

A Third Conversation with Jorge Correia Jesuíno

Maria de Fátima Barbosa Abdalla¹

Orcid: 0000-0001-8290-959X

This is our third *conversation* with Dr. Jorge Correia Jesuíno, to whom I am deeply grateful for sharing his insights and memories, particularly on the role of social representations in his career as a professor and researcher. It is important to note that this is a conversation, not an interview, as per the request of Prof. Jesuíno, from whom I learned that our shared reflections are more than mere exchanges of words—they form a dialogue, a “conversation²” that can reveal “focuses of experience” and “world views,” as he says in an interview with Serge Moscovici (Jesuíno, 2015, p. 327).

JCJ is not easily classified due to the diversity of his interests, although his professional activity falls within the domain of Social and Organizational Psychology. He is a professor emeritus at ISCTE – University Institute of Lisbon, his *alma mater*, and a member of the Centre for Psychological Research and Social Intervention (CIS-Iscte). He was honored with the title of Doctor Honoris Causa by the Federal University of Paraíba (UFPE) in 2008, and by the Pantheon University of Athens in 2017. He has contributed to our studies, which seek to establish connections between Serge Moscovici’s Theory of Social Representations (1925–2014) and Pierre Bourdieu’s Theory of Action (1930–2001).

Our goal is not only to continue the other conversations we have had (Abdalla, 2022; Abdalla, 2024), but, above all, to highlight aspects that can shed light on the extent to which Moscovici’s theory has influenced (and continues to influence) research worldwide, particularly in Portugal and Brazil.

During our “conversation,” several aspects caught our attention. The first, undoubtedly, relates to the importance of “social memory” as a reference discussed from the perspective of the TSR. JCJ not only exemplified it but also, by bringing his own memories into the conversation, sought to reframe this theoretical aspect. The other aspects relate to the key concepts he presented to us regarding Moscovici’s theory, while also highlighting its developments within other theoretical approaches. This has led to an expansion of “boundary work,” as he teaches us throughout this conversation.

We hope that this conversation will raise new questions about the meaning and value of the Moscovician theoretical approach for the research we conduct, aiming to provoke critical reflections on what is currently offered to us. Our goal is to confront our own stories and open

¹ PhD in Education from FE-USP and holding a postdoctoral degree in Educational Psychology from PUC-SP. Professor in the Graduate Program in Education at the Catholic University of Santos, São Paulo, Brazil. Member of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) and associate researcher at the International Center of Studies on Social Representations, Subjectivity - Education. E-mail: mfabdalla@uol.com.br.

² The words of Prof. Jesuíno was kept in European Portuguese.

up possibilities for theoretical, epistemological, and methodological reconstruction based on the TSR, both in the field of Education and in other areas of knowledge. Let us now turn to your reflections based on the questions we have proposed.

MFBA – I would like to begin this new conversation by asking you to share your personal and professional *memories* of how you first encountered the TSR and Moscovici's work. What interests *influenced* you in this regard? What encounters in your life journey led you to embrace Moscovician ideas? And in what aspects?

JCJ – Allow me, dear Colleague, a little context. I will try to be brief. And I start with the domestic context. I remember living under a dictatorship that lasted 48 years, which was only overcome by the Revolution of April 25, 1974, 50 years ago. It is natural for those generous enough to read us to find that, in today's times, such circumstances no longer exist. Portugal was a colonialist country. Brazil was considered the jewel of the Portuguese empire, gaining independence in 1822, but the empire in Africa was maintained and would serve as the regime's justification to remain until 1974. Personally, I had a deep understanding of what this authoritarian and repressive regime was like. A long life, like mine, allows memory to extend further. To address the scope of the question you ask, and to place ourselves within the university experience, specifically in the social sciences, I would also like to remind you that this disciplinary field only began to follow a standard trajectory in my country—one similar to that practiced in Western culture in the broad sense—after the fall of fascism. In this context, subjects such as psychology and sociology were not part of the Higher Education (HE) curriculum. It was only at the end of the regime, starting in 1972, that an attempt at modernization was made, with the creation of new universities alongside the traditional Lisbon, Porto, and Coimbra trio. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar (1889–1970), the dictator who ruled us with an iron fist, suffered a fall that left him unable to remain in power. He was replaced by Marcello Caetano (1906–1980), a prominent university scholar and theorist of corporatism, inspired by Italian fascism. During the last six years of the regime, from 1968 to 1974, the international situation underwent significant changes. However, in Brazil, there was also an authoritarian shift with the establishment of a military regime, which allowed, in particular, the granting of political asylum to Portuguese politicians such as Marcello Caetano, along with many others—both politicians and businesspeople—who sought refuge there and reorganized themselves until more favorable times ensured their return to Portugal.

I have taken another detour, which I would say was inevitable, but I was referring to the fact that it was in 1972 that Portugal began transitioning from an elitist university system to a more open and democratic access one, as we know it today. This shift now translates into a higher education population of around 450,000 students, a figure that, in terms of percentage, is close to the average in the European Union, of which Portugal has been a member since 1986.

MFBA – Professor, I believe this is indeed an “inevitable detour” to reflect on the extent to which social and political circumstances shook us (and continue doing so), especially during the times of dictatorship, both in Portugal and here in Brazil. Which reminds me of that thought by Moscovici (2011a, p. 369), when he tells us that: “The tree must not hide the forest from us.” I see, in this “detour,” a healthy concern not to “hide the forest,” so that we can utterly understand the times we lived through. In other words, a time of authoritarian regime that prevented us from analyzing common sense and social thought derived from everyday life—perhaps because it represented a threat. In light of this, I ask you: How was Psychology treated,

and what role did it play in Portugal, especially after the dictatorship period? And could you tell us what your interest is in this area?

JCJ – As I mentioned before, psychology was only taught as a subject, not as a degree. It was not institutionalized in a college or institute that provided access to a professional career. It was the time of the physician-philosophers, a term we adopted from the French to describe the skills that would later be required of professional psychologists. We know, in fact, that psychology as a science involving the systematic use of the scientific method is relatively recent, with its foundation being attributed to Wilhelm Wundt (1832–1920). In Portugal, with the historical backwardness that has always characterized us, everything arrived later, particularly in relation to the Social Sciences. The psychology I studied in philosophy was somewhat elementary and limited to differential psychology. In any case, given the minimum requirements for training staff that began to be felt in the 1960s, the Institute of Applied Psychology (ISPA) was created as a private initiative in Lisbon. It initially focused mainly on clinical psychology and educational psychology and today remains one of the best-rated higher education institutions in terms of research and teaching. My interest in the subject was not so much in the field of differential psychology, which I encountered while taking philosophy, but rather in genetic epistemology, introduced by Jean Piaget (1896–1980), which naturally led to cognitive psychology. I even applied for a PhD in philosophy in this area, which did not materialize due to the turbulence of the years that followed.

MFBA – Have you taught in this area of Psychology? And how was this work of yours? Who was the author who had the most influence on you along this path?

JCJ – The teaching I did at ISPA then became more diverse, and from 1976 onwards, it also extended to the area of social psychology, in parallel and integrated into the same team that taught at ISCTE. We published several papers, many of which in collaboration with the psychiatrist and psychologist Orlindo Gouveia Pereira, a partnership that has continued to this day and to whom I largely owe my integration into an academic career. I also had the opportunity to teach a non-degree course on genetic epistemology at the College of Philosophy of the University of Lisbon in 1976 and 1977. Jean Piaget was and continues to be one of the authors who most influenced me. I only regret not having had the opportunity to meet him in person, being limited to studying and publishing about his work. This is a practice I continue to pursue, always discovering new ideas, while never forgetting my connection to epistemology. My entry as a professor in public higher education dates back to 1972, when I joined the newly established public institution, then named Higher Institute of Business and Labour Sciences (ISCTE), where I am now a professor emeritus. My Colleague will rightly ask what could have justified the invitation I got to join the teaching staff at a School of Labor and Business Sciences, and what the possible connection is with cognitive development and Jean Piaget, who taught at ISPA.

