

Social Representations in Anthropology and Sociology: Intersections and Horizons of Research

Mammeri Djamila *, University Alger2
djamila.mammeri@univ-alger2.dz

Received:19/05/2025

Accepted:23/09/2025

Published:31/12/2025

Abstract:

The article explores the concept of social representations and their significance in social and cultural studies, starting with their definition and establishment by Durkheim and their evolution in social psychology with Moscovici and Jodelet. Representations are viewed as forms of shared knowledge that guide our understanding and interaction with the social world. They consist of a central core and peripheral elements with generative and organizational functions, also characterized by their rigidity and protective role. Representations serve multiple functions, including the cognitive, interpretative, behavioral guidance, and social identity definition. They are studied using diverse methodologies that integrate emotional, intellectual, and social factors. Furthermore, they are present in various research fields such as social psychology, educational sciences, and anthropology, where they contribute to the understanding of learning and communication processes, as well as our perceptions of our natural and social world.

Keywords: Social Representations; Social Identity; Social Sciences; Functions; Cognitive Frameworks.

* The Sending Author  (<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0882-508X>)

INTRODUCTION

The concept of social representations, born within the crucible of social psychology through the groundbreaking contributions of Serge Moscovici and Denise Jodelet, stands as a theoretical framework of paramount importance. It unlocks our understanding of how individuals and collectives construct their shared knowledge of the social tapestry and how they interact with it, guided by these very understandings. Far from being fleeting opinions, social representations are robust cognitive systems, interwoven with information, beliefs, values, and mental imagery. They play a linchpin role in shaping our socio-cultural identities, steering our behaviors, and interpreting the unfolding events of our daily lives (Moscovici, 1976). The ripple effect of this concept extends across a diverse array of intellectual terrains, including sociology, anthropology, educational sciences, and socio-linguistics, underscoring its comprehensive reach and its capacity to illuminate multifaceted dimensions of human interactions and social practices (Jodelet, 1997). Social representations are instrumental in deciphering how novel knowledge is received and integrated into our existing cognitive frameworks, how our perceptions of others and social occurrences are sculpted, and how our collective attitudes and values take form (Fischer, 1987). Yet, this rich theoretical landscape beckons further exploration, posing a constellation of compelling questions that demand deeper inquiry. For instance, how do social representations take shape and evolve amidst the accelerating currents of societal and cultural transformations? What are the underlying mechanisms that propel the dissemination of certain representations while others fade? How do social representations mediate the intricate processes of communication and interaction across diverse cultural landscapes? What is the role of mass media and digital technologies in the contemporary sculpting and circulation of social representations? And finally, how can a nuanced understanding of social representations be leveraged to address pressing social issues such as discrimination, prejudice, and conflict?

The pursuit of these questions and others casts a revealing light on the enduring significance of the concept of social representations in unraveling the complex dynamics that govern our social and cultural existence.

1.Social representations The concept and constituent elements:

The theory of social representations stands as one of the most prominent frameworks within contemporary social psychology. The concept of social representations itself holds considerable heuristic power and intellectual richness within this field. The genesis of this concept is attributed to the French sociologist

Émile Durkheim (1898), who proposed the notion of "représentations collectives" to elucidate a variety of social phenomena (Moliner, 1996, p. 9).

1.1 Defining Social Representations:

Durkheim (1898) posited that the earliest systems of social representations formed by humankind concerning their world and themselves were rooted in religious origins. He distinguished between two types of representations: collective and individual. Society, he argued, constitutes a reality characterized by unique attributes not found in the same form elsewhere in the world. The social representations that articulate this reality differ in their substance from individual representations, with collective representations serving to enrich and broaden individual understandings.

