

IVANA MARKOVÁ

Ivana Marková

10 February 1938 – 1 December 2024

elected Fellow of the British Academy 1999

by

SANDRA JOVCHELOVITCH

TONY MANSTEAD

Fellow of the Academy

ANN PHOENIX

Fellow of the Academy

Summary. Ivana Marková was an unconventional psychologist and an uncompromising interdisciplinary scholar whose body of work reflected deeply humanist concerns grounded in her biography and her experience of the impact of historical and societal events on individual lives. Her work was both theoretical and applied, but it was the theoretical contribution for which she was particularly known in psychology and beyond. Her writings freely combined philosophy, history, and linguistics with social, developmental and cultural psychology, with the result that her contribution was a highly distinctive one. She never detached her thinking from a more general reflection on the epistemology of psychology, and throughout her long career she never lost the imprint of her training in the Czech philosophical and linguistic tradition.

Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy, 22, 505–518

<https://doi.org/10.5871/mem/022.505>

Posted 27 August 2025. © British Academy 2025.



Gina Markers'

Introduction

Ivana was born on 10 February 1938 in Tábor, a town south of Prague, in what was then Czechoslovakia, and grew up under communist rule and the political turmoil that culminated with the crushing of the Prague Spring in 1968. The experience of her and her family after the communists seized power irrevocably shaped the course of her life. Her family moved to Plzeň in 1946, where she spent her childhood and did her schooling. As a schoolgirl she loved music and opera and would regularly attend the Plzeň Opera House to watch productions from the cheapest standing places at the top of the theatre. Love of opera stayed with her all her life and going to Prague with her daughter to enjoy the season every year was one of her greatest delights.

After she finished school, she was accepted to study medicine at Charles University, Prague. However, before completing her first year, she was thrown out of the university. Her father had been writing letters expressing mildly critical comments about the government, as a result of which he was interrogated and sentenced to prison for 5 years. Other family members suffered similar consequences. Ivana was forced by the communist government to work in industry and got a job as a quality control technician in a chemical technical plant – the Litvínov refinery – for four years (1957–1961). Determined to study during the day, she worked night shifts and subsequently managed, through contacts, to enrol as an external, long-distance, student at Charles University. There she obtained her BA in Philosophy & Psychology in 1962, and went on to get her PhD in psychology from Charles University and the Czechoslovakian Academy of Sciences, again as an external student, in 1964. All of this was achieved whilst working full-time as a housemother in a children's home (1962–1964). Between 1964 and 1967, Ivana worked as a research fellow in psychology at the Czechoslovakian Academy of Sciences, Prague.

Ivana arrived in the UK in 1967 as a postdoctoral visitor to the University of Cambridge, Wolfson College, where she worked in the Psychology Laboratory. During this period, she worked various cleaning and care jobs in order to be able to afford life in Cambridge, including working as a cleaner for Nobel prize winner Paul Dirac. This was a difficult time but also a time of discovery that she considered illuminated aspects of self-other relations, inflected by social class, that she had not previously encountered. There was little money, and Ivana was still learning the language and the culture of the UK, but she also found out that much of what she knew about the UK and other countries needed revision. For example, she was surprised by the fact that education was open and free and that people were able to comment freely and even critically on the government and the Royal Family. Ivana soon met other Czech expats living in Cambridge, including Rudolf Hanka, statistician at the University, and BBC broadcaster Karel Brušák, who became a friend and helped her in her early days in Cambridge. Her daughter remembers

how listening to his radio broadcasts to Czechoslovakia was a regular evening routine for Ivana, and later for the whole family.

Ivana had planned to stay in the UK for no more than two years, but the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 changed her plans. She decided to apply for political asylum and relocate her family to England. She was able to bring her mother and her two young children (her father had since died) and was given a work permit. As the sole worker in the family, she initially took a position as Research Fellow at the University of London, working in their Industrial Training Research Unit in Cambridge. In 1970 she joined the Department of Psychology at the University of Stirling as a Lecturer in Social Psychology, where she was later appointed Professor. She retired from her position at Stirling and became emeritus professor in 2003. She retained a long-standing association with Wolfson College at the University of Cambridge. In 2007 Ivana took up the post of Visiting Professor in the Department of Psychological and Behavioural Science at the London School of Economics and in 2011 she became a Research Associate in the Centre for Philosophy of Natural and Social Sciences also at the LSE. She retained her strong connection to the LSE until the end of her life.

