



Social representations: the historicity of the psychosocial

Representações sociais: a historicidade do psicossocial

Lúcia Pintor Santiso Villas Bôas

PhD in Education, researcher at CIERS-ed/Fundação Carlos Chagas, professor at Universidade Metodista, São Bernardo do Campo, SP - Brasil, e-mail: lboas@fcc.org.br

Abstract

This article aims to emphasize the historicity of social representations as a fundamental aspect for understanding the reappropriations processes, in contemporary society, of historically consolidated meanings. Because of this, it considers that social representations are the result, on one hand, of the reappropriation of contents coming from different chronological periods and, on the other hand, those generated by new contexts. In this perspective, the article briefly discusses some issues relating to the group's history, memory, structural and contents aspects of representations, in order to reveal the complexity of the historical dimension of social representations. The article ends with a survey that illustrates the possibilities for an analysis in this dimension.

Keywords: Social representations. History. Psychosocial processes.

Resumo

Este texto pretende discutir a historicidade das representações sociais como aspecto fundamental para a compreensão da reapropriação, na contemporaneidade, de significados historicamente consolidados. Para tanto, considera que as representações sociais são resultado, de um lado, da reapropriação de conteúdos advindos de períodos cronológicos distintos e, de outro, daqueles gerados por novos contextos. Assim, são discutidas, sinteticamente, questões ligadas ao conteúdo e à estrutura representacional, à história do grupo e à memória social de modo a apontar a complexidade da dimensão histórica na tessitura das representações sociais. O artigo se encerra com uma pesquisa que ilustra as possibilidades de análise dessa historicidade.

Palavras-chave: *Representações sociais. História. Processos psicossociais.*

Introduction

The study of the historicity of social representations, despite its importance for the understanding the of the genesis and construction processes of the representational content stability, constitute an aspect , not new, but still little explored, as evidenced by the work of Villas Bôas (2010), Castorina (2007), Bertrand (2002), Moliner (2001) and Jodelet (1989).

Generally, researches into social representations tend to emphasise much more the action of everyday practices, when analysing the present state of any given representation than its process of genesis and stabilization, where historically constituted determinants play a fundamental role.

Although such discussions are important, if social representations are to be understood in terms of their dynamics and the mechanisms, their historicity must also be examined. Otherwise, there is a risk they will be

considered a historical phenomenon constituted in a generic context, which has contributed in general to the studies in education and other spheres — being increasingly descriptive and rather than interpretive.

Meanwhile, the study of this historicity is a prime field for examining temporal categories, such as permanence and change, associated with the social thinking, once it allows to understand and learn on how time dynamically operates processes by which historically established meanings are reappropriated.

This dynamic feature occurs, although a series of “themes” produced in the past may persist in a current context, it does not necessarily mean there is continuity in the terrain of the problems, that is, in the “[...] specific kinds of approach on the basis of which the theme is reconstructed and understood” (GURZA, 2004, p. 69). Therefore, it is considered a reappropriation.

These reappropriation processes are particularly in evidence in what Moscovici (2000) calls *hegemonic representations*, which characteristically permeate groups and, although able to change, are structurally and temporally stable, because they are anchored in culturally wide. Thus, this would support the idea that there exists a “regularity of style” (MOSCOVICI, 2003), a kind of continuity in categories of thought relating, for example, to national narratives.

Thus, the social representations, in order to guiding behaviour and fostering communication among individuals, connect both knowledge inferred from direct experience of situations and pre-existing knowledge from different chronological periods. That articulation, they can be investigated, depending on the object of analysis, in the medium and long term, even though they are associated with the short term, given their dependence on the ideological context of the moment, the degree of involvement of the group or groups that develop them and the connection and style of the shared communications. This interlacing of different temporalities can be examined by considering the processes of objectivation and anchoring directed to rendering the unfamiliar familiar.

These matrices, which serve as the basis for the development of representations, are dependent on socio-historical conditions and thus cannot be associated with atemporal, immutable or ahistorical conditions, because they are transformed and reappropriated in contemporary times. As a result, the historical aspect of a representational object cannot be disregarded, as it is anchored in an existing universe and thus has historicity.