MFBA – That is right, Professor. Could you clarify these questions by sharing a bit more about your teaching experience at ISPA?

JCJ – The explanation is not immediate and reflects the weaknesses of these early modernization processes. The team I joined was composed of Portuguese professors who had completed their doctorates at foreign universities, which was not my case. However, I had a strong connection and learned a great deal from them. Experience was scarce, and there was a

lot of improvisation and self-teaching in those early days when we were launching new subjects and beginning scientific research. My collaboration at ISCTE took place in the field of business sociology, partly drawing on my own experience gained during my naval career, particularly in terms of organizational theory. It was in this area that I developed my doctoral thesis on organizational leadership processes from a psychosociological perspective. It was also within this disciplinary scope that I taught at ISPA in parallel with ISCTE. These were also times when interdisciplinary circularity, though not always for the best reasons, was practiced more frequently.

While it is true that social psychology had already taken its first steps with Pina Prata, the Professor with whom I worked for several years at ISCTE and who was my doctoral advisor—particularly in the application of systemic therapy models to organizational dysfunctions—it was only a few years later that my contact with the subject gained momentum. Here, we can pinpoint a specific date: 1980, when colleagues Jorge Vala and Maria Benedita Monteiro—well-known names in Brazil—both PhDs from Louvain, under the guidance of Prof. Jacques-Philippe Leyens, had the idea and initiative of organizing a meeting in Lisbon, which would somehow contribute to presenting the state of the subject in Europe. In addition to the aforementioned Jacques Philippe Leyens (1942-2017), this inaugural meeting was attended by psychologists such as Henri Tajfel (1919-1982), Willem Doise (1935-2023), and sociologists such as Michel Crozier (1922-2013). Serge Moscovici (1925-2014) was invited, but could not fit it into his agenda. This was my first contact with European Social Psychology. I presented at that meeting a short essay titled "*Anomia e Mudança na Sociedade Portuguesa*," ("*Anomie and Change in Portuguese Society*") in which I sought to interpret the empirical data related to Portugal, from the cross-cultural study of David McClelland (1917–1998). I proposed the thesis that the Portuguese culture is characterized by what I then called "*anomic individualism*," a concept that may still be worth reconsidering today. The underlying idea was to describe a type of individualism, as a cultural trait, which is more parochial and closed than institutional and open, using the American institutionalist model as a paradigm.

MFBA – The Professor mentioned some names that were and remain relevant here in Brazil, marking the presence of Social Psychology, such as the homonymous work by Vala and Monteiro (1997). By the way, you have two chapters in this very book: One addresses "European Social Psychology" (Jesuino, 1997a), where you highlight the directions of social psychology in Europe and the USA, pointing out a few key aspects; the other focuses on "Group Structure and Processes: Interactions and Effectiveness Factors" (Jesuino, 1997b), which emphasizes issues related to groups in schools, the workplace, and other spaces. More related to our conversation, I find this first text of yours highly relevant due to its clarifications on the meaning of ESP in relation to American Social Psychology (ASP), as it seeks to define the "social identity" of those who belong to the ESP. Furthermore, when it reinforces, according to Moscovici, that social psychology holds a "central place" and plays a "unifying role." The questions developed also lead us to reflect on social representations in relation to other studies, such as, for example, cross-cultural studies³. From this perspective, how do you see the relationship between social psychology and cross-cultural studies? Have you participated in any of these studies? What are your memories regarding the trends and/or changes in the interpretation of the TSR? Could you share an episode that you consider relevant so we can

³ Psychology, according to Gomes *et al.* (2017), has also aimed to contribute knowledge related to understanding cultural and/or transcultural contexts, in which phenomena occur, in order to consider existing diversity, the relationship between cognition, behavior, and culture, and to identify the role of context in human development.



gain a better understanding of the influence of these different studies on Social Psychology and social representations?

JCJ – Cross-cultural studies have always interested me and I have had the opportunity to participate in some of them, such as GLOBE, an acronym for Global Leadership Behavior Effectiveness Research Program, coordinated by Robert J. House (1932-2011), which involved 172 researchers and 62 countries (Jesuíno, 2002). In a way, the interpretation I proposed in the 1981 article was validated in this study 20 years later.

The 1980 Meeting in Lisbon led to the establishment of close collaboration with Henri Tajfel, which, however, was interrupted by his premature death two years later, in 1982. In any case, his presence left its mark due to the impact caused by his social identity theory (SIT). It was, however, still possible to publish his work *Human Groups and Social Categories* (Tajfel, 1981), in a collection I directed at the time, translated into Portuguese by my colleague Professor Lígia Amâncio; today, an internationally recognized name in Brazil for her work in the field of Gender Studies⁴.

The collaboration with Willem Doise (1935-2023) was much more extensive, and we owe him much for his generous availability and guidance in Social Psychology projects, not only in the area of Social Representations (TSR) but also in the area of intergroup relations within the scope of Henri Tajfel's model. Furthermore, Willem Doise was already collaborating intensively with Serge Moscovici in Paris, later joining Jean Piaget's team in Geneva, a position he held until his retirement. Jean Piaget's invitation had been extended to Serge Moscovici, who did not accept it, and Willem Doise ended up occupying that position. Doise's proximity to Piaget, whose theory was of great interest to me, now reinforced with greater attention to sociocognitive processes and their pedagogical consequences, constituted yet another opportunity for collaboration, which took place both at ISPA and at ISCTE.

MFBA – Among the names mentioned, I believe that Tajfel (1981) helps us reflect on the issue of "human groups," particularly regarding the role of social identity in intergroup relations and their conflicts. According to Doise (2002a), with the expansion of his model addressing the effects of categorization on perception, particularly in his studies on social stereotypes and discrimination, Tajfel becomes a key figure in the field of intergroup relations studies. I would also like to highlight the importance of Doise's work (and its ongoing relevance) in relation to his societal approach, particularly due to the connection he makes with the Bourdieusian theory, which aligns with some of our own concerns⁵. In particular, when Doise (1989) considers that *social representations* (SR) are the *organizing principles* of the symbolic relationships that exist among social actors. Or even, as he states under Bourdieusian influence, that SRs are "*relational principles* that structure the *symbolic relations* between individuals or groups, constituting both a field of symbolic exchange and a representation of this field" (Doise, 1989, p. 250, free translation, our emphasis). Furthermore, Doise's piece (2002a) highlights, in my view, the necessity of a societal psychology that integrates explanations at both the individual and social levels, with a particular focus on the dynamics of social interactions, positions, and beliefs. In this regard, Professor, I believe your article "Continuidades e descontinuidades da

⁴ Among Lígia Amâncio's works on *gender studies*, mentioned by JCJ, I highlight one, co-authored with João Manuel de Oliveira, titled "Feminist Theories and Social Representations: Challenges of Situated Knowledge for Social Psychology" (Oliveira; Amâncio, 2006).