Ivana was elected Fellow of the British Academy in 1999 and was also a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh and of the British Psychological Society. Ivana served on the British Academy's Publications Committee (2000–2005) and as a member of Council (2003–2006). She also served on several other national and international committees: she was a member of the Chief Scientist's Health Services Research Committee, Scottish Home and Health Department, Chair of the Social Psychology Section of the British Psychological Society, President of Section J (Psychology) of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and a member of the Scientific Committee of the *Accademia Istropolitana*, a Centre of Advanced Studies in Central Europe, based in Slovakia.

Ivana developed dialogicality as both an epistemological and applied approach to psychology, and emphasised the importance of studying dialogue and language as inter-subjective and contextually grounded empirical processes, without which we cannot understand the human mind and psychological phenomena, be it individual or social (Marková 2003a; 2003b). By 'dialogicality', Ivana meant 'the capacity of the human mind to conceive, create, and communicate about realities in terms of the "Alter"' (Marková 2003a: 85). In other words, Ivana argued for the primacy of the Self-Other dyad in the making of the human mind. Rather than studying how people influence their environments, or how environments influence people, a dialogical approach treats the person and the (social) environment as inextricably intertwined. Meanings are not to be found in words, but rather in how they are used in specific social situations. When people converse, one person's discourse is always addressed to someone else, and therefore reflects the anticipation of how this other person is likely to respond. At the same time,

Ivana turned her attention to societal thinking and the theory of social representations, which she saw as expression of the dialogical mind and its ethical underpinnings. She saw social representations as a unique social psychological theory based on a dialogical epistemology that focused on natural thinking and common sense as a way into studying mind and cognition as human situated phenomena (Marková 2000b; 2008b).

Ivana's theoretical inclinations enriched her engagement with empirical research and made the kind of theoretical psychology she proposed an engaged and applied science. For those of us who knew how deeply her theoretical outlook was integrated in her research, she was the epitome of Kurt Lewin's maxim that 'there is nothing as practical as good theory'. Her reflections on epistemology and methodology combined both her erudition in psychology and philosophy as well as her engagement with empirical research over the years. Studies of AIDS and haemophilia (Marková & Wilkie 1987), health, illness and disability (Marková & Farr 1995), representations of democracy and democratic transitions in Eastern Europe (Marková 1997; Marková *et al.* 1998; Marková & Plichtová 2007), trust and its multiple dimensions in democratic and totalitarian contexts (Marková 2013; Marková & Gillespie 2012; Marková & Gillespie 2008; Marková 2004), and more recently bureaucracies and excessive consumption (Marková 2016) reflected her ability to capture the pressing societal issues of the day. She drew on her own investigative practice and the careful reading of empirical research to reflect on why good theory is needed for producing good research. She engaged with both qualitative and quantitative methodologies and wrote illuminating analyses of the experiment (Marková 1982), the focus group (Marková *et al.* 2007), and the case study (Marková *et al.* 2020; Marková & Novaes 2020), arguing passionately for the importance of 'abduction' for real discovery in psychology (Marková 2012b). Central to her epistemological and methodological stance was the imperative of a dialogue between theory, context and research questions. This, as we discuss below, was integral to her dialogical conception of mind and of psychology itself as a historical and cultural science.

Here we reflect on her contribution by considering the development of her work and the different, albeit related strands that characterise her contribution.