The concept of social representations, much like the phenomena it seeks to explain, inherently involves a degree of complexity in both its comprehension and application. It is a concept situated at the crossroads of a range of sociological and psychological frameworks. This positioning imbues it with a connection to processes stemming from both social and psychological dynamics, requiring a sophisticated theoretical lens for its understanding. Consequently, we must consider the cognitive and psychological functions on one hand, and the role of the social order, groups, and interactions on the other, as influential forces in the formation, structure, and evolution of social representations (Jodelet, 1989, p31)

The concept of representations refers to a form of knowledge specific to common sense, the content of which emerges through a generative and functional developmental process bearing the imprint of society. In a broader sense, it denotes a mode of social thought, where representations are considered applied patterns of thinking oriented towards communication, aiming to understand and exert control over the social, material, and intellectual environment (Jodelet, 1984, p357)

According to (Jodelet, 1997, p365), social representations are profoundly important in our everyday lives. We possess a constant need to understand our surroundings, to make sense of the external world. This necessitates knowing what actions to take to exert material and intellectual control over it, as well as identifying and resolving the problems it presents. This fundamental need is the very reason we construct representations.

They guide us in the shared naming and defining of the diverse facets of our daily reality, and they also steer our interpretation of these facets and our judgment of them, enabling us to take a stance and defend it. Furthermore, they delineate a distinctive form of knowledge, a knowledge rooted in common sense, the content of

which illuminates the processes of the circulation, production, formation, and utilization of these representations by society.

In a wider perspective, it defines a mode of social thinking. At an organizational level, social representations provide specific characteristics related to mental and logical processes. The social nature of their content and processes is linked to their particular context, the modes of communication through which these representations are transmitted, and the functions that facilitate interaction with the world and with others (Fischer, 1987,p118)

Social representations are considered a process of sensory and mental construction of reality. They transform social objects (individuals, contexts, situations) into symbolic categories (values, beliefs, ideologies), granting them a cognitive status. This status allows for the perception of the landmarks of ordinary life and the re-framing of our behaviors within social interactions (Khol, 2006,p1)

The relationship between social representations and reality is a dynamic one. (Khol, 2006) explains this relationship by arguing that a social representation is a content of ideas, but also a dynamic act that creates reality, a reality that cannot be understood without the representation. It is, therefore, a form of worldly knowledge, socially constructed, aspiring to establish a view of the shared reality of a specific group. It is deeply embedded in the minds of individuals and the collective. Consequently, social representations are not merely simple opinions but a structured set that allows individuals to orient themselves within this world (Rouquette,2003,P13) propose three definitions of social representations:

1. They are a way of seeing an aspect of reality, which translates into judgments and actions.
2. They are a body of knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs specific to a particular object, also encompassing information, stances, and normative values.
3. They are a set of cognitive elements, linked by relationships, these pieces of knowledge and relationships receiving recognition within a group.

1.2 The Structure of Social Representations:

To dissect social representations, one must first delineate their structural components and the intricate web of relationships that bind them. Moscovici famously defined social representations as an organized corpus of knowledge, yet also as the cognitive processes through which individuals perceive the physical world. These representations are built upon foundational elements, manifesting in three key dimensions (Moliner, 1996,p51-53)

Firstly, **information**, which embodies the collective pool of knowledge pertaining to a specific object.

Secondly, **attitude**, concerning the underlying organization of this knowledge. Individuals do not possess a complete compendium of information; rather, they hold relative insights into certain facets of the object. The entirety of these facets constitutes the field of the social representation (Moliner, 1996, pp53-54)

Thirdly, **the stance**, reflecting the general orientation of individuals (positive or negative) towards the object.

(Moliner, 1996) elucidates that the knowledge forming social representations springs from three primary sources : personal experiences and observations ("I saw," "I did"), the conduits of communication to which individuals are exposed ("I heard," "I was told"), and finally, self-constructed beliefs ("I think," "I believe"). Regardless of their origin, these pieces of knowledge hold the weight of evidence for the individual, shaping a naive and simplistic understanding.

Adding another layer, Abric (Abric-Jean, 1994, pp13-14) astutely points out that it is erroneous to consider social representations as purely cognitive constructs. Their very essence is social, distinguishing them from other cognitive mechanisms. They are composed of a complex cognitive-perceptual fabric and a social fabric.

