2003: An anthology of translated socio-cultural-historical approaches writings on psychology with the title *Socio-Cultural-Historical Approaches and Child Development* [in Greek] is published (by E. Vagenas, Ed., Transl. Russian to Greek by E. Vagenas).

2007: M. Kouvelas’s book *Dialectical Psychology. In the Footsteps of Vygotsky* [in Greek] was published. The author of this book argues that Vygotsky is the founder of dialectical psychology as an open-ended system of psychological knowledge that reflects the reality. The application of dialectical materialism in psychological research is the foundation of general psychology.

2009: Voloshinov’s *The Word in Life and the Word in Poetry* was translated from Russian and published in Greek by V. Alexiou & M. Dafermos.

2009: *The book General Psychology. Dialectical-Materialistic Approach* [in Greek] is published (by M. Kouvelas, Ed., Transl. Russian to Greek). This is a handbook of translated works by different socio-cultural-historical psychologists on crucial psychological issues (the development of mind, activity theory, personality, cognitive functions, etc.).
2009: K. Papadopoulou’s book *The Zone of Proximal Development in Theory of Vygotsky* [in Greek] was published. Papadopoulou argues that the zone of proximal development is connected with the development of psychological functions and not the acquirement of knowledge or learning skills.

In press is a special issue of the Greek journal *Utopia* on socio-cultural-historical approaches. This issue includes contributions by several Greek researchers on cultural-historical psychology and activity theory.
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