Far from being static, the reappropriation is permeated by a certain plasticity in that each generation alters the meaning and understanding of pre-existing knowledge and of historically established meanings. That means, each current context selects a content from the past which will be updated by way of a specific framing and interpretation proper to that context, which ultimately depend on the meaning that a given group gives to its space of experience and horizon of expectations.

Koselleck (2006, p. 306) describes “field of experience” and “horizon of expectations” as formal knowledge categories that underpin the possibility of a history without, however, transmitting an *a priori* historical reality, because “[...] there is no history which could be constituted independently of the experiences and expectations of active human agents. However, nothing is yet said about a given concrete past, present, or future history”.

It is from that space of experience, constructed on the basis of historical knowledge, either produced or experienced, that a future will be projected in which a horizon of expectations is established, and that horizon

[...] takes place in the today; it is the future made present; it directs itself to the not-yet, to the non-experienced to be revealed. Hope and fear, wishes and desires, cares and rational analysis, receptive display and curiosity: all enter into expectation and constitute it (KOSELLECK, 2006, p. 310).

It is thus out of the tension between experience and expectation that historical time is constructed and constituted in the weave between what is understood as past and what envisaged as future.

However, the historicity of social representations can only be apprehended through their effect¹ in the present (GADAMER, 2002), and its access to the past is mediated by its connection with contemporaneity.

History and social representations: the complexity of a relationship

The complexity of the role of history in the weaving of social representations derives from the porosity and plurality of the features involved in the relationship, which claims particularly to representational content and structure, to group history and to memory.

Regarding representational content, Moliner (2001) argues that social representations tend to go through three distinct phases: a) emergence, where mediation occurs between the existence of a given object and the emergence of stable, consensual knowledge about it; at this stage, individuals seek information about the object in an effort to reduce its complexity and strangeness; b) stability, where the representation becomes knowledge that is consensual (at least at the core) and operational about a given aspect of the group's social medium; and, lastly, transformation, where a relation is established between older and the newer knowledge.

In this regard, although social representations typically feature genesis, stability and transformation, their phases are more easily observable in relation to representational content, which thus makes it difficult to point to a specific moment in the history of any given

¹ Use, albeit restricted, is made here of the effectual history approach theorised by Gadamer in *Truth and Method* (2002), who writes "[...] If we are trying to understand a historical phenomenon from the historical distance that is characteristic of our hermeneutical situation, we are always already affected by history. It determines in advance both what seems to us worth inquiring about and what will appear as an object of investigation, and we more or less forget half of what is really there — in fact, we miss the whole truth of the phenomenon — when we take its immediate appearance as the whole truth." (GADAMER, 2002, p. 449, v. 1).

representation, because it will be in constant movement. The same does not occur in relation to the content of the social representation, which mobilises different processes depending on what phase the representation is at.

Authors such as Guimelli and Reynier (1999) warn that the analysis of a representation's genesis should, on the one hand, consider the determinants of the representation's present state and, on the other, show the role of these same determinants in the construction of that state. They classify such determinants into two categories: ideological determinants and social practices. Thus, determinants of an ideological nature are those relating to the specific values and norms existing in a given group which will originate and structure a representation, giving it a function in terms of the network of meanings constituted by the hierarchy of those values or norms. The other determinant indicated by these authors consists in social practices, which are considered to play a fundamental role in the progressive construction of a representation's present state, particularly by intervening in the process of its transformation.

As regards representational structure, the fact that social representations are framed by pre-existing thinking enables their historicity to be analysed by way, for example, of the concept of *themata* proposed by Moscovici (2003), which has to do with questions about the origin of the ideas that generate social representations, and by way of the concept of *core developed particularly* by the Aix-en-Provence school.

Proposing the concept of *themata* introduces the question of timeframe in the study of social representations, in that they are presented with a kind of general, but not teleological, meaning, and can be placed historically and socially. The references to the historian Fernand Braudel, particularly as relates to the concept of *the long term*, enable representations to be situated in a past which, although distant, is constitutive of their dynamics, which permits research of a genealogical nature. It cannot be forgotten, however, that "every social representation is constituted as a process in which one can locate an origin, but one

which is always unfinished to the extent that other facts or discourses will always come to nourish or corrupt it” (MOSCOVICI, 2003, p. 218).

