

*Text and its message as the foundation
for constructing social representations of objects*

*Tekst i jego przesłanie jako fundament konstruowania
reprezentacji społecznych obiektów*

Piotr Zbróg

UNIWERSYTET JANA KOCHANOWSKIEGO W KIELCACH

Keywords

social representations, contextual anchoring, text, text message

Słowa kluczowe

reprezentacje społeczne, kotwiczenie kontekstowe, tekst, przesłanie tekstu

Abstract

The theory of social representations regards the study of text in discourse as a crucial aspect for discovering ways of describing and perceiving phenomena, ideas in the space of public communication.

The article discusses the main textual mechanisms that allow for the construction of the resource of social representations. These mechanisms appear in articles and media publications, in the statements of participants in discussions on forums, blogs, and posts, etc. Thanks to them, new phenomena become more understandable in public debate, old ideas undergo redefinitions, and previous observations are updated or contested. The described mechanisms also have a metacommunicative potential because they enable discursive circulation in the public sphere.

Abstrakt

Teoria reprezentacji społecznych stawia badanie tekstu w dyskursie za kluczowy aspekt pozwalający odkryć sposoby opisywania i postrzegania zjawisk, idei w przestrzeni publicznego komunikowania.

W artykule omówiono główne mechanizmy tekstowe, pozwalające na konstruowania zasobu reprezentacji społecznych. Pojawiają się one w artykułach

i opracowaniach medialnych, w wypowiedziach uczestników dyskusji na forach, blogach i wpisach itp. Dzięki nim nowe zjawiska stają się bardziej zrozumiałe w debacie publicznej, stare idee poddawane są redefinicjom, następuje aktualizowanie lub kontestowanie dotychczasowych obserwacji. Opisanie mechanizmów mają ponadto metakomunikacyjny potencjał, gdyż dzięki nim możliwa staje się cyrkulacja dyskursywna w sferze publicznej.

Introduction

This article focuses on describing textual mechanisms that form the basis for generating social representations in the realm of public communication. How members of different communities perceive, describe, define, and characterize specific objects¹ often depends not on the inherent characteristics of those objects – their factual, scientifically proven descriptions found in dictionaries or encyclopedias – but rather on the components that construct their social perception, which is lay and non-scientific in nature. This perception and its elements, formed through communication about them using texts, create their social representations. For instance, when people read the press, they construct representations not only of the texts themselves but also of the events, phenomena, features, objects, subjects, and actions discussed within the discourse.

One example of a component of the image of a scientist in the media discourse can be the image of someone who discovers useful and groundbreaking things, possesses unique skills, high competence, performs complex work, deserves admiration, recognition, and respect². In this context, the prism of the dictionary definition of a *scientist* as "a person engaged in scientific work"³ appears to be marginal within the entire spectrum. On the other hand, *vulgarism* is characterized in media discourse as "an indecent, vulgar, offensive, and insulting term, used to express negative (usually) and positive (less often) emotions". It distinguishes between "mild vulgarisms (e.g., butt) and strong vulgarisms (e.g., f***)", with mild ones being more tolerated and strong ones less so. Contextual equivalents are recommended

¹ In the theory of social representations, the objects of study are the objects of reality, including both material objects, individuals (e.g., teachers), symbolic entities (e.g., the state, language), as well as concepts (e.g., education), processes (e.g., educational, linguistic), events, phenomena, issues, ideas, etc.

² Z. Zbróg, P. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznych naukowca w tytułach prasowych*, „Horyzonty Wychowania” 2017, vol. 2, pp. 75-95.

³ Entry: *naukowiec*, [in:] <https://sjp.pwn.pl/szukaj/naukowiec/.html> (access 12 VII 2023).

to soften their negative connotations, e.g., "darn", "f***ing". They are used to insult others, manifest attitudes, increase the impact, and express emotional states. They appear as ambivalent utterances in terms of affective and evaluative aspects – they can generally evoke negative emotions and judgments, but it is impossible not to evaluate them positively as desirable in certain contexts without overusing. In contrast, according to dictionaries, a vulgarism is defined as "an obscene or vulgar word or expression" or "a word or expression considered indecent and vulgar by users of a particular language"⁴.