Regarding Moscovici's conceptualization of the structure of representations, he developed the notion of the "figurative nucleus," which was later adopted and expanded upon by Abric (Abric-Jean, 1994, p21) under the guise of the "central nucleus" or "generative nucleus." According to this theory, a representation is an entirety organized around a central nucleus, comprised of elements that bestow meaning upon the representation. The central nucleus, therefore, is the fundamental structural element of a representation, and its unveiling facilitates the comparison between different social representations (Abric-Jean, 1994, pp21-22)

The nucleus acts as an organizational linchpin within any social representation, fulfilling two essential functions:

Firstly, a **generative function**, as it forms the bedrock of the various elements of the representation, imbuing them with meaning and value. These elements are not immutable; they can evolve.

Secondly, an **organizing function**, as it dictates the nature of the relationships that interlink the elements of the representation. In this sense, it is the unifying force, preserving the stability of the representation (Abric-Jean, 1994, p24)

The content of the central nucleus itself is composed of elements that lend meaning to the representation, namely:

- The nature of the represented object.
- The relationship of this object to the individual or the group.
- The system of values and norms (i.e., the ideological context) (Abric-Jean, 1994, pp 24-25)

The central nucleus is considered the most stable element within a representation, resistant to modification. This is why Mugny and Carugati (1985), through their study on intelligence, speak of a "rigid nucleus" around which the peripheral elements ("les éléments périphériques") are organized (Abric, 1994, p. 24).

Despite the central nucleus forming the bedrock of the representation, peripheral elements occupy a significant space within social representations. They encompass the information retained, selected, and interpreted, the judgments formed about the object and its surroundings, behavioral models, and beliefs. Peripheral elements are positioned in a hierarchical manner, variably arranged around the central nucleus. They form the common boundary between the central nucleus and the concrete reality within which social representations take shape and operate (Abric, 1994, pp. 25-26).

Peripheral elements function as a code for decoding, clarifying a specific situation, according to Flament. He attributes three essential functions to them:

The function of concretization: Peripheral elements define what attitudes and behaviors are appropriate according to the situation. They provide criteria that allow for the understanding of all aspects of the situation, consequently shaping expectations and the comprehension of their outcomes, and guiding individuals in their words and actions.

The organizational function: Peripheral elements play a crucial role in adapting social representations to their environment and its evolutions. They integrate new information about the object and the environment where changes occur.

The protective function of the central nucleus (or the defensive function, as Abrie termed it): The peripheral system acts as a buffer ("pare-choc," as Flament called it) for the representation (Abric, 1994, pp. 25-26).

2. Functions of Social Representations (Defining Social and Cultural Identity):

When a social representation is brought into being, two intertwined processes commence: **objectification**, leading to the establishment of a central nucleus, and **anchoring**, which Moscovici described as follows (Moscovici, 1984,p371) (Jodelet,1984,p375)

2.1 Objectification: This is the process of absorbing a vast amount of meanings and rendering them tangible. It is a process that enables people to grasp and integrate phenomena or complex knowledge, unfolding in three stages:

- **The first stage:** Filtering information based on specific cultural and normative criteria, which inevitably excludes certain elements.
- **The second stage:** The formation of a model or figurative nucleus. The selected information is organized into a simple nucleus, a conceived concept deeply linked to the prevailing culture and social norms.
- **The third stage:** Naturalization and adaptation of the elements, imbuing them with specific characteristics. For example, Jodelet, when discussing elements of psychoanalysis, cites "the unconscious" and "anxiety." The figurative nucleus takes on the status of self-evidence, becoming a reality for the group. The social representation is constructed around this nucleus.

2.2 Anchoring: This is the process of social rooting and stabilization (grounding) of the representation and its object. This process encompasses numerous facets. Anchoring occurs within the pre-existing system of thought to integrate new data. Members of the group arrange and place this data within socially established cognitive frameworks. This generates expectations and pressures associated with the elements of the representation, often manifesting as obligatory behaviors (Jodelet, 1984, p. 375).

The process of anchoring, situated in a dialectical relationship with objectification, gives rise to the three fundamental functions of representations: a cognitive function and the integration of novelty; a function of interpreting reality; and a function of guiding behaviors and social relationships (Jodelet, 1984, p. 376).