Moscovici (2003, p. 224) regards *themata* as expressing a “regularity of style”, that is, they take the form of a type of persistence of certain themes in everyday social life arrived at by way of a “[...] a selective repetition of contents which have been created by society and remain preserved by society. They refer to possibilities of action and experience in common which can become conscious and integrated into past actions and experiences”.

Themata are considered to transmit a kind of general meaning that extends beyond individuals and institutions and are thus bound up with the long-term and intended, in a way, to cater for social representations’ generativeness, conferring even greater weight to their formative processes, and particularly to anchoring.

The concern with the “permanence” of certain themes in the composition of social representations can also be seen – even though the relation with the medium and long term is not so evident – in the Aix-en-Provence school’s work on the structural dimension of the theory, which examines the stability of the elements that make up a representation. Their studies indicate that, by and large, social representations can be said to be oriented by a dual (core and peripheral) system where the core system, which is connected with historical, sociological and ideological conditions, is considered to play a more stable and lasting role in social representations, while the peripheral system is more flexible and so has the property of being more easily modified; it thus performs a system “protection” function, in that it permits adaptation to a given situation without that entailing modification of the core. In this way, it is determined more in interaction with the immediate context and individual characteristics.

Following that line of argumentation, the “core”, the more stable component of social representations, is used by individuals as a frame of reference to guide how they apprehend and perceive social life. In this

respect, to put an end to a representation requires direct action on the core, as this constitutes the most permanent part of the system, which tends not to change even when contradicted by received information, because this will be interpreted in terms of the core.

Accordingly, the existence of a system resistant to change at the base of social representations points to a “structural historicity” that interacts with sociological and normative conditions in a society, serving as a “guide to action”. These historical traits, which relate to the history of both the object and the group and are transmitted by way of memory, interweave with the present to forge the structural frameworks of social representations.

In addition to the historicity of the content of social representations, there is also the history of the group that shares them, in that the representations’ form, content and meaning vary depending on the social group involved. These variations can be investigated in terms of three basic dimensions: firstly, what is known as the *informational dimension* relates to the amount and type of information available to the social subject on a given object, and how this is organised and communicated; the second, known as the *representational field*, has to do with the structure, organisation and hierarchy of propositions relating to the object; while the third is the attitudinal dimension, comprising favourable or unfavourable attitudes to the object, including the emotional involvement that it arouses (ÁLVAREZ, 2004).

These three inter-articulated dimensions become an instrument for interpreting reality, an instrument bound up with a need to adapt and maintain the socio-cognitive equilibrium that shapes a social identity for the collective subject, and it is precisely because of this need that representations display functions connected not only with the subject-object relationship, but with social interaction in terms of how reality is described, classified and explained.

It is also important to observe whether the group’s relation to the object of the social representations is conjunctural or structural. In the conjunctural relationship, the group forms before

the particular representation develops, so that the group's prior history, its experiences and values intervene in its formation. When the relationship is structural, the group's very existence is intimately bound up with the representational object (MOLINER, 2001). Thus, independently of these configurations, the representation's presence over time ultimately always disregards the constant interaction between the object represented and the social structure that represents it, in that, if the object is written into the group's history, its social representations may be maintained, even if the object loses all its social value (ROUSSIAU; BONARDI, 2002). However, underlining the complexity of this relationship, the fact that an object is longstanding does not assure it some kind of "tenure" in the group's history.

Although representational contents are anchored in the past, they are sustained in the present through a selective updating assured by the relations they maintain with social memory.

One of the most striking exemplifications of the history-memory-social representations triad is the study by Jodelet (1989) of social representations of mental illness in a French rural community in the 1970s, which shows how certain social conjunctures make it possible to reactivate historically-situated theorisations expressed in the form of social memory, as with the idea that madness is communicable and that contagion occurs by way of body fluids (saliva, sweat etc.). This dates from longstanding ancestral theories according to which the body is governed by the dynamic balance among its various fluids.