⁵ I mention here the theoretical and methodological relations that we have made based on Moscovician and Bourdieusian studies, in which Prof. Jesuíno was present, as were other colleagues (Abdalla, Domingos Sobrinho; Campos, 2018; Abdalla, 2019; Lima; Villas Bôas; Abdalla, 2022).



psicologia à sociologia” (“Continuities and Discontinuities from Psychology to Sociology”) (Jesuino, 1980) offers some solutions to the issue of the "boundaries" between these sciences, especially when you state that: “[...] it must be shown that *homo psychologicalus* cannot be abstracted from *homo sociologicus*, such as the *homo sociologicus* cannot be abstracted from *homo psychologicalus*” (Jesuino, 1980, p. 6). Continuing with our conversation, could you share a moment when you witnessed Doise or Moscovici's stance on Social Psychology being shaped by social representations?

JCJ – In 1982, a meeting was organized in Italy, in Ravello, on the stunning Amalfi Coast, coordinated by Serge Moscovici and Willem Doise. The goal of the event was to examine the potential specificities of Social Psychology as practiced in the Euro-Latin countries—France, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, even though it was still in its early stages. Both Serge Moscovici and Willem Doise, then active members of the European Association for Social Psychology (EASP), were interested in developing the subject in a way that would distinguish it from the positivism typical of American Social Psychology. I developed this idea of a European specificity, a more social social psychology, which was brilliantly supported by SM in the chapter dedicated to European Social Psychology in the Manual of Social Psychology, published by Jorge Vala and Maria Benedita Monteiro, who the Colleague has already mentioned, in its first editions, as well as in a paper I published, “*O que é a Psicologia*” (“*What is Psychology?*”) (Jesuino, 1992).

The date 1992 is particularly significant, as it was then, ten years later, that the community, now identified in terms of *social representations*, met again, also in Ravello. In a certain way, it marked the formalization of its subdisciplinary institution. It was also at that point that trends toward methodological diversification emerged, reflected in Moscovici's openness to the structuralist approach introduced by social psychologists from the University of Marseille – Jean Claude Abric (1941-2012) and Claude Flament (1930-2019) – commonly known as the *Central Core Theory*. As for the transition to the most inclusive level of *societal psychology*, I fully agree with my Colleague, and I recall a chapter by Willem Doise (2002b), titled “*Jalons pour une Psychologie Sociétale*,” in which he advocates for this methodological extension. Furthermore, one of Willem's important contributions consisted of the epistemological importance he attributed to the levels of analysis in social psychology.

MFBA – I consider the mapping you propose to be of great interest in order to better understand the trends that have emerged within the scope of the TSR, ultimately leading to one of its developments, such as the Central Core Theory, and, in particular, the concept of the *central core*. In Brazil, there is a publication organized by Jodelet (2001), which introduces two texts on this subject: One by Abric (2001), explaining his interest in the experimental study of representations, highlighting their specificity, hypotheses formulated, internal structure, and dynamics, and identifying the emergence of the central core; the other by Flament (2001), addressing questions around “ideology and representation” and “practices and representations,” stating, among other aspects, that “a social representation comprises peripheral schemes, structurally organized by a central core, which is the very identity of the representation” (p. 184). Therefore, I believe the concept of the *central core* has become fundamental to many research projects developed within the framework of the Central Core Theory, particularly in Brazil. What is your opinion about this?

JCJ – This methodological concept underwent significant development in Brazil, largely due to the teachings of Celso Sá (1940-2016), a prominent figure in social psychology, both in



Brazil and internationally. Celso Sá is the only Brazilian presence I recall from that 1992 meeting in Ravello. It was there that we met and initiated Portuguese-Brazilian collaboration projects, with Jorge Vala also joining us. However, we learned from Celso that the Theory of Social Representations had already been introduced in Brazil by Denise Jodelet (1935-), a close collaborator of Serge Moscovici. This led me to joke that, in terms of social psychology, it wasn't the Portuguese, but the French who first arrived in Brazil. From that point on, development was very rapid, with Brazilian colleagues playing a decisive role in the consolidation of social psychology, especially in the field of social representations. Thus, in 1994, the first International Conference on Social Representations (ICSR) was held in Rio de Janeiro (for some, it was Ravello in 1992). This event became a biennial tradition, alternating between Europe and Latin America. In odd-numbered years, it was followed by the International Conferences (JIRS) held in various Brazilian cities, in addition to numerous thematic initiatives and locally organized Summer Schools. The implementation of the Theory, on the other hand, diversified and differentiated itself, further confirming its effectiveness and potential. Today, it is difficult for me to have a comprehensive view of the various versions the theory has undergone, as well as of the multitude of its applications.

Regarding the TCC, I remember the reference that Flament in particular made to the applications of the model in Brazil, by Celso Sá, on the social representation of science perhaps taken as paradigmatic of many others that followed. On a personal note, I recall having collaborated on an international project on economic representations, coordinated by Pierre Vergès, from the University of Aix. Together with Flament, we owe them the development and operationalization of the mathematical model for the "analysis of similarities," which became the foundation for more advanced empirical data analysis and eventually became the hallmark of the TCC. This, however, was not the approach I came to adopt. Instead, I preferred the more genealogical perspective of the so-called "Paris school," that is, the Moscovici–Jodelet duo.

MFBA – I agree with that. At this moment, I would like to emphasize how important Denise Jodelet's strong presence among us was. She actively participated in the Brazilian Conferences on Social Representations (BCSR), CIRS, and JIRS, contributing not only to the dissemination of Moscovician work but, above all, demonstrating its fertility. She highlighted its research objects, directions, and propositions (Jodelet, 2011). It is important to also highlight Jodelet's (2017) willingness to analyze Latin American research based on social representations, aiming to achieve "sociocultural knowledge without borders," which could encompass the "symbolic, the historical, and the cultural."

Also, another point I would like to comment on is the fact that Jodelet (2017), based on Augé, explains to us the logic that governs symbolic constructions when referring to "a social state and the historical regime" (p. 71). In this sense, she recovers Augé's "triple logic", indicating: 1st the *logic of difference*, which is primarily based on biological differences, such as gender, and reproduces binary classification systems; 2nd the *logic of reference*, which is integrated into cultural systems and emphasizes the role of social and power relations, and 3rd the *logic of time or chronological logic*, which concerns the "recording of events in the history of individuals and groups" (Jodelet, 2017, p. 71, our translation). In other words, it seems significant to analyze the approaches built upon the Moscovician theory, identifying the differences, establishing their references, and gradually expanding to other spaces and situations experienced by those conducting research in this direction over time. Furthermore, Jodelet (2001) encourages us to map the space related to the study of social representations by posing three key questions: "Who knows and where do they know it from?"; "What do they know and how?"; and "What do they know and with what effects?" (p. 28). Based on these



questions, the author also identifies three key issues that have been studied or investigated within the field of the TSR: a) the "conditions of production and circulation;" b) "processes and states," and c) the "epistemological status of social representations" (Jodelet, 2001, p. 28). Such issues also contribute to outlining a mapping of studies, investigations and other developments for the TSR.