These two examples demonstrate the contrast between the scientific and common-sense perceptions, as affirmed in texts circulating in the realm of public communication. At times, they intersect, but the differences are exceedingly evident, convincing us that social representations formed outside the realm of science constitute a distinct and independently functioning resource that shapes the image of various aspects of reality.

Therefore, it is worth taking a closer look at texts and their messages in the process of constructing social representations. Social representations are embedded in communicative practices such as dialogues, debates, media discourses, and scientific discourses, enabling social communication and, in particular, understanding between social groups. They are themselves a "product of discourse: through communication, representations are invoked into collective consciousness and reproduced"⁵.

Text as a Starting Point in the Theory of Social Representations

In his theory of social representations, Serge Moscovici proposed an analysis of how scientific knowledge permeates society. He distinguished textual and extra-textual methods of socially accommodating unknown or poorly understood phenomena, which, thanks to texts generated in the realm of public communication, become more understandable to laypeople⁶. Examples of such "domesticating" linguistic terms could be descriptive nominations like foreign words, foreign insertions, loans, or affective terms like begged words, weed words, foreign gibberish, or contagion, translations of foreign words. Texts containing these constructs also conveyed a specific message to the audience: something is valuable (here: borrowing is good because it is "functional", "trendy", "prettier", "smarter", "more adequate", "understandable in international communication", "for the educated"), while

⁴ Z. Zbróg, P. Zbróg, *Reprezentacja społeczna wulgaryzmów*, „Socjolingwistyka” 2017, vol. 31, pp. 207-230.

⁵ S. Moscovici, *Social Representations. Explorations in Social Psychology*, Cambridge 2000, p. 45.

⁶ S. Moscovici, *On social representations*, [in:] *Social Cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding*, ed. J. P. Forgas, New York 1981, pp. 181-210.

something else is deserving of condemnation (here: borrowings are bad because "it's shameful to borrow from strangers", "it's a begged word", "it threatens the nation and the state", "it's a linguistic error", "it results in neglecting the Polish language"⁷).

Similarly to the "psychoanalysis" described by Moscovici, which appears in texts in the social space in many ways (during communication), borrowings and other terms of both scientific and non-scientific origin have become subjects of public discussions, debates, and, consequently, components of common-sense knowledge. "We can observe the spread of original systems of concepts and images that are born and evolve before our eyes. Most of them have a scientific lineage. They fill our minds and conversations, our media, popular books, and political discourses. At the same time, they shape our worldview and our reactions to people and things". Issues and topics that are the domain of scientists have infiltrated everyday conversations, and this has become particularly evident in the development of the internet, which demands a discursive approach and interaction from its users, especially in social media⁸. In this context, Moscovici defined social representations as systems of ideas, values, thoughts, images, and shared knowledge among members of a community, as a collectively agreed-upon universe of beliefs created in texts to form collective consciousness. According to him, social representations relate to the resource of social knowledge that people share in the form of common theories about the world. They constitute a natural foundation of common-sense knowledge, as they encompass a particular type of knowledge that can also be called lay knowledge, everyday knowledge, stereotypical knowledge, and even naive knowledge. The properties of this type of knowledge lie in the social nature of the processes of its generation, as they are based on texts that are produced, transmitted, received, commented upon by other texts, replicated, or modified with a specific message. Social representations constructed during communicative interactions shape beliefs, attitudes, opinions, practices, and are processes through which social reality is created.

The continuous circulation of texts related to discussed entities causes representations to be neither stable nor unchanging. They should be regarded as flexible entities that dynamically evolve alongside the cultural and social reality in which new texts are constantly being created. The new messages within these texts provide a basis for modifications, redefinitions of existing definitions, and the resource of representations. For example, initially around the 15th century, Polish was considered too limited to be used in academic

⁷ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń w polszczyźnie do wieku XVIII*, Kraków 2018.

⁸ S. Moscovici, *The Phenomenon of Social Representations*, [in:] *Social Representations*, Cambridge 1984, p. 53.

endeavors. However, after the formulation of new theses in the 16th century, Polish began to be perceived differently. It managed to establish its place in the academic community and more broadly, in offices, schools, literature, and culture⁹.

Moscovici focused his research attention on the process of analyzing objects during their transformation and described how old ideas are modified and how new social representations are formed during public debate: "We want to study how representations take shape, why scientific or medical theories are transformed into representations"¹⁰ (Moscovici 1988: 219). Particularly intriguing are any phenomena that alter collective thinking within society about a certain object.