The debate between history and memory is far from consensual; today, it constitutes a vast field of study which, for lack of space, cannot be discussed nor even presented here. In the domain of social psychology — where the approach taken by Maurice Halbwachs in his study of the social frameworks of memory is still one important reference — Haas and Jodelet (2007) point to the current difficulty in finding consensual definitions with regard to social memory (and/or collective memory), notwithstanding the agreement that it is shared in a group and constituted in social processes, such as social communication.

Memory has become an object of study among historians, particularly since the 1980s. Nora (1984) considers that, although memory and history overlap, they are by nature different, that is, while memory claims to be “faithful” to the past and is intended to combat forgetfulness, history lays claim to truthfulness, with a view to understanding the past.

Carretero et al (2007) corroborate this distinction when they assert that “[...] while the former [memory] is connected with personal experience (such as lived experiences or received accounts), the latter [history] goes far beyond the individual or plural dimension of the person who remembers [...]” (p. 28), because

[...] history does not concern itself only with the present use of inherited memories; its imperatives include being truthful (relying on empirical evidence of the past) and actively seeking forgotten memories, giving an account of all that happened, describing it and explaining it” (CARRETERO et al., 2007, p. 29).

Ricoeur (2000) qualifies that idea, in that memory is presented as the matrix of history.

Here is not the place to enter at length into the complexity of the relationship between representational content and structure, group history and memory. It is nonetheless important to emphasise that, over and above the differing positions, social representations are constituted on the basis of prior knowledge and necessarily articulate an individual and a socio-cultural dimension — and, accordingly, articulate representational content and structure, group history and memory. This shows that although these aspects are distinct, they are not independent; rather, in their multiple, complex variations, they constitute intrinsic components of social representations.

That said, and with a view to providing empirical input to the ongoing discussion, a brief report will now be given of a study which discusses ideas of diversity associated with one way of representing Brazil, and thus exemplifies the possibilities for analysing the historicity of social representations.

Social representations of Brazil: the historicity of racial and natural diversity

The study *Brasil: idéia de diversidade e representações sociais* (VILLAS BÔAS, 2010), which examines the idea of diversity and social representations in Brazil, is among the few that interrelate history and social representations. One of the study objectives was to examine social representations of Brazil connected with diversity, and to highlight aspects of convergence between contemporary representational content and historiographical production from the 19th century, a period when systematisation of a set of discourses about Brazil's singularity outlined a narrative of nation that continues to guide common sense about Brazil to this day.

The notion of diversity was chosen on the basis of analysis of texts produced by 1,029 students on university courses in Nursing, Engineering, Medicine, Pedagogy and Social Services, in Brazil's five regions, for a study coordinated by Sousa and Arruda (2006) of the imaginary in Brazil. That study examined two questions — “Why do you think all of this is Brazil?” and “To you, what differentiates Brazil from other countries?” — which make no mention of diversity, thus enabling this concept to be identified as one of the axes around which social representations of the country are organised.

The semantic fields in the students' production which were identified as associated with diversity were amplified by recourse to dictionaries, making it possible to construct an associative framework of the contemporary idea of diversity. From there, it was investigated whether the idea of diversity was already present in the 19th-century historiographical production, and what forms it took, by examining the work of the following authors: Martius ([1845] 1982), Varnhagen ([1854] 1975), Macedo ([1864] 1905) and Celso (1901)².

² Affonso Celso wrote *Porque me ufano de meu paiz* [Why I am so proud of my country] towards the end of the 19th century, although it was not published until 1901.

These authors were chosen for two basic reasons. Firstly, it was in the 1900s, in the process of organising the nation-State, that a set of ideas was systematised as to the singularity of Brazil, in the endeavour to explain and understand it, giving rise to an official history that represented its diversity as unity, thus laying the foundations for what is taken to constitute Brazilianness to this day. The second stems from the comprehensive scope with which these works discuss Brazil, that is, although written in a specific historical context, they allow the historicity of social representations of Brazil to be investigated by analysing not social practices, but rather historically constructed “ideological determinants” (GUIMELLI; REYNIER, 1999).