As mentioned, I must highlight Celso Sá's (2007) perspective on the formation of Brazilian social psychology, which, according to him, is characterized by being fundamentally "plural, critical, and averse to rigid disciplinary boundaries" (p. 12). I would like to emphasize once again, as you pointed out, that the notion of the *central core* of a social representation, proposed by Abric (1994), was studied, investigated, and disseminated by Sá (1996a, 1996b). Furthermore, we have another book by Sá (1998), which contributes immensely to the "construction of the research object in social representations," especially in guiding our students. In this sense, I consider it important to also mention the text by Celso Pereira de Sá and Angela Arruda (2000), which presents a study of social representations in Brazil, offering an initial survey of the trajectory of SR, from 1982 to 1997. I would also like to highlight the paper "Intercambios entre la educación y la teoría de las representaciones sociales en Brasil," by Clarilza Prado de Sousa and Adelina Novaes (2022), which discusses the most recent research developed by the International Center for Studies in Social Representations and Subjectivity – Education (CIERS-ed⁶), and explores the relationship between Education and the TSR.

In addition to these data, might the Professor have any other important aspects to highlight regarding other elements addressed by Social Psychology, including social representations?

JCJ – Thank you, dear Colleague, for these details, many of which were unfamiliar to me. I would just like to add one more observation, which also serves as a tribute to the development of this line of research in Brazil. I refer once again to the pioneering role of Celso Sá, now in the area of "*social memory*" which, starting with Maurice Halbwachs (1877-1945), and later taken up by Denise Jodelet, gave rise to several studies published by Celso, if not even to the creation of a school with its own identity. I would like to recall the study we conducted based on his idea, which focused on the social memory of the discovery of Brazil in 1500. Specifically, it examined how this historical event is interpreted today by both intellectual elites and common sense, as well as how it is conveyed to future generations through schools and in the media. This intersection of the TSR with other social and human sciences, such as Anthropology, Sociology, and History, undoubtedly represents one of the most promising trends in the area. This multidisciplinary study, which brought together psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, and historians from both Brazil and Portugal, resulted in a book published by the Museum of the Republic, Rio de Janeiro. The book, called "*Collective Memories of the Discovery of Brazil*," was coordinated by Celso Sá and Paula Castro (2005).

⁶ CIERS-ed was created in 2006, under the initiative of Serge Moscovici (Fondation Maison de Sciences de l'Homme, France), Denise Jodelet (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, France) and Clarilza Prado de Sousa (PUC/SP), and is currently coordinated by Adelina Novaes (Carlos Chagas Foundation/FCC and University City of São Paulo). CIERS-ed/FCC also has two Chairs, led by Lúcia Villas Bôas: UNESCO Chair on Teacher Professionalization and Franco-Brazilian Serge Moscovici Chair (the latter in alliance with Nikos Kalampalikis). Data available at: <https://www.fcc.org.br/educacao-pesquisa/ciers/>. Visited on: 08 Feb. 2025.



MFBA – In Brazil, we had access to Sá's invaluable work, *“Collective Memories of the Discovery of Brazil”* (Sá; Castro, 2005), as well as to another publication (Sá et al., 2000), which aims to characterize the state of social memory regarding the discovery of Brazil among the Brazilian population. This study involved 742 adult subjects and was conducted one year before the celebration of Brazil's fifth centenary. The results, from the perspective of the TRS, sought to define several key aspects: The predominance of the arrival of navigators in Brazil within the memory of the subjects; the complaints and criticisms directed at the official history, and whether favorable and unfavorable attitudes coexist toward the Portuguese discoverers and colonizers. Indeed, having experienced this research must have been significant for you! At this point, I would like to revisit Jodelet (2017), who addresses the theme of "social memory" in a significant way, particularly when discussing the "conflicts between histories and spatial records of memory." She highlights the models that guide the relationship between the history of memory, the issues of conflict, the opposition between memory and history, the connection between memory and the city, and the ethical dimension of working with memory. I also consider it significant when the author works with “mass memory,” emphasizing that it is the “moral and affective side of History” (p. 193-224). Here in Brazil, Sá is certainly one of the researchers who best addresses social memory from a psychosocial perspective (Sá, 2007), when discussing the unifying principles of the field of social memory and showing its constructive character and its articulation with social thought and its affective dynamics. Now, I ask you: How was the experience of leaving your roles as a professor and researcher at the mentioned universities? Can you tell us a little about that?

JCJ – During the 20 years between 1994 and 2014, after I ceased performing institutional functions, my work in social psychology was more focused in Brazil and Italy than in Portugal. In Italy, it was thanks to Annamaria de Rosa, from the “La Sapienza” University of Rome, who had encountered the initiative in Ravello in 1982, that a European doctorate in Social Representations was created. This was based on an International Agreement and implemented through annual seminars primarily held in Rome. The program was supervised by Serge Moscovici, Klaus Helkama, from the University of Helsinki, and me, a trio that convened at the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in Paris. It was there that De Rosa took stock of the progress made in terms of the internationalization and expansion of the theory. Professor Annamaria played a fundamental role in the dissemination and deepening of the TRS.

MFBA – It is great to hear about this! I know how important Professor Annamaria is, but I have only read the text she wrote about “The impact of images and the social sharing of emotions in the construction of social memory: a shocking mass flash memory from September 11th to the Iraq war” (De Rosa, 2005). In this text, what she calls “multi-paradigmatic integration” is significant, as she simultaneously considers the conceptual dimensions - *image, memory, social representations* and *mass communication systems*-, to analyze the effects of the tragic events of September 11, in an attempt to understand what she calls “flash memory of mass.” In view of this, the text also highlights the “social memory” aspect, which encompasses the memory of mass media and the role of images and emotions in social construction and sharing. This paper reminds me of another one, written by Villas Bôas (2015), also a Colleague of ours in the discussions between Moscovici and Bourdieu, and who weaves, in it, reflections on “History, memory and social representations,” presenting a “critical and interdisciplinary approach.” His intention is to propose a discussion on the public uses of memory and history, without putting aside the political dimension and social representations, especially when interpreting some singularities regarding the “Brazilian military coup” and the “creation of the National Truth



Commission.” And this leads us to once again reflect on the importance of the “social memory” aspect for our studies on social representations. I now propose that we revisit the theories developed by Moscovici, as I believe you can help us gain a better understanding of the key concepts that have become essential to our studies and research. So, Professor, can we move on to this more specific question?

JCJ – Returning to the specific question of engaging with the theories developed by Serge Moscovici, it is important to remember that he was a multidisciplinary author, not just the creator of the TSR, with which his name is most commonly associated. It is true that his magnum opus, “Psychoanalysis: Its Image and Its Public”—originally his doctoral thesis, published in 1961 and revised in 1976—remains the definitive reference that established his reputation. However, Serge Moscovici did not confine himself to introducing this “new perspective” into social psychology; rather, he aimed to develop a broader and more integrative social theory with the ambition of unifying the field of social sciences. His contribution to the more specific field of social influence processes, which took on a more experimental nature, was no less innovative. This even raised questions about a possible epistemological incompatibility with the constructivist logic of the TSR. This issue remains a topic of debate, and it cannot be ruled out that, in scientific practice, we may also encounter the phenomenon of “*cognitive polyphasia*”—a concept introduced by SM to describe beliefs that appear contradictory but are, in fact, only seemingly so.

MFBA – There is no doubt that Moscovici’s work is vast and prolific. In addition to the Theory of Social Representations (Moscovici, 2012), we have the Theory of Social Influence (Moscovici, 1985) and his work on the Psychology of Active Minorities (Moscovici, 2011b), among many others. Notably, “The Invention of Society” (Moscovici, 2011a) earned him the Amalfi Award, one of the most prestigious in Europe. This book encourages us to reflect on the society we live in, the history we have experienced, and the possibilities for reinventing new ideas to address the many challenges we face—and will continue to face—every day. Furthermore, we must not forget that there are researchers and scholars who focus on specific Moscovician theories, such as social influence and/or the TSR, or who draw on particular Moscovician concepts to analyze them more deeply in relation to their research and teaching practices, all within the scope of a psychosocial perspective. What is your opinion about this?