Shaking the foundations of psychology

Soon after taking up her position in Stirling, Ivana started working on the problem of language and the paradigms underpinning psychological research on thinking and cognition. In the early 1970s she spent a sabbatical leave with Ragnar Rommetveit in the Department of Psychology at the University of Oslo, where she was greatly impressed by his seminars on language and communication. On her return to the UK, she organised a conference and edited a volume on language and social context, which to this day

remains an important source in understanding how Chomsky's views of language guided debates between social, cognitive and developmental psychologists. In her introduction to this volume, Ivana shows that Chomsky's conception of a universal grammar as rooted in innate human intellectual capabilities ignores the developmental conditions under which human language is acquired and used (Marková 1978). His theory cannot reveal the rules of reasoning or cognitive functioning because it ignores how real people, in context and in relation to each other, come to speak and understand a language. Drawing on ancient Greek thinking and Aristotle in particular, Ivana shows that the individualistic programme of Chomskian linguistics and cognitive psychology pulls thinking out of the world and treats its logic as an a priori abstraction. The consequences of this programme are serious because, as well as detaching thinking from its concrete and real conditions of realisation, it introduces a 'deficit' approach to human thinking: people think in the 'wrong' way, they have 'biases' and are ultimately 'irrational'. As Ivana puts it:

the laws of thought lose the physical, biological and social significance that were given by the Greeks. And the result is that while adults and children are completely capable of utilising the laws of thought as a commonsense guide in their lives, they fail to utilise them in logical and psychological tasks, make errors and, apparently, behave illogically (1978: 6).

In her subsequent writings in this early period Ivana offers a fully-fledged examination of these ideas, juxtaposing the influence of Cartesian and Hegelian philosophy in shaping modern psychology, and outlining a history of human awareness and its social development (Marková 1982; 1987). While *Paradigms, Thought and Language* (1982) is primarily a book on the philosophy of psychology, it is also a painstaking exploration of the practical consequences of philosophical orientations in science insofar as it provides a detailed contrast between different types of research conducted under each paradigm. Ivana shows that Cartesian philosophy both in its rationalist and empiricist strands shaped psychology as the science of individual behaviour, limiting its theories of knowledge and the questions it asks. The Cartesian perspective treats mind as individualist, static and passive. It is implicit, and often unrecognised, in forms of psychology that make the individual the dominant unit of analysis. Instead, Ivana argues that a Hegelian philosophy is a better foundation for the study of psychological phenomena because it conceives of mind as inherently social and active. Ivana's book was to become a central critique and resource for understanding how contrasting programmes of research and thinking developed in psychological science. Despite the density of its scholarship, it enabled generations of students to understand the historical and philosophical grounding of psychology, opening them up to the possibility of an expanded psychology that could go beyond the individual cogito and embrace a Hegelian approach.

Human Awareness: Its Social Development (1987) follows-up on these ideas by

examining the development of human consciousness in the child. The book integrates biological foundations with interpersonal and complex social interactions to offer a powerful demonstration of how the social mind emerges. Human biological capacities are a necessary but not sufficient condition for the human mind: its full development requires intersubjective interaction and socio-cultural processes. This integration is an expression of the Hegelian approach she advocated in her previous work, and as before Ivana supports the theoretical argument by drawing on extensive research. She carefully shows how awareness and recognition of others emerge early in human infants as a biological predisposition that is then acted upon in the social and cultural stage of Self-Other interactions, gradually building empathy and communicative awareness, which characterise the full reciprocities of the dialogical mind. Here, Ivana was anticipating her subsequent work on dialogue as an empirical phenomenon and dialogicality as the basis of mind and language.

While writing these books Ivana was also conducting important research on the social and psychological problems of people with haemophilia, learning difficulties and cerebral palsy, focusing on language and communication and on interdependence between selves and others. Her extensive research on haemophilia rendered visible the social and psychological consequences of this genetic disorder, investigated in studies of knowledge and representations of people with haemophilia, their families, and society, of parental practices, the integration of haemophilic boys in schools, their self-perception, the dilemmas of disclosing the condition, of genetic counselling, the associated risk of HIV/AIDS, and the very real consequences these issues had for employment (Marková, Lockyer & Forbes 1977; Marková & Forbes 1979a; 1979b; Marková, MacDonald & Forbes 1980a; 1980b; Marková & Wilkie 1987).

Through this research and early papers on haemophilia and HIV/AIDS, Ivana was a pioneer in demonstrating the practical import of social theories of knowledge and considering both expert and lay knowledge in policy-making and public debates. Her work on these conditions identified the practices, attitudes and representations of Self and Other: of those who directly experience a condition and the way publics think about them, and how these different systems of thinking shape societal dynamics and individual experience (Marková *et al.* 1990; Marková 1991).