Once the sources were chosen, an explanatory matrix had to be constructed, because the words associated with diversity could not be sought in the 19th-century works without running the risk of incurring in anachronism. Therefore, in order to identify their use context in the 1900s, a list of associations was built up by consulting two dictionaries in current use at the time.

Record cards were then prepared on the sources, referencing the passages where terms from the list of associations connotative of those terms featured explicitly. The theory informing this whole process was drawn from the effectual history approach (GADAMER, 2002) and the history of concepts (KOSELLECK, 2006), which made it possible to establish indicators reflecting the conceptual delimitation of diversity both in the past and in contemporary times.

These different corpuses were then compared in order to investigate the historical variations in diversity-related semantic fields. From among these fields, the question of racial and natural diversity will now be highlighted so as to evidence contemporary reappropriations of historically established meanings.

Data analysis revealed that racial diversity appears in association with “racial mixing”, characterised as the integration of differences, as indicated by the following excerpts from the university students’ responses:

Miscegenation of cultures, races, tongues. That is what makes us different, but which, in our differences, makes us the same (Nursing, Mid-West).

In addition to the numerous cultures spread across a single country, there is a merging of all the races and an identity is established, Brazilian identity, which is singular and makes Brazil a unique country (Medicine, South).

The idea of a “mixing of races”, as one formative axis for an interpretation of the history of Brazil, was formally proposed in the project *Como se deve escrever a história do Brasil* [How the history of Brazil should be written] by Martius ([1845] 1982), which won an award from the *Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* (IHGB) in 1844 as the best work in the competition of the same name. What he considered to be most characteristic of Brazil was not its natural features, but rather what he considered its distinctive racial make-up.

Responding, in a way, to those who shared the view of European racial theories, which saw miscegenation as the cause of all the country’s ills, Celso (1901) places it as one of Brazil’s reasons for pride, resting particularly on two features that may be described here as synthesis and harmony. The former refers to the idea that mestizos, the product of racial mixing, contain the synthesis of the positive characteristics present in each of their races of origin. This was at odds with two lines of thinking current in the 1900s: firstly, that mestizos, being hybrids, were weak or incapable; and, secondly, the tendency to hierarchise the contribution of the “races” involved, as did Martius ([1845] 1982) and Varnhagen ([1854] 1975), for example.

The second feature, which sees racial mixing as a factor that tends to harmony, stems from its indicating a capacity, proper to Brazilians, to harmonise their differences: “Men of whatever origin can choose a location in Brazil where they will find a suitable environment in which to prosper. Blacks, whites, redskins, mestizos live here in abundance and peace” (CELSONO, 1901, 10).

To this day, that ability inhabits the common sense of the university students surveyed, in that various responses express that harmonisation, as below:

The mixture of races, creeds and cultures, because here people who were forever in conflict in their countries of origin coexist peacefully (Social Service, Southeast).

The miscegenation of cultures, races, tongues. That is what makes us different, but which, in our differences, makes us the same (Nursing, Southeast).

Although the idea of “race” has undergone various re-elaborations, meaning it cannot be analysed as a mere reflection of 19th-century theories of race, the university students’ responses indicate that the racial issue — particularly, the merging of races, which is currently associated with diversity — is still a significant factor in the organisation of social representations of Brazil. However, the race issue is not present as conflict, but has come to form part of what Ortiz (2006) regards as an “ideology of harmony” explained by the fact that “[...] the problem had already been addressed ideologically in the 1930s, the Brazilian people being defined once and for all by the cross-breeding of races” (ORTIZ, 2006, p. 92).

Another aspect significantly associated with diversity is “nature”, including natural riches and natural beauty, as can be seen from the following responses from the university students:

Brazil differs from other countries basically in terms of territory, although not that prominent, because of the concentration of land ownership and an agrarian reform that is not appropriate to the country; that, as regards the economy (Pedagogy, Northeast).