JCJ – In the case I am mentioning, it is almost paradoxical that SM is primarily debated within the field of social influence processes. This is largely due to the fact that his work has been embraced by the international scientific community, which is predominantly influenced by the American positivist paradigm. In a sense, there is a kind of divide among the followers of Moscovici—those who focused on continuing the line of studies on social influence and those who pursued the TSR line. Between these two sub-communities there has not been, or at least so it seems to me, any attempt at dialogue. The boundaries are respected as if they were incommensurable paradigms. But SM himself does not seem to have shown any interest in projecting an image of strict paradigmatic coherence. On the contrary, I have always seen him as the creative thinker behind the “thousand flowers that bloom” and “methodological polytheism,” in the beautiful phrase that Annamaria de Rosa often invoked in his honor. I believe, however, that in early collaborators like Willem Doise, particularly concerning group dynamics processes, we can find clues that help establish a bridge between the macro levels of social representations—those that gain broad consensus, reminiscent of Émile Durkheim (1858-1917)—and the micro levels of inter-individual relations within small groups. Both are credited with the publication of the work “*Conflict and Consensus – A General Theory of Collective*



Decisions” (Moscovici; Doise, 1991), which was first published in 1991 in its Portuguese version in Portugal, followed by the French version in 1992 and the English version in 1994. It was primarily this mediating zone that attracted me the most and even influenced the studies I conducted in the field of leadership processes, where I sought to apply the polarization theory developed by Serge Moscovici and Marisa Zavalloni (1969)—an equally innovative theory that has now been robustly validated.

The phenomenon of polarization—that is, the tendency for collective deliberation to push individual positions to extremes—had been previously identified, but only as a tendency for groups to adopt riskier positions than the average of individual stances. However, SM is credited with the idea that this tendency applies not only to the risk pole but also to the prudence pole, and that it is not limited to risk situations, but extends across the entire domain of opinions, attitudes, and beliefs. As far as I know, this line of research initiated by Serge Moscovici and Willem Doise is even more relevant today, given the new context of digitalized social networks in which we live. This has led to much more complex and flexible mediations, where the transition from the micro level to the macro level has become increasingly diffuse and problematic. The distinction that SM makes between open groups and closed groups, closely tied to his theory of active minorities as generators of social innovation, seems to acquire clearer meaning today. I believe it supports the idea that polarization mechanisms facilitate the opening of groups—or at least the dilution of their borders—an essential process that transitions from individual representations to social representations. This perspective also helps to understand SM's insistence on demarcating social representations, which are by nature open, from ideologies, which are by nature closed.

MFBA –I agree with your observations, and would like to highlight that when reading the text by Moscovici, Zavalloni, and Louis-Guerin (1972), I gained a deeper understanding of how these studies contribute to our understanding of the effects of polarization in shaping people's views. They also help explain how individuals are influenced in and by the group during judgment tasks, which may even involve a "cognitive reorganization," as they suggest. On the other hand, you also mention the book by Moscovici and Doise (1991), and I would like to highlight how significant their positions were to me. In particular, their assertion that "consensus" is based on three fundamental ideas: *Choice*, *trust*, and *reason*. They argue that the truth and strength of *choice* depend on the existence of a consensus; they define *trust* as the absence of fear of violence, the avoidance of suspicion, and the belief in the “good faith of each one,” and they view *reason* as what guides “individuals on the path of common science” (p. 10). For these authors, the key is to recognize the reality of conflicts of opinions and interests, allowing the parties to be guided and, above all, to seek a solution amidst antagonistic positions. You might ask me why I prioritized the issue of “consensus”? It is because it seems to me to be a fundamental element for reflecting on our concerns regarding participation and reinforcing more democratic practices, especially in the field of Education in which I work. Even to confront, as you point out, the “phenomenon of polarization” between the “pole of prudence” and the “pole of risk,” which is so prevalent in our training and teacher professionalization practices. In light of this, I also tend to agree with you when you refer to the mechanisms of polarization, particularly when considering, according to Moscovici, that "social representations are *open by nature*, while ideologies are *closed by nature*." I understand that, in this brief explanation, you also returned to your article “Entre representações sociais e ideologias – o caso do gênero” (“Between Social Representations and Ideologies – The Case of Gender”) (Jesuíno, 2021), where you discuss Moscovici's earlier work, “O fim das representações sociais?” (“The End of Social Representations?”). I go back to this work of



yours for two reasons: 1st because it states that the TSR is a scientific theory, based on a methodology that “refers to reason and not to belief” (p. 281), and 2nd, when considering that ideologies “refer to an ‘epistemology of denunciation,’ to which it proposes as an alternative an ‘epistemology of criticism,’ of the confrontation of ideas” (p. 282, emphasis added). I also believe that there is the *open nature* of the TSR, as it confronts ideas, enables openness, critical thinking and encourages scientific rather than ideological dialogue. But, returning to our question, which other groups chose different paths? You have already mentioned a few, but could you summarize this briefly?

JCJ – Returning to the more restricted community centered around the TSR, there were also divisions, such as the structuralist and certainly more cognitivist approach to the *Central Core Theory*, which I have already mentioned, as well as the more socio-genealogical approaches explored by Willem Doise. Additionally, there is the more anthropological perspective of Denise Jodelet (2005), in her study on the representations of mental disorders in a rural French community that welcomes deinstitutionalized mental patients. In the representation of these places, mental illness is seen as something organic, with a risk of contagion, thus justifying its stigmatization. In a closed community such as in the case of the Jodelet study, consensus would in fact be the norm and the shared representation of mental disorders or at least of the examples seen there, which would be “hegemonic” in nature, to recall Moscovici's term. I am only referring to initial trends that lead to the application of the survey of representations to clear domains such as Health and Education, which continue to provide the conditions that position the TSR as a Social Observatory in the processes of change and communication, as well as the dynamics that interconnect them. No less important for the development of the TSR was the contribution of Ivana Marková (1937–2024), although she joined the community gathered around Serge Moscovici later on. She was also deeply interested in and published work on the issue of “trust” that the Colleague raises. In this sense, there is a book by Markova and Gillespie (2008), “Trust and Distrust: Sociocultural Perspectives,” in which I collaborated with one of the chapters, titled “Theorizing the Social Dynamics of Trust in Portugal” (Jesuino, 2008).

Ivana Marková was a Czech-born social psychologist who, once exiled, took over a teaching position at the University of Stirling, in Scotland. She was a specialist in language issues, and it is thanks to her that we were introduced to the dialogism of Mikhail Bakhtin (1895-1975), as SM himself acknowledged in a long interview he gave her in 2000. This interview has since become a fundamental text for better understanding Moscovici's intellectual journey.⁷ IM's work “*Dialogicality and Social Representations*,” published in 2003, is another essential milestone for a more comprehensive reading of the TSR, but above all for the way it shows how representations are constructed through communication. I can and must say that I owe it to Ivana Marková for alerting me to dialogism as an alternative to dialectics. This perspective highlights communication processes that tend to open, rather than close, groups within their identity boundaries, thus facilitating reciprocal influences that are not necessarily convergent. Polyglossia instead of monoglossia, in Bakhtin's terminology, or also dialogism instead of monologism.