Thus, social representations fulfill several functions to maintain the identity and equilibrium of the group, which are as follows (Jodelet, 1989, pp. 51-53):

- Firstly, the **cognitive function:** It allows individuals to integrate new knowledge within their existing cognitive framework and disseminates this knowledge through social categories such as journalists, politicians, doctors, etc.
- Secondly, the **functions of interpretation and reality construction:** They are modes of thinking and interpreting daily life. The values and the context in which they arise influence the construction of reality. There is always an element of individual or collective creativity in representations; hence, they are not permanently fixed but evolve slowly.
- Thirdly, the **functions of guiding actions and behaviors:** They carry meanings and create relationships, thus possessing a social function. They help individuals to

communicate and to orient their actions in their environment, as well as enabling them to act by generating attitudes, opinions, and behaviors among individuals.

- Fourthly, the **functions of identity**: They position individuals ("elles les positionnent") within the social field, allowing for the construction of social identity and an accepted and adapted personality within the socially and historically defined system, norms, and values.

3. Methodological Approaches to Studying Social Representations:

When studying social representations, attention must be paid to the emotional, mental and social factors, integrating them with the cognitive, linguistic and communication aspects, and taking into account the social relations that influence these representations as well as the physical, social and intellectual realities in which they intervene. (Jodelet, 1989, p 41).

3.1 Specific Approaches to Social Representations:

Representations are conceived as a tapestry of knowledge woven from the threads of shared customs, built through the accumulation of countless observations and experiences validated by practical engagement with the world (Moscovici, 1984, p542)

They emerge at the intersection of social reality and the subjective experience of the individual who carries the representation, as well as from the very fabric of the social system within which the relationships between the individual and the object of the representation are inscribed (Abric-Jean, 1994, p14) Moreover, representations are recognized as complex phenomena, operating continuously and exerting a palpable influence on the social lifeblood of communities (Jodelet, 1989, p 36). The very essence of this subject matter, with its inherent intertwining of the individual and the collective, places it at the crossroads of numerous scientific disciplines, as previously noted. Consequently, a diverse array of scientific approaches has emerged to grapple with this multifaceted concept. Should our aim be **to study social representations as a form of social and cultural expression**, our endeavor would involve navigating the realms of ideologies and social meanings (concepts). This constitutes a sociological leaning, where the focus of inquiry centers on the overarching currents of society rather than the intricacies of individual thought (Khol, 2006, p48).

The process of cultural anchoring ("ancrage") of a social representation is a crucial and necessary endeavor in its study, given its profound significance within

society. Representations are intrinsically linked to the cultural milieu within which the individual interacts.

The second lens through which to view social representations is an anthropological one. Here, they are understood to reside at the confluence of individual experiences and societal norms.

The third approach is a cognitive one – a cognitive approach, where social representations are considered a specific modality of social thought. The individual, in this framework, is a social being, a vessel carrying ideas, values, and models gleaned from their group of belonging, or ideologies that circulate within the societal sphere. Social representations take root when an individual finds themselves within a context of social interaction or confronted by a social stimulus.

3.2 Studying social representations:

The study of social representations beckons us to embark on a journey of description, to meticulously trace their evolution through the corridors of time, and to decipher the underlying logic that governs their formation and transformation. Our gaze can also be directed towards the tangible outcomes of these representations – the behaviors they engender – demanding a nuanced understanding of the intricate dance between individual conduct when confronted with a specific object and the broader tapestry of societal expectations.

Examining representations through the lenses of pragmatism and clinical insight allows us to consider them as unique forms of expression, deeply embedded within the fabric of culture, and as the very offspring of social dynamism. Alternatively, they can be perceived as a fundamental mode of social thought, a cognitive current to which all individuals are subject.

The process of mapping and gathering these representations can be achieved through a diverse toolkit of research techniques, ranging from the intimate dialogue of interviews to the broad reach of questionnaires, or a strategic blend of both. Furthermore, they can become the focal point of in-depth monographic explorations, while within the realm of anthropological inquiry, they can be subjected to the rigors of empirical investigation (Khol, 2006, p 45).