An approach to mind and psychology: dialogicality and social representations

Much of the work Ivana developed in subsequent decades focused on dialogicality as both an epistemological approach to psychology and as a phenomenon that could and should be studied empirically. She was convinced that communication between self and other was the

key unit of analysis to understand mind and importantly, to solve the practical problems that emerged when difference in perspectives could not be bridged, and dialogue failed. In the 1990s this work evolved through a collaboration initiated when Carl Graumann invited several social scientists (psychologists, sociologists and linguists) to give papers on 'The Social Construction of Meaning' in a seminar held at the Wener Reimers Foundation in Bad Homburg, Germany. Other participants included Rob Farr, Per Linell, Thomas Luckmann, Klaus Foppa, Ragnar Rommetveit, and Jorg Bergmann. Together they went on to produce a trilogy of books on dialogue, whose central tenet was that we can only advance knowledge of language and communication by studying speech in concrete historical and social context. While the first volume on *The Dynamics of Dialogue* (Marková & Foppa 1990) provided the basis of a conceptual framework for the study of dialogue as embedded in its socio-historical contexts, the subsequent books focused on empirical aspects of dialogue as it manifests in verbal and non-verbal interaction (Marková & Foppa 1991; Marková, Graumann & Foppa 1995). By digging deep into the roots of dialogical approaches, this group developed a conversation that integrated disciplines and theoretical traditions and enabled their collaboration to continue for many years. Most of the participants remained research collaborators and friends throughout their lives, and the model initiated by Graumann continued to inspire Ivana, who herself was to organise many seminars of the same kind, addressing a variety of topics and bringing together scholars belonging to different disciplines and generations.

The work on dialogicality evolved in parallel with Ivana's increasing concern with the profound transformations taking place in Europe generally and in her own home country specifically. Towards the end of the 1990s her empirical research focused on social representations of democracy, trust and responsibility in post-Communist Europe, involving comparative research carried out in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, France and the UK (Marková *et al.* 1998). The role of trust in the transition from communist to democratic societies was the topic of one of the first British Academy International Symposia, indeed the first of these symposia to be held at the Academy itself, entitled 'Trust as a pre-condition to communication, social thinking and social practices during democratic transition in post-communist Europe'. The symposium was a collaboration between the Academy and the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, in Paris, and was organised by Ivana. It took place in the Academy on 13–15 September 2001. Reflecting Ivana's own commitment to an interdisciplinary approach, the symposium involved contributions from cultural, historical, political, philosophical, sociological and social psychological perspectives. Papers from this event were subsequently published as *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe*, edited by Ivana (Marková 2004). Presciently, the cover featured a photograph of Boris Yeltsin and Vladimir Putin. The Head of Publishing at the Academy, James Rivington, recalls that in 2022 Ivana asked

him for a PDF file of the book so that she could send it to interested parties, noting in the course of an email exchange that ‘I am totally distraught by the war in Ukraine, when the face of Putin was placed on the cover of my book together with Yeltsin, we did not dream about what could happen. In addition, I am reliving the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Gorbachev changed nothing apart from destroying the Soviet Union. All institutions, KGB, their aims, people’s minds – all remains the same.’ Ivana’s work on trust continued with two further volumes examining sociocultural perspectives on trust and distrust (Marková & Gillespie 2008) and the dynamics of trust and distrust in situations of conflict (Marková & Gillespie 2012).

Ivana’s overall work on dialogicality and social representations reflected her constant interest in how contexts shape psychological theories and even the entirety of a discipline such as social psychology (Marková 2000a; 2003a; 2003b; Moscovici & Marková 2006). She brought concerns with dialogue and language to the heart of social representations theory and theorised the dynamic of mind with reference to its active process of engagement with the dyad stability-change. Ivana’s lasting contribution to the theory of social representation is an explicit integration of dialogicality in its theoretical and methodological edifice. She theorised language and communication in the formation of social representations and made the analysis of ‘self-alter’ relations a central empirical focus in the study of social representations in context. She drew on her own experience of cultural displacement to bring concepts to life, and showed that the dialogical mind is an ever evolving historical and situated outcome of antinomies and oppositions, of old and new (Marková 2008b).