MFBA – Here in Brazil, Ivana Marková's (2006) studies are quite significant, as they contribute to the understanding of the concepts of “dialogicity” and “social representations” as “dynamics of the mind.” I find it very pertinent when Ivana Marková, while discussing the TSR,

⁷ Here, Prof. Jesuino is referring to Moscovici's book (2005) and also to the interview between SM and IM, titled “Ideias e seu desenvolvimento: um diálogo entre Serge Moscovici e Ivana Marková” (“Ideas and their development: A conversation between Serge Moscovici and Ivana Marková”) (Moscovici, 2005, p. 305-387).



distinguishes two interconnected meanings: She refers to the TSR as the theory of social knowledge and also as a theory concerned with the study of specific social phenomena that emerge in public discourse. In addition to these aspects, Marková (2006) also explains that “the theory of social knowledge and the specific theory of social representations feed off each other” (p. 280). I also consider it especially important when she refers to two other concepts of the TSR: *Themata* (or *theme* in the singular) and *theming* (Marková, 2006, p. 243-275). The author says that “themata are dialogical concepts that contribute significantly to the theoretical development of the theory of social representations, as a theory of knowledge” (p. 248). Further on, she explains that themata “are normally theoretical assumptions that guide and restrict scientific thinking from the inside out. They are not usually explicit in scientific terminologies and can be largely revealed through meta-analyses” (p. 250). However, “thematization and re-thematization of social representations occur through different styles of thought and communication” (p. 268). Marková (2006, p. 268) further reinforces that these styles “are structured by the social positions of interlocutors, by their personal interrelationships, by norms and rules of education and tradition.”

I would like to draw your attention, Professor, to the fact that in another work, Marková (2017) revisits the Moscovician concept of *cognitive polyphasia*, which you have already remarked on, defining it as: “The simultaneous and dynamic coexistence of different modalities of thought and knowledge, such as traditional and modern or ritualistic and scientific” (p. 363); in addition, she also states that “cognitive polyphasia is characterized by tension, conflict and restrictions, rather than by balance and adaptation” (p. 363). Finally, it is important to consider Marková's studies (2006, 2017), as they concern the “linguistic aspects of thematization,” the “polyphasia in thought and knowledge,” the “explorations of speech and communication genres,” the “interdependencies between modern technology, dialogicity and the relevant macrosocial phenomenon” (Marková, 2006, p. 281). However, what I consider significant in Marková's work (2006) is the understanding of the TSR as a theory of social knowledge. Having known her well and collaborated with her, do you have anything else to share?

JCJ – Although Ivana Marková was not particularly inclined towards the perspective of the Central Core, the new approach she proposed ultimately contributed to challenging the idea of a core that organizes the periphery of cognitive representations. Instead, she emphasized the agency of the peripheries in the construction of a transient center. This is a shift that TCC theorists have been admitting since Claude Flament and now with even greater reason to do so. See, in particular, the most recent works of Pascal Moliner. As for Marková's 2016 work, published in Brazil, I couldn't agree more with my Colleague, only adding that the centrality of notions such as “epistemic trust” and “epistemic responsibility” introduced within the scope of Social Theory stands out. While it is true that for Serge Moscovici the communicational logic complements and is even a condition of possibility of representational processes. It suffices to recall the pioneering work on Psychoanalysis in France during the 1950s; above all, it is to Marková that we owe the deepening of the logic that connects the two processes.

I had the opportunity to collaborate on several editorial initiatives organized by IM, but I would like to highlight the most recent one, in 2018—a special issue of *Culture & Psychology* dedicated to Gustav Jahoda (1920–2016), a social psychologist who strongly criticized the TSR in 1988. I then had the opportunity to return in this work to Jean Piaget, which Gustav Jahoda had, in a certain way, continued in his research with children, but who equally influenced SM in terms of constructivist epistemology (Marková; Jesuíno, 2018). The confrontation between SM's and JP's theories evolved into a distinct line of research, extensively documented in the work of Gerard Duveen (1951–2008), who spearheaded the first English translation of



Psychanalyse, son image et son public, in 2008. The absence of such a translation may, to some extent, explain the limited reception that the TSR had in the English-speaking community, despite the efforts of Robert Farr and Serge Moscovici. In 1984, they published a work in English dedicated to promoting the TSR, with contributions from several European social psychology scholars. This collective work runs parallel to the one published by Denise Jodelet in French, in 1989, both of which have become essential references for the study of the TSR.

MFBA – As for Duveen, I believe my first encounter with his work was through the intriguing texts “O poder das ideias” (“The Power of Ideas”) (Duveen, 2005) and “Children as Social Actors: Social Representations in Development” (Duveen, 2003). Regarding the latter, I recall Castorina's (2009) interpretation, in which he identifies Duveen as the leading researcher on the relationship between the TSR and Developmental Psychology, analyzing Piaget's and Vygotsky's perspectives on children's social knowledge. After Duveen's passing in 2008, a book edited by Moscovici, Jovchelovitch, and Wagoner (2013) was published, highlighting his contributions to development as a social process. This book is organized into three sections, which cover: 1st Duveen's engagement with Jean Piaget; 2nd the role of social life in human development and the construction of cognition, and 3rd social representations and social identities. It is a precious collection of the near entirety of Duveen's work, as well as being a beautiful tribute to this author and a wonderful gift to us all. Do you recall any other aspects of the TSR, by Moscovici?

JCJ – There is also another source of SM's work to be addressed separately. I am referring to the line of Philosophy of Science, which culminated in the publication of “*Histoire Humaine de la Nature*” (Moscovici, 1968), another work that was overlooked, despite being followed by a series of essays that gained broader attention. All of these works led to the central issue that SM terms the “*Natural Question*,” which, in his view, represents the ecological challenge that threatens the survival of our planet. The ecological praxis advocated by SM is an opportunity to apply his thesis of active minorities as a source of change. In this context, it serves as a means to raise awareness about common-sense representations concerning the urgency of not only changing social regulations but also transforming the very model of the hegemonic social contract to which we have been subjected since the Enlightenment. This facet of SM's work is, moreover, the one with which I feel most affinity at the moment, as it is the area that has attracted my greatest attention over the last ten years. In any case, the issue is not about changing paradigms but rather shifting, on one hand, to more abstract and general levels of analysis, and on the other, revisiting the disciplinary boundaries within the field of both natural and human sciences. For this, both Jean Piaget and Serge Moscovici remain essential reference points.

MFBA – Indeed, this work of Moscovici's (1968) is particularly relevant for today's times, displaying an extraordinary level of genius and remarkable scope. The book spans 606 pages, with the first part addressing “natural processes and the succession of states of nature.” In the second part, Moscovici examines “the evolution of natural categories and disciplines,” followed by a discussion in the third part on “society and the human history of nature.” The most interesting thing is that, in his *conclusions*, the author points to two themes. The first section is titled “Por uma nova ciência: a tecnologia política” (“For a New Science: Political Technology”) (p. 659–679), where Moscovici proposes a program of political technology. He emphasizes “the general history of education” and the “history of the formation of the human species” from the perspective of “different histories” (p. 678), while also highlighting “the dynamic aspect of political technology” (p. 679). Furthermore, in the second part of his



conclusions, he aims to shed light on the theme "Two cultures or just one" (p. 680-694) and offers the following final reflection: "Whoever develops the theory projects his movement and his language, knowing that only the human race [...] adds to the announcement of truth the power of reality" (p. 694, our translation). In light of these various ruptures in theoretical approaches, developed by Moscovici (1968, 1985, 2005, 2011a, 2011b, 2012) and expanded by other lines, as we have seen, could you explain what you consider to be "boundary work?"