We can also apprehend social representations as the very product of social dynamism. Research in this vibrant field focuses on the very form of these representations, acknowledging their dual nature – both individual and collective. Individuals are simultaneously shaped by the pressures exerted by the value-producing collective, yet also driven by the currents of their own desires and personal values. Consequently, research in this domain must consider both the weight of the social and the psychological gravity of the individual, necessitating the

study of representation within the temporal frames of both individual experience and social history (Khol, 2006, p48).

4. Social Representations and Fields of Research in the Social Sciences:

4.1 Social Representations in the Realm of Social Psychology:

The very genesis of the concept of social representations within the domain of social psychology can be traced back to the seminal works of Serge Moscovici in France, where he laid the foundational stones for this vibrant field of inquiry. Across his extensive writings, Moscovici illuminated the pivotal role of social representations in the very construction of agreed-upon reality, as well as their socio-cognitive function in the assimilation of all that is novel and in the channeling of communication and behaviors. His research further revealed that representations can be studied holistically as contents possessing multifaceted dimensions – information, values, opinions – coherently interwoven through an organizing principle encompassing attitudes and behaviors.

The groundbreaking research of Denise Jodelet, particularly her work on madness, also significantly contributed to the exploration of social representations within the field of social psychology. Her keen observations highlighted that the stability of a representation holds both personal benefit for each individual and profound social utility. She posits that representation has become a keystone concept for elucidating and comprehending the social functions inherent in both individual and collective action (Jodelet, 1989, p. 40).

Expanding on this (Jodelet, 1989, p41) astutely notes that the concept itself is inherently complex and multifaceted, residing at the intricate intersection of sociological and psychological frameworks. Its comprehension necessitates an understanding of the interplay between social and psychological dynamics. Consequently, engaging with this concept demands a broad and still-evolving research agenda, one that grapples with emotional, intellectual, and social elements. Furthermore, it requires the integration of the cognitive, the interactive and communicative facets, and the material, social, and intellectual realities that these representations both influence and are influenced by.

4.2 Social Representations in the Realm of Educational Sciences:

Within the landscape of educational sciences, this concept emerges as a pivotal axis around which the very processes of learning and the assimilation of novel information and knowledge revolve, ultimately contributing to the reshaping of shared understandings of reality. However, scholarly inquiries specifically

dedicated to this concept within the field of education remain somewhat scarce when juxtaposed with other domains. Its utility, as eloquently articulated by (Gilly, 1989, pp 363-364) lies in its capacity to unlock new horizons for explaining the intricate mechanisms through which social forces exert their influence upon the very currents of learning, thereby forging vital bridges of communication between the disciplines of psychology and educational sociology. The benefits extend beyond a mere comprehension of overarching phenomena, such as the interplay between social origin and attitudes and behaviors towards schooling, as well as the multifaceted ways in which educators perceive their roles. Rather, it delves into nuanced levels of analysis concerning pedagogical communication ("la communication pédagogique") within the classroom and the very architecture of knowledge construction. Engaging with this concept within the educational sphere significantly contributes to answering fundamental questions regarding the formation and functions of social representations, particularly given that the educational system has consistently held, and continues to hold, a prominent position within the concerns of political and social discourse. The issues of academic failure and social disparities in the face of education stand as potent indicators of the underlying manifestations of social representations that subtly shape the diverse narratives surrounding the institution of schooling (Gilly, 1989, p365).

4.3 Social Representations in the Realm of Socio-linguistics:

Social psychology posits that social representations are meticulously constructed through the very fabric of social interaction, and the study of discourse serves as a key to unlocking the diverse forms of social thought. Turning our attention to the significance of this concept within linguistic studies, (Branca-Rossof, 2006, p79) argues that linguistic representations are foundational elements in the very architecture of communicative phenomena. The intertwined concepts of representations and the linguistic imaginary serve as indices of the collective imagery that speakers associate with the languages they employ, be it in terms of value, aesthetics, normative meaning, or, more broadly, metalinguistic vocabulary. They provide a pathway to transcend the stark dichotomy often perceived between objective reality, the phenomena arising from linguistic description, and underlying ideologies. Regarding the term "linguistic imaginary," its emergence in 1975 was a direct result of doctoral research investigating the phonology and dynamics of contemporary French (Houdebine-Graveaud, 2002, pp9-11).