The dialogical mind and ethics

Throughout her conceptualisation of the dialogical mind, Ivana emphasised the importance of linking knowledge, thinking and action to the dynamic of self-other relations. This link was foregrounded in her most recent books, which explored the centrality of ethics and relationality in both human psychology and psychological theory. Her aim was to demonstrate that there is no human psychology outside relationships, and because of that, an ethical dimension is integral to both the concepts and the practice of psychology. In *The Dialogical Mind: Common Sense and Ethics* (Marková 2016) she argued that dialogicality entails ethics and cannot be conceived outside an ethics that must be constantly examined through the empirical study of self-other relations. This ethics is ontological in human life and the basis of all knowledge. At the same time, this ethics is fragile and can easily be broken by the pathologies of our age, by experiences of consumption, bureaucracy and totalitarianism. Ivana was acutely aware that human beings are not ‘saints’ and much of her applied work was dedicated precisely to the empirical description of the multiple distortions that can brew in the psychosocial

dynamics of self-other relations, which she studied empirically in communication failures with the disabled and those stigmatised by illness, but also in the historical examples of totalitarianism and in more contemporary forms of bureaucratisation and consumerism (Marková & Watier 2004; Marková 2008a).

The fragility of our ethical life and our relations to others was a strong theme in her work, as was the foundational role ethics played in building a distinctively human life. Most likely related to her own ethical dilemmas, she considered that witnessing persecution was important for having the courage to speak truth to power. Ivana sought to understand the psychological forces that created blind belief, persecution, mistrust, conflict and the nullification of the self under state control. She was both intrigued and appalled by these phenomena but saw them as integral to human experience and therefore in need of explanation. Part of her answer to these issues was to identify the lines of continuity and dialogue between communication and miscommunications, asymmetries and mutualities, between extreme forms of thinking and the ordinary representations that make everyday life. Ivana returned to the history of Western representations of knowledge and the problems involved in considering some forms of thinking 'superior' and others 'inferior'. She was not a relativist, but she understood the futility of these hierarchical representations of knowledge, because she knew well that the separation between logos and mythos, science and common sense, reason and experience was not absolute, but in fact a dialogical opposition through which these antinomies constitute each other.

In her final books, Ivana offered a psychological history of this problem, retrieving the work of the Italian philosopher Giambattista Vico as a precursor of the psychology that is engrained in the dialogical approach and in the psychology proposed by Moscovici, not only in social representations theory but also in his theory of active minorities. And true to her commitment to applied research, she also offered detailed empirical analyses of how these issues present in the multiple domains of professional practices related to therapy and care of people with mental health and communication problems. Her final book (Marková 2023) examined what makes a dialogical theory, taking the work of Serge Moscovici and his theory of social representations as a case study. It brought together the different strands of her thinking and highlighted her hopes that a truly social psychology was possible.

Conclusion

Towards the end of her life Ivana returned to memories of her life in Czechoslovakia, revisiting dreams and experiences of her childhood and thinking again about specific communicative genres, such as confession, in which the self nullifies itself under the

pressure of a party, a cause, a government, a group (Marková 2012a), or alternatively is able to resist the pressures and costs of totalitarian domination (Marková 2013). The case of Milada Horáková, a female Czech politician who had been a member of the underground resistance against Nazism and was later convicted and executed by the Communist Party on false charges of conspiracy and treason, remained a haunting memory. Ivana was engaged on writing about this case just before she died, exploring the conditions under which self stands up for its convictions and resists domination, even if at the cost of its own life. Earlier, in 2018, she had made a journey back to Litvínov, the chemical factory where she worked in her youth, with the idea of trying to speak to some of the people who had been around at that time. She had always planned to write about this. Likewise, after the Velvet Revolution, when she was able to return to Czechoslovakia, she obtained the archives of her father's case, his interrogation and sentencing and also wanted to write about this.