JCJ – In this regard, related to "*boundary work*," I must mention the project that brought us both together, dear Colleague, initiated by our late Colleague Moisés Domingos Sobrinho (1958-2021). The project aimed to form a "reflection group" on the boundaries between Social Psychology and Sociology, or more specifically, between SM's TSR and Pierre Bourdieu's Social Field theories (1930-2002). This theme was previously mentioned by Willem Doise, and it is a subject on which we later published texts together, as noted. In one of these works, titled "*The crowd as a boundary object in social sciences*" (Jesuino, 2023), as a chapter of a collective work on interdisciplinarity from 2023, I examine the controversy that occurred in 1982 on the occasion of the publication of "*L'âge des foules*" ("*The Age of the Crowd*") by SM, a debate that took place on Radio France but is rarely referred to or commented on either by social psychologists or sociologists familiar with these topics. I conclude, in this study, that interdisciplinary relationships, even when they seem obvious, are difficult, especially when dialectics prevails over dialogism.

MFBA – Professor Jesuino, I remember when you spoke about this publication, based on the text transcribed by our late friend Moisés, and I also tend to agree with the conclusions of this study. Now, I would like to highlight that from this same transcription, we wrote a text titled "Abordagem psicossocial das massas: o debate Serge Moscovici e Pierre Bourdieu e contribuições para a educação" ("Psychosocial approach to the masses: The debate between Serge Moscovici and Pierre Bourdieu and contributions to education") (Lima, Villas Bôas, Abdalla, 2022). Our intention was to revisit the problematization surrounding the concepts of "masses" and "crowds" from a psychosocial perspective and, if possible, identify interfaces with education. We also aimed to highlight a few elements from the debate between Moscovici and Bourdieu that could contribute to understanding the notion of masses and the role of beliefs in this context, with the goal of reflecting on the current state of Brazilian education. For us, the problem of *belief* has become fundamental; and, in this direction, we outline three aspects, addressing: 1st educational policies and their regulation and control standards; 2nd the possibilities of action and overcoming strategies in facing obstacles, and 3rd the effects of the influence of education in fostering beliefs in subjects so that they "understand the logic of the social world and their possibilities of exercising leadership in this sense" (p. 248). To us, these aspects remain present in the history of the educational field and, at times, lead to disenchantment, insecurity, and contradictions, "potentiating forms of conformism, on the one hand, and resistance, on the other" (p. 248). This provided clues to help us understand some of today's educational issues.

To conclude our "conversation," I would like to ask if there is anything else that could help us gain a better understanding of the importance of the TSR in our research, particularly those focusing on the educational field.

JCJ – There is certainly much more to discuss; we merely skimmed the surface, highlighting one or two prominent landmarks, leaving a more in-depth exploration for later. Serge Moscovici was a broad-spectrum intellectual defying any attempt at a coherent synthesis that he possibly



never sought. He prioritized innovation and always believed that the fundamental characteristic of science was its fertility. A holder of vast knowledge, he was well-versed in both the so-called hard sciences and in the social sciences, in addition to being deeply inspired by universal literature. The public sphere also mobilized him, to the point where he ran for political office as a committed ecologist. He exemplified a well-known old aphorism – “nothing human was foreign to him.” We owe him the creation of a school through a group of close collaborators who not only validated his hypotheses but also contributed to diversifying both the theoretical models and their numerous applications. In Brazil, he found a particular audience as if it were the key helping to decipher his watercolor. We have had the opportunity to mention some of his followers and disciples, but we are aware that many others have been unjustly silenced. However, the theory of social representations, like the entire field of social sciences and even science as a whole, continues to acquire new configurations and boundaries, both internally and in the political dynamics that grant them centrality in global society. Today we are all constructivists without, however, any naively relativist complicity. But that does not make us any less perplexed or uneasy about the drift towards new technocratic hegemonies.

A final word of thanks to my Colleague Fátima Abdalla for conceiving this exchange of ideas on topics that we have in common and on which we have worked in partnership. And also, a salute to the warm reception by the Brazilian editorial community for the space it continues to offer to the debate on these recycled issues.

MFBA – Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you once again for the chance to be together, reflecting on such significant issues. It allows us to appreciate how valuable this exchange of words, experiences, and ideas is in helping us continue our struggles in facing the many challenges that lie ahead!

All of this also reminds me of the words of Moscovici (2012, p. 426), when he says: “The struggle of ideas, whatever their form, if they do not always resolve what they propose, necessarily respond to an ideal of truth from which we can sometimes move away, but never separate ourselves.” So, let us continue together in our fight for ideas and for Life!

References

ABDALLA, Maria de Fátima Barbosa (org.). **Bourdieu e Moscovici: fronteiras, interfaces e aproximações**. Santos: Editora Universitária Leopoldianum, 2019.

ABDALLA, Maria de Fátima Barbosa. Dialogue with Jorge Correia Jesuino. **Revista Educação e Cultura Contemporânea**. Rio de Janeiro, v. 19, n. 58, p. 307-329, 2022.

ABDALLA, Maria de Fátima Barbosa. A new Conversation with Jorge Correia Jesuino. **Revista Eletrônica Pesquiseduca**. Santos, v. 16, n. 42, p. 414-444, nov. 2024.

ABDALLA, Maria de Fátima Barbosa; DOMINGOS SOBRINHO, Moisés; CAMPOS, PEDRO HUMBERTO FARIA. Apresentação - Repensando o social: diálogos com Pierre Bourdieu e Serge Moscovici. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 48, n. 167, p. 10-13, jan./mar. 2018.

ABRIC, Jean-Claude. **Pratiques sociales et représentations**. Paris : Preses Universitaires de France, 1994.



ABRIC, Jean-Claude. O estudo experimental das representações sociais. *In*: JODELET, D. (org.). **As Representações Sociais**. Tradução de Lilian Ulup. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2001, p. 155-171.

CASTORINA, José Antonio. Gerard Duveen: un enfoque dialéctico para relacionar la teoría de las Representaciones Sociales y la Psicología del Desarrollo. **Psicologia da Educação**, São Paulo, n. 29, p. 7-26, 2º sem.2009.

DE ROSA, Annamaria Silvana. O impacto das imagens e a partilha social de emoções na construção da memória social: uma chocante memória *flash* de massa do 11 de setembro até a guerra do Iraque. *In*: SÁ, C. P. de (org.). **Memória, imaginário e representações sociais**. Rio de Janeiro: Museu da República, 2005, p. 121- 164.

DOISE, Willem. Attitudes et représentations sociales : um bref aperçu historique. *In*: JODELET, D. (org.). **Les Représentations Sociales**. Paris : Les Presses universitaires de France, mars 1989, p. 242-261.

DOISE, Willem. Da Psicologia Social à Psicologia Societal. **Psicologia: Teoria e Pesquisa**. Brasília, v. 18, n. 1, p. 27-35, jan./abr. 2002a.

DOISE, Willem. Jalons pour une psychologie sociétale. *In*: GARNIER, C. (ed.). **Les forms de la pensée sociale**. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (PUF), 2002b, p. 79-93.

DUVEEN, Gerard. Crianças enquanto atores sociais: as representações sociais em desenvolvimento. *In*: GUARESCHI, P. A.; JOVCHELOVITCH, S. (org.). **Textos em Representações Sociais**. 8ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003, p. 261-293.

DUVEEN, Gerard. O poder das ideias. *In*: MOSCOVICI, S. **Representações Sociais: investigações em psicologia social**. 3ª. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2005.