Social representations of social phenomena are shared meanings created through the process of social interaction, primarily using texts. They describe reality, enabling individuals to navigate the world. They allow people to understand reality by possessing their own systems of representation as a community (of various objects and phenomena, e.g., language, scientists, borrowings, vulgarisms, pandemics). Through these representations, individuals can attempt to understand the "new" – new ideas, objects, phenomena – by associating them with something that is familiar to them. For example, to illustrate the harmfulness of borrowings, they were compared to "weeds", and the necessity to combat them was likened to "weeding", which has remained so deeply anchored in consciousness that it continues to be repeated even today¹¹. When something is named and classified into categories, and therefore becomes associated with other objects of the same kind, all members of the community can talk about it. Representations provide group members with a common code that they use for efficient communication. Currently, expressions and phrases from old texts related to language are repeated, including "respecting the Polish language", "love for the language", "language defense", "fighting against borrowings", "overgrown language", "destroying the language". Members of the same group can develop representations that not only connect them but also guide their reasoning and orient their behaviors. These representations help them understand the world and facilitate their lives in the world. Consequently, some Poles still fight against the word *weekend* as one of the symbols of "polluting the language with ubiquitous Anglicisms", making it one of the key contemporary components of the social representation of borrowings¹².

⁹ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit.

¹⁰ S. Moscovici, *Notes Towards a Description of Social Representations*, "European Journal of Social Psychology" 1988, vol. 18, p. 215.

¹¹ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit.

¹² Ibidem.

In a general sense, social representations constitute socially and culturally shared understandings of social objects and are generated through texts in the space of public communication. The ways in which linguistic mechanisms are involved in discourse will be discussed below.

Textual Mechanisms Generating Social Representations

The theory of social representations describes the mutual relationship between social representations and interactions, texts, and communication. On one hand, it explains how individuals and groups generate and transform social representations in texts through communication. On the other hand, it characterizes how social representations are created and transformed through textual and extra-textual communication.

In the everyday world, when a new element (object, process, phenomenon) emerges, the community develops new representations based on what is already known.

Social representations are formed through two socio-communicative processes: anchoring in the text and objectification. Both mechanisms are responsible for the transformation process, modifying concepts, categories, ideas, and notions created in the universe of reification into concepts, categories, ideas, and notions functioning in the consensual universe where common-sense knowledge prevails. Moscovici explains the difference between the two processes: "The first mechanism – anchoring – makes the unknown familiar by transferring the new into the sphere of our previous representations, where we can compare and interpret it. The second mechanism, objectification, makes the new familiar by recreating and replicating it among things that we can see and touch"¹³ (2000: 42). In the subsequent part of the article, in line with its title, textual mechanisms that constitute the resource for anchoring will be described. Objectification, being a non-textual mechanism by nature (based on elements like photos, illustrations, real objects as representations of ideas, phenomena), falls outside the scope of this work.

1. **Anchoring** in the text is a process in which something new or foreign is compared to a selected appropriate category. "As long as a given object or idea is compared to the paradigm of a specific category, it takes on the characteristic features of that category and is adjusted to it. [...] Even when we are aware of some discrepancy between our assessment and what emerges from the paradigm of a given category, our assessment aligns itself with it as long as there is a minimum consistency between the unknown and the known, between what is new and what is familiar"¹⁴.

¹³ S. Moscovici, *Social...*, op. cit., p. 42.

¹⁴ Ibidem.

The world is perceived through the prism of agreed-upon definitions of phenomena, and new phenomena are assimilated within the existing and internalized system of shared categories. During this process, new social representations are incorporated into those already known within a given community, and at the same time, the latter are transformed by the new representations. For example, the textual equivalent of vulgar language became nominations such as insult, curse, profanity, offensive vocabulary, ugly words, words commonly considered insulting, curses¹⁵. As a result, the linguistic term gradually became part of collective frames of reference. Anchoring can therefore be seen as the process of placing a new object within the framework of reference to the already familiar to interpret it. This means that new concepts, ideas, and phenomena are successively linked to a well-known phenomenon or context, becoming rooted in the social space. It is then widely used for the everyday description of reality.