Despite these haunting memories and concerns, Ivana's humanist vision of psychology remained with her until the end of her life, and was the topic of her final paper on common sense, published posthumously, in a special issue dedicated to her memory (Marková 2025). An inspiring lesson of her work is that we are all polyphonic beings, that our ways of thinking are vast and encompass different modalities of knowledge, that we embrace science as well as myth, legends, religious beliefs and multiple folk cultural traditions, to build a shared human reality that is seen and can only be seen and understood from different perspectives. Evolution may have predisposed us to recognise faces and engage intersubjectively with others, but the dialogical mind is not ready at birth and must be constructed over time in the ontogenetic history of the human child, just as it was in the evolutionary history of our species. Realising that there is no single knowledge and no single truth, but many different perspectives and forms of knowledge is both the challenge and the achievement of the dialogical mind that must seek, in communication with Alter, the pathway to knowledge and self-realisation. From the revolution of perspective-taking in the life of the human child, to the discovery of perspective in Renaissance painting and in socio-cultural life, Ivana gave us a history and a psychology of the dialogical mind as a key way of sustaining our human condition and our ethical life.

Ivana was a much treasured mentor, colleague and friend, as is abundantly evident from the many warm tributes made by those who worked closely with her.¹ Recurrent themes in these tributes are that Ivana was inspiring, kind, witty, and humble. She was a devoted friend and hospitable host. The enduring legacy of her work is signalled not only by its prescient engagement with key social issues, but also by the fact that she worked with and influenced younger generations of scholars, as seen in the 2020 special issue of

¹ See <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/condolences/2024/12/06/in-memory-of-professor-ivana-marková-1938-2024/>

Culture and Psychology on generalisation from dialogical single case studies. She will be deeply missed by her colleagues, friends, and followers.

Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to Ivana Marková's daughter, Ivana S. Marková, for her considerable help during the preparation of this memoir. The photograph of Ivana Marková on a walk from her home in Cambridge in 2015 is by courtesy of Ann Phoenix.

Bibliography

- Marková, I., Lockyer, R. & Forbes, C.D. (1977), 'Haemophilia: A survey on social issues', *Health Bulletin*, 35(4): 177–82.
- Marková, I. (ed.) (1978), *The social context of language* (London: Wiley-Blackwell).
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420100121>
- Marková, I. & Forbes, C.D. (1979a), 'Haemophilia: A study into social and psychological problems', *Health Bulletin*, 37(1): 24–9.
- Marková, I. & Forbes, C.D. (1979b), 'The social and psychological effects of haemophilia on patients and their families', *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, 2(4): 515–17.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/00004356-197912000-00011>
- Marková, I., Macdonald, K. & Forbes, C.D. (1980a), 'Integration of haemophilic boys into normal schools', *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 6(2): 101–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2214.1980.tb00802.x>
- Marková, I., Macdonald, K. & Forbes, C.D. (1980b), 'Impact of haemophilia on child-rearing practices and parental co-operation', *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 21(2): 153–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1980.tb00027.x>
- Marková, I. (1982), *Paradigms, Thought and Language* (Chichester and New York: Wiley-Blackwell).
- Marková, I. (1987), *Human Awareness: Its Social Development* (London: Hutchinson).
- Marková, I. & Wilkie, P. (1987), 'Representations, Concepts and Social Change: The phenomenon of AIDS', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 17: 389–409.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1987.tb00105.x>
- Marková, I. & Foppa, K. (eds) (1990), *The Dynamics of Dialogue* (New York: Springer-Verlag).
- Marková, I., Wilkie, P.A., Naji, S. & Forbes, C.D. (1990), 'Self- and other-awareness of the risk of HIV/AIDS in people with haemophilia and implications for behavioural change', *Social Science and Medicine*, 31(1): 73–9. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(90\)90012-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(90)90012-H)
- Marková, I. (1991), 'Scientific and public knowledge of AIDS: The problem of their integration', in Cranach, M., Doise, W. & Mugny, G. (eds), *Social Representations and the Social Bases of Knowledge* (Bern: Huber). pp. 179–83.
- Marková, I. & Foppa, K. (1991), *Asymmetries in Dialogue* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf).
- Marková, I. & Farr, R.M. (eds) (1995), *Representations of Health, Illness and Handicap* (Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers).
- Marková, I., Graumann, C. & Foppa, K. (1995), *Mutualities in Dialogue* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Marková, I. (1997), 'The individual and the community: A post-communist perspective', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(1): 3–17.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(199702\)7:1<3::AID-CASP396>3.0.CO;2-L](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199702)7:1<3::AID-CASP396>3.0.CO;2-L)