This research unveiled the difficulties encountered by speakers (the researched subjects), particularly in their relationships with their own language and with the languages of others – specifically, speakers from other villages, who were

either derided or praised (by individuals, media figures, politicians, and academics). The concept of the linguistic imaginary aids in understanding the intricate relationship that binds a speaker to their language or the language of the community to which they belong, a relationship manifested through the images that take form within the minds of the speakers.

This term was deliberately chosen in Houdebine's research, stepping away from the more ambiguous "attitudes" or "representations" ("Attitudes et représentations") due to their multiplicity of meanings. For instance, the term "representations" itself carries echoes from psychology as "mental representation," and from sociology as Durkheim's "collective representations" and Moscovici's "social representations," as previously discussed. In contrast, the concept of the linguistic imaginary serves as a unifying lens, gathering the scattered observations from studies focusing on the linguistic sensations of the researched subjects – their praise for speech forms deemed "elegant and refined" and their condemnation of forms "stigmatized as shameful, backward, uncivilized, etc." – essentially capturing their feelings of guilt or what is known as "linguistic insecurity" ("Insécurité linguistique"). The research of Anne-Marie Houdebine revealed that her recourse to this term was also motivated by the fact that even subjects belonging to the same geographical area could exhibit variations in their pronunciation or linguistic output, as well as in their evaluations of themselves and others. It was rare to find subjects with neutral evaluations; instead, negative assessments were prevalent, often denigrating their own way of speaking, and this was accompanied by diverse logical justifications.

Through meticulous interviews and insightful fieldwork, the researcher was able to delineate categories of linguistic representations (Houdebine-Graveaud, 2002, p12) which unfolded as follows:

Categories of Pure Language: "Good French," "Incorrect French"; Categories of Language Aesthetics: "Beautiful French"; Category of History: Referencing the history of the language.

4.4 Social Representations in Anthropology and Sociology

The concept of social representations stands as a pivotal nexus where the intellectual currents of anthropology and sociology converge. It furnishes invaluable analytical tools for comprehending how individuals and collectives construct their shared understanding of the socio-cultural world, and how this very understanding shapes their practices and interactions. Within the realm of **sociology**, the study of social representations aids in unveiling the social foundations of reality as perceived by members of a society, illuminating the formation of collective identities, the

construction of norms and values, and the interpretation of diverse social phenomena (Luckmann,2018,pp58-65).

For instance, grasping the shared representations surrounding class, gender, race, and religion empowers sociologists to dissect the root causes of social inequality, conflict, and integration within communities.

Within the realm of **anthropology**, the study of social representations assumes a particularly vital role in deciphering the cultural tapestries, beliefs, and symbolic practices that characterize diverse societies. Anthropologists embark on a quest to understand how the natural, social, and spiritual worlds are represented by the members of a particular culture, and how these representations are passed down through generations via the currents of socialization, rituals, and narratives (Geertz, 1973,pp89-95) ,The analysis of representations surrounding kinship, myths, health and illness, and the very concept of space unveils the deep-seated structures that shape the worldview of different peoples and influence their daily conduct.

The intersection of anthropology and sociology in the study of social representations yields a more holistic comprehension of socio-cultural dynamics. For instance, an in-depth anthropological exploration of how a specific group represents the concept of "family" can enrich sociological analyses of familial relationships and their patterns within broader social contexts. Conversely, sociological analyses of shifts in representations surrounding "work" can provide anthropologists with valuable insights into the transformations in lifestyles and livelihoods within societies undergoing change.

Furthermore, both disciplines underscore the inherently social and contextual nature of representations. They do not arise in a vacuum, but rather take form and evolve through the intricate interplay of social interactions, cultural discourses, and societal institutions (Moscovici, 1984, pp 112-118). Consequently, a true understanding of representations necessitates a meticulous analysis of the socio-cultural contexts within which they emerge and operate.

In this context the significance of social representations shines brightly as a shared analytical instrument between anthropology and sociology, facilitating a transcendence of mere methodological distinctions and allowing for a profound comprehension of the shared meanings that sculpt the lives of individuals and collectives within their diverse social and cultural landscapes.