In outline, this process unfolds in the following way: new concepts, information, objects, ideas are incorporated into previously known classes through their textual naming, categorization, or classification, etc. In the process of categorization, new objects are compared to other known objects, prototypes, or models that already exist in cultural texts.

Moscovici emphasizes that the tendency to classify reflects the desire to define the object as normal, ordinary, or extraordinary. The need to classify objects as conforming or deviating from the norm primarily applies to all new things (Moscovici 2000: 45).

Moscovici presented several ways of textually anchoring new concepts, ideas, and phenomena within well-known concepts, ideas, phenomena, or contexts.

1.1. Textual Naming and Classification

Naming is closely linked to simultaneous categorization and – as Moscovici argues – enriching the object by giving it new characteristics and dimensions. Both processes are crucial for understanding reality because “objects that are uncategorized and unnamed remain foreign, non-existent, and at the same time, they seem threatening to us. [...] If we can talk about something, evaluate it, and thus communicate, convey something to others, it means that we have the ability to represent what is new, unknown in our ordinary, everyday world [...]”¹⁶.

Naming is one of the most commonly used textual methods to make something that is foreign, unclear, and unknown to others become something closer and more familiar. “[...] by naming something, we extract it from disturbing anonymity to give it genealogy and include it in a complex

¹⁵ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit., p. 148.

¹⁶ S. Moscovici, *Social...*, op. cit., p. 42.

of specific words, to situate it in reality [...]“¹⁷. In this way, through naming, the phenomenon is released from mystery and incomprehensibility.

In the above context, it should be noted that, for example, from the very beginning of the formation of social representations of borrowings, there have been at least several different types of nominations to some extent capturing the essence of the phenomenon discussed in the public sphere. Sometimes efforts were made to anchor these objects in texts through vivid detailing, and equivalents like Jewish words, Latin words, and also generalizations like foreign words were used. Words or expressions with characteristics of terms were also used, referring to languages known at that time from which foreign words originated, such as Latinisms and Hellenisms. In this way, a new object, about which little had been said until then, was anchored, and it appeared in the process of social communication in connection with raising the status of the Polish language by creating its image as a self-reliant language, including native vocabulary, among other things¹⁸.

1.2. **Emotional anchoring** is a mechanism in Social Representation Theory (SRT) that has been extensively discussed by Birgitta Höijer¹⁹. According to her, it is a process in which a new phenomenon (e.g., communication) is linked to familiar emotions. This makes the unknown recognizable because emotions help people interpret and evaluate social situations and objects. Emotions can help recognize that something elicits feelings of danger, threat, or, conversely, feelings of something pleasant and enjoyable.

The example of emotional anchoring in the case of borrowings can be seen in the selected ways they were named, which appeared at the end of the 18th century and the beginning of the 19th century. The object was already well-known by then, but the main goal was to discredit it in light of the growing anti-foreign sentiments. Phrases like "foreign mixtures", "foreign elements", "foreign encroachments", "foreign intrusions", and "foreign shreds" were used. All these nominations were formulated to discourage recipients through negative associations with the lexemes used. There were also judgments intended to evoke fear and a sense of threat associated with the influx of foreign elements. It was written that "a linguistic contagion is spreading", and the language "has been infected by foreigners". Borrowings were somehow associated with the fear of a kind of epidemic²⁰.

¹⁷ Ibidem, p. 46.

¹⁸ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit., p. 160.

¹⁹ B. Höijer, *Social Representations Theory. A New Theory for Media Research*, "Nordicom Review" 2011, volume 32, pp. 3-16.

²⁰ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit., p. 176.

Other studies have shown that individuals who positively value swear words described them as "accepted words that serve important functions in communication, are not offensive, and punishing their use is an abuse, a violation of freedom of speech; in certain contexts, they are necessary and express positive emotions". On the other hand, their opponents argued that they are "bad, harmful, should be fought against, their use should be abandoned, and there should be punishment for using them"²¹. These emotional texts provided a basis for associating one's own feelings toward swear words and resulted in their social perception, as expressed in public discourse.

1.3. Thematic Anchoring

Thematic anchoring allows us to capture the basic, general patterns of thinking and primary ideas of a given community, which in a specific context generate and structure new social representations. These so-called themes or "themata" have been "created by society and preserved by society" (Moscovici, 2000: 163). Moscovici understood themata as "a set of opposing preconceptions, always present in dialogue and organizing cognition, constituting a linguistic resource of a kind of axioms, socially shared and entrenched". Examples of such thematic threads, according to Moscovici, can be found in motifs like democracy, human rights, equality, justice, etc. However, they "never reveal themselves clearly"²², but must be abstracted from texts.

Themata can take the form of beliefs (e.g., Polish discussions about borrowings, vulgarisms), proverbs, social definitions, categories ("language protection", "guardian of the language", "weeding the language", "nurturing the language", "A Pole in Poland speaks Polish"), or symbolic examples (e.g., "time for the Polish language", "fighting foreign intruders – borrowings")²³.

The construction of rooted and enduring themes is also referred to by Moscovici²⁴ as canonic themata. They play a fundamental role in the development of representations when new information is incorporated into existing ideas. These themata, to some extent, limit the meanings attributed because their characteristic feature is that, due to their anchoring in social discourse, they are considered obvious. Even if representations of a particular object change or evolve, thinking about it may still be constrained and influenced by old ideas.

In this context, it can be observed that from the very beginning in native texts regarding borrowings, the theme-preconception shaping the dynamics of their social representations was the opposition "our – foreign": foreign word – native word, Latin (Greek, German, English) word – Polish word. It provided different ways of valuation: "our" as better because it's Polish, na-

²¹ Ibidem, p. 234.

²² S. Moscovici, *Social...*, op. cit., p. 182.

²³ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit.

²⁴ S. Moscovici, *Social...*, op. cit.

tive, national, "our" as worse because it's local, backward, simple; "foreign" as worse because it's a loanword, and "it's shameful to borrow from foreigners", it's a linguistic mistake (for example, the expression in the first place is a Germanism, needlessly replacing Polish primarily), "foreign" as good – global, fashionable, elite. This opposition – widely used in anchoring other objects as well – became one of the key foundations for formulating judgments about borrowings.

1.4. Anchoring in antinomy

Textual antinomies most often arise in times of vivid contradictions, during which new social representations develop most intensively.

Ivana Markova²⁵ (2003) argues that the ability to think in opposition, polarization, or antinomy, the skill to distinguish dichotomous elements, is the foundation for constructing meanings. Such thinking brings about changes in the world.

In all societies and cultures, antinomies such as life – death, us – them, war – peace, exist. In a socio-historical context, antinomies related to a social phenomenon can become a source of tension, conflict, or problem and part of public debate²⁶. Social representations framed in antinomies organize discourse at various levels depending on which pole of the antinomy dominates in public debate. Analyzing these oppositional distinctions allows for the description of key tensions during the formation or evolution of social representations of a particular object. Antinomies become the basis not only for disputes but also for reflection²⁷ (Bruner 2006: 99).

It can happen that antinomies are combined with thematic anchoring. However, the latter can occur without anchoring in antinomy. An example of this is texts from all epochs in which judgments were made about foreign words without placing them in clear opposition to native words (compare, for example, the opinion: "I don't like anglicisms, they sound foreign, and what's the point of speaking in English on TV" – based on the theme "ours – foreign", lacking a clear verbalization of the "ours" part, even though it is clearly implicit)²⁸. Markova points out that anchoring in antinomy can appear without thematic anchoring because "not all antinomies that are conceived become themata"²⁹.

Anchoring in antinomy was used when discussing the Polish language and borrowings. The example given illustrates the verbalization of the encouragement to conduct mass in the national language, the use of which was

²⁵ I. Marková, *Dialogicality and Social Representations. The Dynamics of Mind*, Cambridge 2003.

²⁶ See B. Höijer, op. cit., p. 10.

²⁷ J. Bruner, *Kultura edukacji*, Kraków 2006.

²⁸ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit.

²⁹ I. Marková, op. cit., p. 184.

supposed to demonstrate good manners, in opposition to a situation where a mass conducted in a foreign language was deemed worthless, e.g., "a service... performed in a foreign, incomprehensible, unnatural language, brings no benefit or edification; a nation that does not praise the Lord God in its own language is considered crude"³⁰. In this case, the antinomic message is quite clear, and not by chance – according to the TRS – most of its examples appeared during a period of dynamic clashes of opinions regarding the role of the Polish and Latin languages, i.e., in the early and middle Polish period. Later, the role of Latin ceased to be significant, and as a result, the antagonism in this matter lost its importance.