The great concentration of forest reserves. The biodiversity due to the geographical location and the climate in the tropics (Social Service, Southeast).

What differentiates it is its natural wealth that we still possess across all our territory. In addition to the natural resources such as oil, the rivers with waterfalls, [there is] the diversity of fauna and flora etc. (Social Service, Northeast).

The discursive production analysed here coincides with the characteristics of what Carvalho (1998) called the *edenic tradition*, that is, the crystallisation of a vision of Brazil grounded in the idea of paradisiacal nature and mirrored in components such as natural riches, diversity of fauna and flora, agreeable climate, forest reserves, freedom from hurricanes, tsunamis etc., which are present already in the historical sources studied.

Of course there can be no denying the extent of Brazil's territory nor its natural riches and beauties. The problem is that ultimately this representation immobilises, because it is contemplative, as if the exaltation of nature paralyses the endeavour of human action, of culture. Nor did this go unnoticed by Varnhagen ([1854] 1975), who observed that: "Although there is so much life and variety in the native forests, they have a sombre side, which saddens men, who feel their heart tighten, as when at sea, before the vastness of the ocean" (p. 16, t. 1). In this connection, the exaltation of nature may be due to a lack of other causes for pride (CARVALHO, 1998).

The fact that, as an organisational axis for social representations of Brazil, diversity is associated with the idea of race and nature, exemplifies what Shumway (1993) called "guiding fictions", a concept developed in *The invention of Argentina*, where he discusses how, in that country, certain fictions structure the creation of a "national spirit" grounded in the discussions pursued among 19th-century intellectuals. He writes that "the guiding fictions of nations cannot be proven, and indeed are often fabrications as artificial as literary fictions. Yet they are necessary to give individuals a sense of nation, peoplehood, collective identity and national purpose" (p. 14-15).

Interpreting racial and natural diversity as a guiding fiction means also attributing to it a social function, given that the idea of mixing and, consequently, the racial tolerance correlated with it, ultimately masks conflicts and enhances national unity by mitigating social differences.

Thus, what we today designate by *diversity* is a reappropriation, although not exclusively, of the configuration of meanings that, in the 19th century, were given a different semantic scope (variety, variegated etc.). This it was possible to observe only by considering the historicity of the social representations from the perspective of the history of concepts (KOSELLECK, 2006). Even though used only very occasionally and specifically, this made it possible to identify, in relation to the representational content, not only the meanings that correspond to given lexical traits, but also those lexical traits where the “state of things” referred to has changed, indicating also that, although the problems formulated by the university students are different from those formulated by the 19th-century authors examined here, there is a “structure of repetition” (KOSELLECK, 2006), which continues stable even though the historical context is no longer the same.

Final remarks

It is clear from the example of this study that the composition of diversity-related social representations of Brazil is based on a system designed to guide behaviour and interpret reality which, at the same time, is constructed on the effects of prior thought content. In that regard, the intention is not to argue that the students’ responses constitute merely a transposition to the present of ideas established over the course of the 1900s. On the contrary, the idea is rather to indicate the existence of structures of thought that guide one way of representing Brazil and, although produced in a different historical context, have effects in the present day. The result is that, evidently, these ideas are reappropriated and reinterpreted over time.

The existence of a regularity of content in the university students' textual production on representations of country demonstrates the need for a permanent dialogue to be established between the theory of social representations and considerations involving their historicity, in order to understand how contemporary social representations are impacted by content established in other historical periods, as almost nothing has been done to explore these aspects in theoretical terms.

References

ÁLVAREZ, J. El contexto social y teórico del surgimiento de la teoría de las representaciones sociales. In: ROMERO, E. (Ed.). *Representaciones sociales: atisbos, cavilaciones del devenir de cuatro décadas*. México: Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, 2004. p. 29-53.

BERTRAND, V. Dimension historique des représentations sociales: l'exemple du champ sémantique de la notion d'exclusion. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, v. 55, n.5, p. 497-502, Sept./Oct. 2002.

CARRETERO, M. et al. Ensinar história em tempos de memória. In: CARRETERO, M. et al. (Org.). *Ensino da história e memória coletiva*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2007. p. 13-30.