Conclusion:

Throughout this comprehensive exploration, the fundamental importance of the concept of social representations has become firmly established, not merely as a theoretical framework for understanding collective cognitive structures, but as a penetrating analytical lens that unveils the very mechanisms shaping social and cultural reality. By tracing the roots of this concept and its evolution across the diverse branches of the social sciences, it has become clear that representations are far from being passive reflections of reality. Instead, they are active forces that contribute to its very production and reproduction, profoundly influencing the behaviors of individuals and groups, the formation of their identities, and the very contours of their relationships with the surrounding world.

The multifaceted functions of social representations, ranging from the cognitive capacity that allows for the assimilation of the novel, to the interpretative power that imbues events with meaning, extending to the directive role that guides actions and the identity-defining function that anchors belonging, underscore their centrality in understanding how we, as social beings, engage with a shared world. Moreover, their diverse applications across vital domains such as education, communication, health, and culture highlight their potential to offer practical insights into contemporary challenges.

Yet, the accelerating dynamism of the contemporary world unlocks new and pressing horizons of research within the field of social representations. The erosion of traditional boundaries, propelled by the forces of globalization and digital technology, calls for a profound understanding of how representations emerge, evolve, and circulate across virtual and transcultural spaces. How do algorithms and social networking platforms influence the formation of new "collective truths"? And what are the ethical and epistemological challenges that these transformations impose on the cohesion of societies and their perceptions of themselves and others?

Furthermore, a deeper comprehension of the intricate interplay between social representations and individual psychological processes necessitates a meticulous exploration of how emotions and cognitive biases influence the assimilation and adaptation of collective representations. Are there specific psychological mechanisms that render certain representations more deeply entrenched and widely disseminated than others? And how can individual factors contribute to challenging or transforming prevailing representations?

Future research endeavors are also called upon to embrace more robustly interdisciplinary approaches, weaving together sociological, anthropological, psychological, and linguistic insights to achieve a more holistic and nuanced understanding of how social representations operate within diverse contexts. Moreover, the development of innovative methodological tools capable of capturing the dynamic nature and evolution of representations over time represents a significant research priority.

In conclusion, the understanding of social representations remains indispensable, not solely for comprehending the currents of the past and the complexities of the present, but also for anticipating the contours of the future and its inherent challenges. A deeper immersion into this vital field of knowledge will empower us to develop more effective strategies for fostering intercultural understanding, combating stereotypes and biases, and building more just and inclusive societies in an increasingly intricate and interconnected world.

References:

- Abric-Jean, C. (1994). *Les représentations sociales : aspects théoriques. In Pratiques sociales et représentations*. France: PUF.
- Branca-Rossof, S. (2006). *The Imaginaries of Languages. In H. Boyer et al., Sociolinguistics: Territory and Objects. L'Harmattan*.
- D, J. (1989). *Madness and Social Representations*.
- Fischer, G. N. (1987). *The fundamental concepts of social psychology*. PUF de Montréal, Dunod.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. new york: basic books inc publishers.
- Gilly, M. (1989). *Social Representations in the educational field. In D. Jodelet et al., Social Representations* . PUF.
- Houdebine-Graveaud, A. M. (2002). *The Linguistic Imaginary. L'Harmattan*.
- Jodelet, D. (1984). *phenomena, concepts and theories. In S Moscovici et all Social psychology* . PUF.
- Jodelet, D. (1989). *Madness and Social Representations*. PUF.
- Jodelet, D. (1997). *Social representations*. PUF.
- Khol, F. S. (2006). *Social Representations of schizophrenia*. MASSON.
- Luckmann, P. B. (2018). *la construction sociale de la réalité*. France: Armand colin.
- Moliner, P. (1996). *Images and social representations. From the theory of representations to the study of social images*. Presses universitaires de Grenoble.

Moscovici, S. (1984). *The domain of social representations. In S. Moscovici (Ed.).*
Rouquette, C. F. (2003). *Anatomy of ordinary ideas, How to study social representations.*