- Marková, I., Moodie, E., Farr, R.M., Drozda-Senkowska, E., Eros, F., Plichtova, J., Gervais, M., Hoffmannova, J. & Mullerova, O. (1998), 'Social representations of the individual: A post-communist perspective', *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 28(5): 797–829. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(199809/10\)28:5<797::AID-EJSP896>3.0.CO;2-6](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199809/10)28:5<797::AID-EJSP896>3.0.CO;2-6)
- Marková, I. (2000a), 'The individual and society in psychological theory', *Theory and Psychology*, 10(1): 107–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354300010001605>
- Marková, I. (2000b), 'Amédée or how to get rid of it: Social representations from a dialogical perspective', *Culture & Psychology*, 6(4): 419–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X0064002>
- Marková, I. (2003a), *Dialogicality and Social Representations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Marková, I. (2003b), 'Constitution of the Self: Intersubjectivity and Dialogicality', *Culture and Psychology*, 9(3): 249–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X030093006>
- Marková, I. (ed.) (2004), *Trust and Democratic Transition in Post-Communist Europe (Proceedings of the British Academy)*, 123; Oxford: Oxford University Press/British Academy). <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197263136.001.0001>
- Marková, I. & Watier, P. (2004), 'Trust as a psychosocial feeling: Socialization and totalitarianism', in Marková (2004), pp. 25–46. <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197263136.001.0001>
- Moscovici, S., & Marková, I. (2006), *The Making of Modern Social Psychology: The Hidden Story of How an International Social Science was Created* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Marková, I., Linnel, P., Grossen, M. & Salazar-Orvig, A. (2007), *Dialogue in Focus Groups: Exploring socially shared knowledge* (London: Equinox).
- Marková, I. & Plichtová, J. (2007), 'East-West European Project: Transforming and shaping research through collaboration', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 41(2): 124–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-007-9014-y>
- Marková, I. (2008a), 'Persuasion and propaganda', *Diogenes*, 55 (1): 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0392192107087916>
- Marková, I. (2008b), 'The epistemological significance of the theory of social representations', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 38(4): 461–87. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.2008.00382.x>
- Marková, I. & Gillespie, A. (eds) (2008), *Trust and Distrust: Sociocultural Perspectives* (Charlotte: Information Age Publishers).
- Marková, I. (2012a), 'Confession as a communication genre: The logos and mythos of the Party', in Marková & Gillespie (2012), pp. 181–200.
- Marková, I. (2012b), 'Method and explanation in history and social representations', *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 46: 457–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-012-9210-2>
- Marková, I. & Gillespie, A. (eds) (2012), *Trust and Conflict: Culture, Representation and Dialogue* (London: Routledge). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203806265>
- Marková, I. (2013), 'Forms of resistance during Stalinism', in Bauer, M.W., Harré, R. & Jensen, C. (eds), *Resistance and the Practice of Rationality* (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing).
- Marková, I. (2016), *The Dialogical Mind: Common Sense and Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 137–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511753602>
- Marková, I. & Novaes, A. (2020), 'Chronotopes', *Culture and Psychology*, 26(1): 117–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X19888189>
- Marková, I., Zadeh, S. & Zittoun, T. (2020), 'Introduction to the special issue on generalisation from dialogical single case studies', *Culture and Psychology*, 26(1): 3–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X19888193>
- Marková, I. (2023), *The Making of a Dialogical Theory: Social Representations and Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009295000>
- Marková, I. (2025), 'Epistemic trust and authority', *Cultures of Science*, 8(2): 133–9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20966083251324673>

Note on the authors: Sandra Jovchelovitch is Professor of Social Psychology at the London School of Economics. Tony Manstead is Emeritus Professor of Psychology, Cardiff University; he was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 2011. Ann Phoenix is Professor of Psychosocial Studies, at University College London; she was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 2014.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy (ISSN 2753–6777) are published by The British Academy, 10–11 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AH
www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk