

SOCIAL REPRESENTATIONS THEORY: A POTENTIAL FOR GENDER SENSITIVE LATIN AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE REGIONAL STUDIES

Serena Eréndira Serrano Oswald¹

Strongly rooted in the sociological tradition of social psychology, the Theory of Social Representations (SRT) has been developing since the sixties as a useful theoretical and practical multidisciplinary social research tool, particularly in European and Latin American contexts. However, since the end of the nineties, and following the consolidation of Social Representations Theory, there has been an important effort to bridge this perspective with other important contemporary critical theories given its emphasis on the way in which social subjects, groups and society as a whole construct and transform meaning rooted in pre-existing knowledge and experience. Besides, in the Latin American context, one of the most promising exchanges has been established between Feminist Gender Studies and Social Representations Theory. The goal of the present paper is to outline the main premises of SRT and its importance, in order to suggest its potential and relevance for gender sensitive regional development studies applied to the Latin American context. Note that the focus of the paper is the potential of SRT for regional development studies; it does not discuss regional development studies as such.

The paper unfolds in six sections. Following this *Abstract* (1), comes a section which presents *Social Representations Theory* (2), which leads to a discussion of *What a Social Representation is* (3), followed by a section on *Epistemology and Social Representations* (4) and one addressing the *Functions of Social Representations & the link of Social Representations and Identity* (5). Finally, a section entitled *Feminist Gender Studies & Social Representations for Latin American Regional Development Research Contexts: A Common Sense Relation* (6) closes the reflections presented throughout the paper.

Keywords: Social Representations Theory; gender perspective; Latin American epistemologies; multidisciplinary research; critical social science.

Palabras clave: Teoría de Representaciones Sociales; perspectiva de género; epistemologías latinoamericanas; investigación multidisciplinaria; ciencias sociales críticas.

¹ Serena Eréndira Serrano Oswald is postdoctoral fellow at the Centre of Regional Multidisciplinary Research, National Autonomous University of Mexico (CRIM-UNAM). Email: sesohi@hotmail.com Tel: 01777-315-06-52.

Palavras-chave: Teoria das Representações Sociais; perspectiva de gênero; epistemologias latino-americanas; investigação multidisciplinaria; ciências sociais críticas.

1. Abstract

Strongly rooted in the sociological tradition of social psychology, the Theory of Social Representations (SRT) has been developing since the sixties as a useful theoretical and practical multidisciplinary social research tool, particularly in European and Latin American contexts. However, since the end of the nineties, and following the consolidation of Social Representations Theory, there has been an important effort to bridge this perspective with other important contemporary critical theories given its emphasis on the way in which social subjects, groups and society as a whole construct and transform meaning rooted in pre-existing knowledge and experience. Besides, in the Latin American context, one of the most promising exchanges has been established between Feminist Gender Studies and Social Representations Theory. The goal of the present paper is to outline the main premises of SRT and its importance, in order to suggest its potential and relevance for gender sensitive regional development studies applied to the Latin American context. Note that the focus of the paper is the potential of SRT for regional development studies; it does not discuss regional development studies as such.

The paper unfolds in six sections. Following this *Abstract* (1), comes a section which presents *Social Representations Theory* (2), which leads to a discussion of *What a Social Representation is* (3), followed by a section on *Epistemology and Social Representations* (4) and one addressing the *Functions of Social Representations & the link of Social Representations and Identity* (5). Finally, a section entitled *Feminist Gender Studies & Social Representations for Latin American Regional Development Research Contexts: A Common Sense Relation* (6) closes the reflections presented throughout the paper.

2. Social Representations Theory: An Introduction

Although strongly rooted in the sociological European tradition of social psychology, the Theory of Social Representations (SRT) is multidisciplinary from its origins as it directly draws from psychology, sociology and anthropology. SRT develops following a critique to positivism and to the individualist-collectivist juxtaposition, i.e., to individualizing and reductionist perspectives, as well as those that advocated the collective as totalizing. In the post-war years, the boom of

individual psychology in North America saw the consolidation of the behaviourist tradition represented by Allport, although it also led to an opposing trend looking at social constructionism (Farr, 1996). Initially, both had a tendency towards anonymous generalization, taking social subjects as impersonal, partial, fragmented, undifferentiated and devalued objects of study. Instead, the richness of SRT's perspective was to put forward a third way that gave primacy to social thought however addressing the processes through which individual and collective histories interrelate (Moscovici, 1976, 2000; Farr & Moscovici, 1984). Besides, social subjects came to be seen as agents, female and male social agents and groups producing and transforming specific knowledge and practices, culture and history processually.

Social Representations Theory initially developed in France in the sixties, following Serge Moscovici's work *La psychanalyse, son image et son public* (1961 [1976]). In this study, the author researched the way in which diverse groups built their specific knowledge relating to a same 'scientific' topic, according to their particular context, modes of thought and ideologies. So, Moscovici looked at the different representations of psychoanalysis held by the French Communist Party, the Catholic Church and the liberal press. The importance of this study, revised in 1976 and which has already become a social science classic was the ability of the author to question the individualistic and laboratory experimental psychology at micro level at the time, suggesting its links to other societal social sciences. However, the alternative was not to reproduce the functionalist durkheimian notion of "collective representation" that would subsume the individual either. Instead, he sought to articulate a theory that accounted both for social structure as well as for the processes whereby the social subject constantly generates, interprets, and transforms knowledge inter-subjectively. Unlike the Marxist conception of ideology as false consciousness, or the durkheimian conception of passive social subjects paralyzed in the face of "social facts" and social control, Moscovici explored the ways through which social groups are structured and act according to different yet shared social representations, enabling them to perceive, give sense and transform them, appropriating and gestating knowledge, communicating and becoming active minorities inserted by not only determined by power structures (the social change conception). In this view, conflict and tension in the social sphere are addressed positively, as motors of change and not of crises, a process of innovation that is normalized as well as questioned given representational activity (Arruda, 1998; Arruda 2010).

3. What is a Social Representation?

At this point, it becomes important to clearly note that a social representation is constructed in culture and it is not a psychological or a cognitive individual construct. Social representations are social products derived from interaction and their nature is relational. It is impossible to find an isolated social representation; it always develops, circulates and is transformed in relation to other social representations. Besides, social representations do not constitute reality as such; they are an approximation to it. Reality cannot only be seen as a social construction, as it cannot be apprehended if it is not through inter-subjective processes in which the “natural” world becomes known and is represented (Jovtchelovitch, 2007 [2001]; 2007 [2002]). Social subjects re-present reality, which is to say that they do not merely reproduce it mechanically as a mirror; they interpret and transform it and at the same time are transformed by it. This has direct implications for social scientific and feminist gender studies, given that representation processes are directly linked to the processes of conformation, maintenance and transformation of social and collective identities. The multi-level identity approach includes relations within individuals, between in-groups and out-groups, as well as historical, societal and ideological processes, including deeply embedded representations of gender such as world outlooks and other that are more flexible and less resistant to change.

In social sciences the general concept “representation” has become a “meta-notion” that “designates any content unconditionally applicable to any content or situation” (Herzlich, 1991 in Torres López, 2002: 39). However, since its inception, the notion of social representations addressed a particular type of knowledge and of social subject: common sense knowledge related with everyday experience and shared by *any* social subject regardless of age, race, gender, status and particular context (without overlooking the way in which specific contexts and constructs impact on subjects’ representations). Beyond specialized and technical knowledge, Moscovici emphasized the importance of common sense (*sensus communis*) as the symbolic capital from which all knowledge is historically constructed, rooted and transformed. This knowledge is not legitimated by its scientific testability, but following from its contextual and everyday usage. Herein resides the importance of lived experience in social representation studies that is also so important for feminism (see Flores and Wagner, 2011) and critical epistemologies. According to Jodelet (2004: 97):

“For the subject, things are not defined by their physical properties but by their lived aspects, with their value and action components. Things are not “for the subject” except for the perception that she or he has of them, given the sense that they have for her or his concrete life...”

Social representations are systems of ideas, values and practices with a dual function: i) to establish a framework of order guiding social subjects in the symbolic and material world they inhabit, and ii) to enable communication between the members of a collectivity through a shared code to name and classify objects and processes:

Social representations are “systems of values, ideas and practices” that simultaneously “establish an order that enables individuals to become familiar with and be part of the social and material world” and at the same time “enables communication between members of a community providing them with a shared social exchange code which names and classifies various aspects of the world and their personal or group history without ambiguity” (Moscovici cited in Herzlich and Graham, 1973, preface: xiii).

Social representations originate in everyday life, “society is a thinking system and they [SRs] can be seen as the contemporary equivalent of myths and belief systems in primitive societies” (Moscovici, 1981: 181 cited in Augoustinos & Walker, 1996). They emerge both from common sense and also from scientific knowledge in modern societies, and although they seem contradictory, this is because social representations explain social reality in its distinct levels of complexity. They are consensual (shared) and dynamic (they exist in a constant transformation process). Thus, social representations go way beyond ways of thinking the world, they are ways of making the world (Moscovici, 1988), of symbolically and collectively making sense and being part of change, of incorporating new phenomena (Wagner and Kronberger, in Philogène & Deaux, 2001), as well as of re-constructing the past from the present (Mead, G.H., 1932). Moscovici speaks of SRT as a way of making anthropology of modern life (1993). The study of social representations focuses on the ways in which knowledge is built, especially everyday knowledge. It is thus that SRT has important links with the processes through which social subjects and group identities are forged; through social representations that are shared and distinguish groups and group members, representations express particular cultural codes. Besides, representations have a direct relation to action- setting its norms and making it possible. According to the definition provided by Jodelet (1988: 474-5):

“The concept of social representation designates a specific form of knowledge, common sense knowledge; its contents manifest the operation of genitive and functional processes that are socially characterized. In a greater sense, it designates a form of social thought.

Social representations constitute ways of practical thought oriented to communication, comprehension and dominion of the social, material and ideal environment. As such, they present specific characteristics in terms of contents, mental operation and logic.

Social characterization of contents or of representation processes must be referred to the conditions and the contexts where representation emerge, to communication that makes them circulate and to the functions that they serve as part of the interaction with the world and with others.”

Given that SRs exist in the minds of individuals, they are understood as socio-cognitive constructions, as they have both a social and a cognitive component. However, given that they gestate in a given cultural context –which they conform– social representations go beyond being mental structures, they possibilitate and frame communication at its base. Abric describes this relation:

“Thus, a representation is not a mere reflection of reality; rather, it is its significant organisation. This signification depends as much on contingent factors –the nature and limits of a situation, its immediate context, the finality of a situation– as well as on more general factors that transcend the situation as such: [that is to say] the social and ideological context, the place of individuals in social organization, individual and group history, what is socially at stake, as well as systems of values” (Abric cited in Philogène & Deaux, 2001: 43).

Culture organises, transforms and perpetuates world experiences, framing identity as ‘social being’ in the development of the ‘mind’ (Goetz, 1972). Cognition is social by definition, it develops in social interaction. Culture constitutes its framework; it makes the formation and dissemination of SRs possible, as well as of their continuous transformation. ‘Social cognition’ implies shared representations, emerging from social systems and group relations, as well as from mental operations such as learning, interpreting, thinking, making arguments and inferences, etc (Farr & Moscovici, 1984; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Wyer & Srull, 1984). Thus, studying social representations enables us to have access to and make visible the components

of culture and its relation to gender. For example, according to G. Duveen “identity, then, is not a thing like an attitude or a particular belief. It is the force or power that links a person or group to the attitude or belief, in a word, to the representation” (Duveen, in Philogène & Deaux, 2001: 268). So, even if representations inhabit the mind, they are constituted in the world of cultural matrixes where thought emerges as such, in a relation that cannot arbitrarily separate the subject from the representational object not the researcher and her/his position with the study of representations. In this sense SRs have two basic functions:

- i) *categorizing*: they make (and are) conventional cognitive models of objects, people, facts and everyday events;
- ii) *prescribing*: as cognitive models they have an important force as they constitute the structures of reality that constantly operate *a priori* as categorizations are part of previous cognitive models, although they also have an equilibrating and justification function *a posteriori*.

So we may say that SRs precede identities –not in the durkheimian sense– but in that *in fieri* they are the base contents from which the world and auto and hetero-normative identities are constructed throughout life in agentic processes of socialization, identification, familiarization or internationalization (identitary function of social representations). Besides, SRs make communication possible, they enable us to assimilate and be part of change, as they constitute the symbolic or shared signified space that the sociogenetic vision of relational systemic processes puts forward at different levels: “individuals position themselves within groups at the same time as groups position themselves within the cultural space” (Deaux, in Philogène & Deaux, 2001: 316). Besides, whilst establishing meaning structures, representations have a power function as they “condition human existence” (Arendt, 1998 [1958]), institutionalizing knowledge, common sense, local capacities and thus they norm action.

4. Epistemology and Social Representations

The relational outlook in SRT breaks with the subject-object/ subjectivism-structuralism divide given that “an object does not exist by itself; it only exists for an individual or group and in relation to them. Thus, the subject-object relation determines the object itself. A representation is always the representation of something to somebody” (Giménez, 2005: 407). A representation always has a relational and social character; it is historically rooted without falling prey to a rigid

determinism, as re-presentation it is a process, and its working mechanism is dynamic as we shall see. According to this critical perspective, the social subject is seen as situated and agentic, and research is also not neutral. The researcher situates her or himself before the studied object, breaking the duality imposed by positive science (e.g., standpoint feminist theory following Sandra Harding).

The social subject put forward by SRT is: 1) active and autonomous in relation to the object(s) s/he “represents” throughout history (this spatial and temporal relation has been graphed as ‘Toblerone Model’; Bauer and Gaskell, 1999); 2) relationally conforming her or his identity at individual and group level; 3) possessing an ontological value in diversity which in turn validates her or his experience its derived product, namely knowledge; 4) inhabits shared universes instead of reified ones (ideology seen as deeply rooted world outlooks and not as false consciousness); 5) is not only the male social subject of traditional scientific elites; it is any female or male social subject whose knowledge and knowledge processes must be ontologically taken as valid and epistemologically addressed from a broad optic (this also includes other axes of inequality that are so relevant in Latin American contexts: age, ethnicity, status, etc). Besides, this model rearticulates the asymmetric dual subject-object (subject) research relation, inviting both to define their standpoint, and it also includes preferences, affective and emotional processes (Banchs, 2000) and lived experience (Jodelet, 2004).

There are two basic processes of historical production of knowledge: anchoring and objectification. It is through these two processes that the unfamiliar becomes familiar, and that new concepts and ideas are assimilated into pre-existing knowledge, in the contextual framework of existing world outlooks. Anchoring is the process through which an object is assigned meaning as it is associated to other symbols. Objectification implies linking existing with emerging knowledge; it is the exercise of translating something unfamiliar into something concrete. It takes place symbolically through metaphors and analogies or materially, linked to objects and entities. It is through these two processes –anchoring and objectification– that social representations fulfil their dual role (Moscovici [ed. by Duveen], italics in original, 2000: 22-3):

- a) They make **conventional** the objects, people and events we face. SRs given them a defined form, locating them into existing categories and gradually establishing them as specific, unique and shared models.

- b) They are **prescriptive**, i.e., they impose upon us with an irresistible force. This force is a combination of a pre-existing structure that is there even before we start to think, as well as of a tradition that decrees *what* it is that we should think.

5. Functions of Social Representations & the link of Social Representations and Identity

Besides the basic processes of anchoring and objectification, as well as having reviewed the structure of SRs, it is also necessary to outline the functions of SRs, in order to expose how they are a useful and complete research tool with regards to specific research objects. This is particularly relevant for feminist gender studies, as it explicitly makes the link between SRs and identity. SRT established links between subject and representational object, between the self and identity, identity and the representational contents that inform it and guide its practices, between different levels of identity ranging from the individual to the collective in a given context, between interaction and communication, thought and action, contents and processes, tradition and change, individuality and ideology as system:

“The representation works as a system of representation of reality that rules the relations of individuals with their physical and social environment, determining behaviour and practices. It is a *guide for action*, orienting actions and social relations. It is a pre-codified system of reality given that it determines a set of *anticipations* and *expectations*” (Abric, 1994: 13, emphasis in original).”

Representations are useful in order to describe, classify and explain reality (see Álvarez Bermúdez in Romero Rodríguez, 2004: 45-6). The four basic functions of social representations are (Abric, 94: 15-17; Jodelet, 1989; Banchs, 2000):

- 1) Function of *knowing*: permits understanding and communication. Social representations enable us to understand and explain reality, i.e., to acquire new information and knowledge and integrate it in an understandable framework. This representational framework makes communication possible, where common sense gestates, is disseminated and transforms knowledge.
- 2) *Orientation* function: guide behaviour and practices. Social representations are a guide for action, defining a situation and its objective, working as a system of

anticipations and expectations, as well as determining behaviours that guide social subjects.

- 3) Legitimation or *justification* function: makes it possible for social subjects to justify their postures and behaviours *a posteriori*.
- 4) *Identity* functions: defining identity as a social process that delimits and defines group identity and specificity. From SRs individuals and groups are situated in the social field, the detraditionalised public sphere (Jovchelovitch, 2007), which makes socialization processes possible (Duveen, 1997, 2001; Duveen & Lloyd, 1986, 1990; Lloyd & Duveen, 1992), as well as social comparison and esteem (Howarth, 2002 a & b). It is at this level that inter-group processes have been typically researched. However, from a deep ethnographic and systemic perspective, a specific topic, place and historical period may be researched (e.g. Jodelet, 1989), looking at the ways in which social representations define the elements that conform specific identities, the ways in which they are part of culture, and how they configure specific gender identities (See Flores, 2001; Serrano, 2010).

At this point, it is also important to make explicit the dialectic relation between existing and emerging social representations in social change dynamics seen from the Hegelian historical paradigm (Marková, 1982): just as the novel is integrated into existing representations and knowledge, existing knowledge is transformed in the lights of its relation to the novel, in such a way that reality is constantly re- presented.

6. Feminist Gender Studies & Social Representations for Latin American Regional Development Research Contexts: A Common Sense Relation

This section aims at presenting reflections surrounding the link and promising exchange between Social Representations Theory and Feminist Gender Studies (FGS), a research area that has had an important development in Latin America. It revises this exchange in order to suggest its potential and relevance for regional development studies; however it does not discuss regional development studies or particular case studies as such (*note*: this will be the focus of another complementary paper also presented at the XVII AMECIDER Congress).

Gender is a particular and indispensable lens and perspective deriving from feminism and feminist political theory. In science and policy, there is a recurrent bias of equating gender to women, often assuming that addressing women's issues marginally -either statistically or rhetorically- means being gender sensitive. Adopting a gender perspective implies looking at the ways in which the social construction of sexual difference specifically impacts on social subjects, their identities, experience, and life conditions. It means questioning the universalising male-female dyad and looking at specific subjects, groups and cultures.

The classical subject-object divide in functionalist psychological and social science studies has tended to perpetuate and justify roles and attitudes at the root of differentiation explanations, institutionalising models of 'normality', which seen as natural and consensual, impact in the construction of power relations and equity (Flores, 2009). In this sense, looking at "gendered" reality from the perspective of social representations, we become aware of the processes of knowledge construction and the functions of social representations, and it is there where we see the dual tension of knowledge as *pre-established* and knowledge *in the making*, which enables us to think of the processes through which social reality and meaning is constructed, re-constructed and may be de-constructed, with the aim of more equitable gendered social representations, for example in the Latin American context.

Gender is one of the first forms of social identity that children acquire and legitimise through their experience. Through gendered social representations social subjects establish a frame of order to understand reality and position themselves and live within the signified social world. Looking at mechanisms through which knowledge has been institutionalised through social representations within particular societies and cultures (religion, ideology, science, world outlooks) enables us as social scientists to identify the components of gender systems in cultures and to find ways of transforming them. By system is meant "the totality of ideological elements, thoughts, beliefs, values and norms that constitute social relations through which communication becomes dynamic, representing a certain complexity when analysing a social representation" (Flores, 2010: 368).

In the present case, we are interested in gender systems as such and at gender components in other representational systems. Gender systems do not exist separate from the social practices

of its individuals and groups, and they are linked to the meanings that both sustain and are central in transforming them. These shared systems of meaning and practices do not operate in a vacuum, they operate and are transformed through human relations, taking place with important power differentials. Here, the potential is to explore what are the specific meanings linked to Latin American gender system(s); how do social subjects make sense of these meanings and translate them into their personal identity; how do social subjects and groups make sense of the identity of others; what happens in terms of inter-personal and intra-/inter-group relations; how are social representations linked to individual and collective life experiences; and how to transform existing knowledge and practices in order to forge a more just and equitable society, taking into account that this process is rooted in existing unfair and inequitable meanings, representations and practice gendered systems.

Although in order to do this it is important to focus on specific regional development case studies or research areas from a feminist gender perspective, the importance of suggesting the usefulness of incorporating the Theory of Social Representations and outlining briefly its main premises and potential for Latin American multidisciplinary social science studies has been the main goal of the present paper. Instead of focusing on objectivity and neutrality, SRT and FGS take a particular research stand and position before the object (increasingly agentic subjects) of research; they see the knowledge generation process as direct, shared and dialogical (not hierarchically top-down or juxtaposed bottom-up); they look at particular contexts and power relations as they unfold across space and time (historicity and process); space is taken to be symbolic and material in its interrelation (overcoming the structural-idealist divide); both address a multiplicity of levels systemically, from the micro to the macro, intra-individual to societal an ideological dimensions; affective dimensions and experience are considered central in knowledge, change and meaning transformation systems; knowledge and change are seen as directly accessible to all and not at a merely abstract or expert level (democratization of knowledge); a variety of elements, meaning and practices are accounted for in their interrelation (not only hegemonic, dualistic or fragmentary stances); knowledge is linked to action and action to knowledge (addressing the theory-practice gap), amongst others.

Besides, it is important to note that both feminist gender studies (FGS) and social representations theory (SRT) emerged given their critical stance, they share similar premises and goals, have a common history in terms of the particular political context and dates of their

consolidation, they have a theoretical as well as a practical and multi-methodological orientation, both have consolidated by now and it is clear that nowadays they have many lessons to share in order to enrich each other and the Latin American social science scenario –including regional science studies– in the near future. Deepening this relation, especially in practical cases that may give us greater lights as to their mutually fecundating potential across diverse disciplines in the social sciences is the challenge ahead.

Bibliography

Abric, Jean-Caude, *Prácticas sociales y representaciones*, Ediciones Coyoacán, Mexico City, 1994.

Álvarez Bermúdez, Javier, “El Contexto social y teórico del surgimiento de la teoría de las representaciones sociales”, in: Romero Rodríguez, Eulogio (Ed.), *Representaciones Sociales: Atisbos y cavilaciones del devenir de cuatro décadas*, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP), Puebla, 2004: 29-53.

Arendt, Hannah, *The Human Condition*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1998 [1958].

Arruda, Ángela (org.), *Representando a Alteridade*, Editora Vozes, Rio de Janeiro, 2002 (1998).

Arruda, Ángela, “Teoría de Representaciones Sociales y teorías de género”, in: Blazquez Graf, Norma, Flores Palacios, Fátima & Ríos Everardo, Maribel (Coords.), *Investigación Feminista: Epistemología, metodología y representaciones sociales*, CEIICH-CRIM-Facultad de Psicología, UNAM, Mexico City, 2010: 317-338.

Banchs, María Auxiliadora, “Aproximaciones Procesuales y Estructurales al estudio de las Representaciones Sociales”, in: *Papers on Social Representations*, Vol. 9, 2000: 3.1- 3.15.

Bauer, Martin & Gaskell, George, “Towards a Paradigm for Research on Social Representations”, en: *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 29 (2), 1999: 163-186.

Deaux, Kay & Philogène, Gina (Eds.), *Representations of the Social*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2001.

Duveen, Gerard, “Psychological Developmental as a Social Process”, in: Smith, Leslie, Dockerell, Julie & Peter Tomlinson (Eds.), *Piaget, Vygotsky and beyond*, Routledge, London, 1997.

Duveen, Gerard, "Representations, Identities and resistance", in: Deaux, Kay & Philogène, Gina (Eds.), *Representations of the Social*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2001: 257- 271.

Duveen, Gerard & Lloyd, Barbara (Eds.), *Social representations and the development of knowledge*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990.

Duveen, Gerard & Lloyd, Barbara, "The significance of social identities", in: *British Journal of Social Psychology*, UK, 25, 1986: 219-230.

Farr, Robert M., *The Roots of Modern Social Psychology*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1996.

Farr, R.M. & Moscovici, Serge (Eds.), *Social Representations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984.

Fiske, Susan T. & Taylor, Shelley E., *Social Cognition*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1991.

Flores Palacios, Fátima, *Psicología social y género*, McGraw Hill/dgapa/UNAM, Mexico City, 2001.