FLAMENT, Claude. Estrutura e dinâmica das representações sociais. *In*: JODELET, D. (org.). **As Representações Sociais**. Tradução de Lilian Ulup. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2001, p. 173-186.

GOMES, Lauren Beltrão *et al.* Pesquisas transculturais em psicologia do desenvolvimento: considerações teórico-metodológicas. **Arquivo Brasileira de Psicologia**. Rio de Janeiro, v. 70, n. 11, p. 260-275, 2017.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Continuidades e discontinuidades da psicologia à sociologia. **Psicologia**, v, 1, n. 1, p. 5-9, 1980.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. **O que é Psicologia**. Lisboa: Quimera, 1992.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. A Psicologia Social Europeia. *In*: VALA, J.; MONTEIRO, M.B. (org.). **Psicologia Social**. 3ª ed. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1997a, p. 49-59.



JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Estruturas e processos de grupo: interações e factores de eficácia. *In: VALA, J.; MONTEIRO, M.B. (org.). Psicologia Social*. 3ª ed. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1997b, p. 259-286.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Latin europeu cluster: from South to North. **Journal of World Business**, Elsevier, v. 37, n.1, p. 81-89, March 2002.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Theorizing the Social Dynamics of Trust in Portugal. *In: MARKOVÁ, Ivana; GILLESPIE, Alex (ed.). Trust and Distrust: sociocultural perspectives*. Charlotte, N.C.: IAP, 2008, p. 179-206.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Conversação com Serge Moscovici. *In: JESUÍNO, J.C.; MENDES, F. R. P.; LOPES, M. J. (org.). As representações sociais nas sociedades em mudança*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2015, p. 327-348.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Entre representações sociais e ideologias – o caso do gênero. *In: ROSO, Adriane et al. (org.). Mundos sem fronteiras: representações sociais e práticas psicossociais*. Florianópolis: ABRAPSO Editora, 2021, p. 280-319.

JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. The crowd a boundary object in social sciences. *In: POMBO, O.; GÄRTNER, K.; JESUÍNO, J. C. (ed.). Theory and Practice in the interdisciplinary production and reproduction of scientific knowledge: ID in the XXI Century*. Berlin: Springer Verlag, 2023, p. 205-221.

JODELET, Denise. Representações sociais: um domínio em expansão. *In: JODELET, D. (org.). As Representações Sociais*. Tradução de Lilian Ulup. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2001, p. 17-44.

JODELET, Denise. **Loucuras e Representações Sociais**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2005.

JODELET, Denise. A fecundidade múltipla da obra “Psicanálise, sua imagem e seu público”. *In: ALMEIDA, A. M. de; SANTOS, M. F. de S.; TRINDADE, Z. A. (org.). Teoria das Representações Sociais: 50 anos*. Brasília: Technopolitik, 2011, p. 199-223.

JODELET, Denise. **Representações sociais e mundos de vida**. Edição de Nikos Kalampalikis (org.). Tradução de Lilian Ulup Paris: Éditions des archives contemporaines. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas; Curitiba: PUCPress, 2017.

LIMA, Rita de Cássia Pereira; VILLAS BÔAS, Lúcia; ABDALLA, Maria de Fátima B. Abordagem psicossocial das massas: o debate entre Serge Moscovici e Pierre Bourdieu e contribuições para a educação. **Revista Educação e Cultura Contemporânea**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 19, n. 58, p. 233-257, 2022.

MARKOVÁ, Ivana. **Dialogicidade e Representações Sociais: as dinâmicas da mente**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2006.

MARKOVÁ, Ivana. A fabricação da Teoria das Representações Sociais. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**. São Paulo, v. 47, n. 163, p. 358-375, jan./mar. 2017.



MARKOVÁ, Ivana; GILLESPIE, Alex (ed.). **Trust and Distrust: sociocultural perspectives**. Charlotte, N.C.: IAP, 2008.

MARKOVÁ, Ivana; JESUÍNO, Jorge Correia. Social psychology as a developmental discipline in the dynamics of practical life: Gustav Jahoda's pioneering studies on children's social thinking. **Culture & Psychology**, v. 24, Issue 3, p. 343-357, September, 2018.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **Essai sur l'histoire humaine de la nature**. Paris: Flammarion Éditeur, 1968.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **Psicología Social I: influencia y cambio de actitudes**. Individuos y grupos. Barcelona: Editorial Paidós, 1985.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **Representações Sociais: investigações em psicologia social**. 3ª ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2005.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **A invenção da sociedade: Sociologia e Psicologia**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011a.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **Psicologia das minorias ativas**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011b.

MOSCOVICI, Serge. **A Psicanálise, sua imagem e seu público**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2012.

MOSCOVICI, Serge; DOISE, Willem. **Dissenso e consenso: uma teoria geral das decisões coletivas**. Tradução de M. Fernanda Jesuíno. Lisboa: Horizonte Psicologia, 1991.

MOSCOVICI, Serge; JOVCHELOVITCH, Sandra; WAGONER, Brady (ed.). **Development as a Social Process: contributions of Gerard Duveen**. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2013.

MOSCOVICI, Serge; ZAVALLONI, Marisa. The group as a polarizer of attitudes. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 125-135, 1969.

MOSCOVICI, Serge; ZAVALLONI, Marisa; LOUIS-GUERIN, Christiane. Studies of polarization of judgements: I. Group effects on person perception. **European Journal of Social Psychology**, v. 2, n. 1, p. 87-91, jan. 1972.

OLIVEIRA, João Manuel de; AMÂNCIO, Lígia. Teorias feministas e representações sociais: desafios dos conhecimentos situados para a psicologia social. **Estudos Feministas**, Florianópolis, v. 14, n. 3, p. 597-615, set./dez. 2006.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de. **Núcleo central das representações sociais**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1996a.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de. Representações Sociais: teoria e pesquisa do núcleo central. **Temas em Psicologia**, n. 3, p. 19-33, 1996b.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de. **A construção do objeto de pesquisa em Representações Sociais**. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 1998.



SÁ, Celso Pereira de. Sobre a Psicologia Social no Brasil, entre memórias históricas e pessoais. **Psicologia & Sociedade**, v. 19, n. 3, p. 7-13, 2007.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de; ARRUDA, Angela. O estudo das representações sociais no Brasil. **Revista de Ciências Humanas**. Florianópolis: EDUFSC, Edição Especial Temática, p. 11-31, 2000.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de; CASTRO, Paula (org.). **Memórias do descobrimento do Brasil**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora do Museu da República, 2005.

SÁ, Celso Pereira de; OLIVEIRA, Denize Cristina de; MÜLLER, Renato Cesar; NAIFF, Denis Giovani Monteiro. A memória social do descobrimento do Brasil: seu estado em 1999. **Temas em Psicologia da SBP**, v. 8, n. 3, p. 301-312, 2000.

SOUSA, Clarilza Prado de Sousa; NOVAES, Adelina. Intercambios entre la educación y la teoría de las representaciones sociales en Brasil. **Psicologia da Educação**, São Paulo, n. 55, p. 119-128, 2022.

TAJFEL, Henri. **Grupo humanos e categorias sociais**. Tradução Lígia Amâncio. Lisboa: Horizontes, 1981.

VALA, Jorge; MONTEIRO, Maria Benedicta (org.). **Psicologia Social**. 3ª. ed. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1997.

VILLAS BÔAS, Lúcia. História, memória e representações sociais: por uma abordagem crítica e interdisciplinar. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 45, n. 156, p. 244-0258, abr./jun. 2015.