CARVALHO, J.M. **O motivo edênico no imaginário social brasileiro**. *Revista Brasileira de Ciências Sociais*, v. 13, n. 38, out. 1998. Available at: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?pid=s0102-9091998000300004&script=sci_arttext&tlng=>. Accessed in: Sept. 18, 2012.

CASTORINA, J. A. Um encontro de disciplinas: a história das mentalidades e a psicologia das representações sociais. In: CARRETERO, M. et al. (Org.). *Ensino da história e memória coletiva*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2007. p. 75-88.

CELSO, A. *Porque me ufano do meu paiz*. Rio de Janeiro: Laemmert & C. – Editores, 1901.

GADAMER, H-G. *Verdade e método: traços fundamentais de uma hermenêutica filosófica*. 4. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 2002. 2 v. (Pensamento humano).

GUIMELLI, C.; REYNIER, J. Structuration progressive d'une représentation sociale: la représentation de l'infirmière. In: ROUQUETTE, M-L.; GARNIER, C. (Dir.). *La genèse des représentations sociales*. Montréal: Nouvelles, 1999. p. 171-181.

GURZA, A.. *Vida pública e identidade nacional: leituras brasileiras*. São Paulo: Globo, 2004.

HAAS, V.; JODELET, D. Pensée et mémoire sociales. In: PÉTARD, J-P. (Dir.). *Psychologie sociale*. 2. Ed. Rosny: Bréal, 2007. p. 117-162.

JODELET, D. Pensée sociale et historicité. *Technologies, Idéologies, pratiques, numéro spécial Psychisme et histoire*, v. 8, n. 1-4, p. 395-405, 1989.

KOSELLECK, R. *Futuro passado: contribuição à semântica dos tempos históricos*. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto/PUC-Rio, 2006.

MACEDO, J. M. de. *Lições de historia do Brasil: para uso nas escolas de instrução primaria*. Paris: Garnier, 1905. Publicado originalmente em 1864.

MARTIUS, C. F. P. von. Como se deve escrever a história do Brasil. In: MARTIUS, C. F. P. von. *O estado do direito entre os autóctones do Brasil*. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia; São Paulo: Edusp, 1982. Transcrito da Revista Trimestral de História e Geografia ou Jornal do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro, n. 24, jan. 1845.

MOLINER, P. Formation et stabilisation des représentations sociales. In: MOLINER, P. (Dir.). *La dynamique des représentations sociales: pourquoi et comment les représentations se transforment-elles?*. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 2001. p. 15-41.

MOSCOVICI, S. *Representações sociais: investigações em psicologia social*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003.

NORA, P. (Dir.). *Les lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1984. v. 1

ORTIZ, R. *Cultura brasileira e identidade nacional*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2006.

RICOEUR, P. *La mémoire, l'histoire et l'oubli*. Paris: Le Seuil, 2000.

ROUSSIAU, N.; BONARDI, C. Quelle place occupe la mémoire sociale dans le champ des représentations sociales? In: LAURENS, S.; ROUSSIAU, N. (Dir.). *La mémoire sociale: identités et représentations sociales*. Rennes: PUR, 2002. p. 33-49.

SHUMWAY, N. *La invención de la Argentina: historia de una idea*. Trad. César Aira. 6. ed. Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 2005.

SOUSA, C. P.; ARRUDA, A. (Coord.). *Imaginário e representação social de jovens universitários sobre o Brasil e a escola brasileira*. Relatório de pesquisa apresentado à Fapesp. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas, 2006. Mimeografado.

VARNHAGEN, F. A. de. *História geral do Brasil: antes de sua separação e independência de Portugal*. 8. ed. integral. São Paulo: Melhoramentos/MEC, 1975. 5 v. Originalmente publicado em 1854.

VILLAS BÔAS, L. P. S. *Brasil: ideia de diversidade e representações sociais*. São Paulo: Annablume, 2010.

Received: 02/04/2013

Recebido: 04/02/2013

Approved: 02/24/2014

Aprovado: 24/02/2014