Flores Palacios, Fátima, "Representación Social y género; una relación de sentido común", in: Blazquez Graf, Norma, Flores Palacios, Fátima & Ríos Everardo, Maribel (Coords.), *Investigación Feminista: Epistemología, metodología y representaciones sociales*, CEIICH-CRIM-Facultad de Psicología, UNAM, Mexico City, 2010: 339- 358.

Giménez Montiel, Gilberto, *Teoría y Análisis de la Cultura: Vol. I & II*, CONACULTA/ICOCULT, Mexico City, 2005.

Goetz, Joseph, *Symbolique Cosmobiologique*, Istituto delle Scienze Sociali, Departamento de Etnosociología, Roma, mimeo, 1972.

Herzlich, C. & Graham, D., *Health and illness: A social psychological analysis*, Academic Press, London, 1973.

Hewstone, Miles & Augoustinos, Martha, "Social attributions and social representations", in: Flick, Uwe (Ed.), *The Psychology of the Social*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998.

Howarth, Caroline, "'So, you're from Brixton?' The Struggle for Recognition and Esteem in a Multicultural Community", in: *Ethnicities*, 2,2, 2002a: 237- 260.

Howarth, Caroline, "Identity in Whose Eyes? The Role of Representations in Identity Construction", in: *Journal of the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 32,2 2002b: 145- 162.

Jodelet, Denise, "Experiencia y representaciones sociales", in: Romero, Eulogio (ed), *Representaciones sociales: Atisbos y cavilaciones del devenir de cuatro décadas*, Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla (BUAP), Puebla, 2004.

Jodelet, Denise, *Folies et Representations Sociales*, PUF, Paris, 1989.

Jodelet, Denise, "La representación social: *fenómeno, concepto y teoría*", in: Moscovici, Serge, *Psicología Social II*, Paidós, Barcelona, 1988 [1986].

Jovchelovitch, Sandra, *Knowledge in Context: Representations, Community and Culture*, Routledge, London, 2007 [2002]).

Jovchelovitch, Sandra, "Social representations, public life and social construction", LSE Research Online, Londres, <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/2649> [originally published as Deaux, Kay & Philogene, Gina (eds), *Representations of the social*, Blackwell Publications, 2007 [2001].

Lloyd, Barbara & Duveen, Gerard, *Gender Identities and Education: The Impact of Schooling*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York, 1992.

Marková, Ivana, *Paradigms, Thought and Language*, John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1982.

Mead, George Herbert, edited by Charles W. Morris, *Mind, Self, and Society: From the standpoint of a social behaviourist*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962 [1932].

Moscovici, Serge, edited by Gerard Duveen, *Social representations. Explorations in social psychology*, Polity Press, London, 2000.

Moscovici, Serge, "Social consciousness and its history", in: *Culture and Psychology*, 4, 1998: 411-429.

Moscovici, Serge, *The Invention of Society: Psychological Explanations for Social Phenomena*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1993.

Moscovici, Serge, *La Psychanalyse: Son image et son public*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1976.

Moscovici, Serge, "Prefacio", in: Herzlich, C. y Graham, D., *Health and illness: A social psychological analysis*, Academic Press, London, 1973.

Serrano Oswald, Serena Eréndira, *La Construcción Social y Cultural de la Maternidad en San Martín Tilcajete*, Oaxaca, PhD Thesis, Institute for Anthropological Research, Faculty of Philosophy and Letters, UNAM, Mexico City, 2010.

Torres López, Teresa Margarita, "Una aproximación cualitativa al estudio de las enfermedades crónicas: las representaciones sociales", *Revista Universidad de Guadalajara*, Dossier Ciencias Sociales y Ciencias de la Salud, 23, spring, 2002: 35-44.

Wagner, Wolfgang (edited by Fátima Flores), *El discurso cotidiano y el sentido común: la teoría de las representaciones sociales*, CRIM-UNAM/Anthropos, Barcelona, 2011.

Wagner, Wolfgang y Kronberger, Nicole, "Killer Tomatoes! Collective Symbolic Coping with Biotechnology", in: Deaux, Kay & Philogène, Gina (Eds.), *Representations of the Social*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 2001: 147- 165.

1er Congreso Iberoamericano sobre Desarrollo Regional
17° Encuentro Nacional sobre Desarrollo Regional, AMECIDER
Ciudad de México, Septiembre 2012

Wyer & Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Cognition*, L. Erlbaum Associates, London, 1984.