1.5. Anchoring through metaphors

Metaphors make things and phenomena understandable. Some metaphors are universal, while others reflect cultural changes. Everyday language is saturated with metaphors, and, in fact, all thinking and communication are metaphorical; metaphors facilitate understanding the world, which is an element of lay knowledge.

Höijer³¹ proposed considering metaphors as part of the process of anchoring the unknown in the known. She argued that anchoring through metaphors makes things and phenomena understandable. Her textual explanation of how metaphors function in the theory of social representations differed from Moscovici's approach, who placed the use of metaphor in the process of objectification.

One could argue that metaphor represents a case similar to anchoring and emotional objectification – both processes can be embedded in language or in visuals, images, illustrations, photographs, films, etc.

In this context, it is worth mentioning an example of metaphorical anchoring of the Polish language and loanwords. One of the key foundations for building portable verbalizations was the motif of LOSS OF SOVEREIGNTY associated with the acceptance of foreign terms. For example, in Górnicki's "Dworzanin polski", one of the characters said: "Who says 'Koronne stawy' because it is not otherwise then it as if someone were driving the Poles out of the land, and receiving the Czechs into it"³². The phenomenon of linguistic borrowing and its harmfulness, often not entirely understood by most participants in public discourse, was anchored in what was much better known to them – in the more accessible imagination or experience of the possibility of losing land and freedom.

³⁰ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit., p. 145.

³¹ B. Höijer, op. cit.

³² P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń...*, op. cit., p. 187.

Cognitive polyphasia

Moscovici emphasized the coexistence of competitive and sometimes conflicting versions of reality within a single community, culture, and individual, as well as the plurality or hybrid nature of social knowledge. This is reflected in his concept of cognitive polyphasia, which is currently generating significant interest among theorists of social representations³³. This concept shows that people can draw from conflicting representations. In this way, older and newer representations, different and incompatible cognitive styles, and forms of knowledge can coexist within a single social group, and even within an individual, confronting each other and functioning alongside each other, rather than replacing each other.

A text representing polyphasia is characterized by drawing from competing components of social representations of a given object, creating a kind of "third way". For example, in the case of vulgar language, there was a relativizing valuation – vulgarisms were negatively judged, but in certain situations, they were considered necessary or at least accepted; or they were positively evaluated, but their overuse was criticized³⁴. Regarding loanwords, texts announced that we should fight against loanwords, but not all of them; only those that are necessary; but Slavic loanwords are acceptable, better than Latin ones³⁵.

Conclusion

Text and the message of the text are fundamental components that allow for the construction of social representations of objects and ideas. Studying how users anchor phenomena and scientific and non-scientific problems in texts in public spaces, including economic, political, and cultural ones, allows for the interpretation of the ways in which they perceive and understand them. This is crucial for explaining changes in thinking systems about the surrounding reality because, regardless of the inherent characteristics of these objects, common knowledge shaped through everyday opinions, partially verified information, emotional media entries, manipulative newspaper headlines, etc., becomes central in the social image. This occurs even if there is often a significant discrepancy between these images. These mechanisms of textual construction of social representations, described in the article (anchoring through naming, thematic, emotional, metaphorical anchoring

³³ See S. Jovchelovitch, J. Priego-Hernandez, *Cognitive polyphasia, knowledge encounters and public spheres*, [in:] *The Cambridge Handbook of Social Representations*, eds. G. Sammut, E. Andreouli, G. Gaskell, J. Valsiner, Cambridge 2015, pp. 163-178.

³⁴ P. Zbróg, Z. Zbróg, *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczonych...*, op. cit.

³⁵ Ibidem.

and anchoring through antinomies, as well as cognitive polyphasia), provide a perspective for explaining how objects are socially described, perceived, and how their image can be modified in public discourse. By creating press articles, internet posts and blogs, comments in social debates, participants provide the basis for generating social representations of these objects. Although they often have a subjective dimension, they become part of the common resource of texts, thus creating a common-sense image, further processed by other participants in public communication. Through the circulation of views, opinions, judgments in the media, a way of social thinking is shaped, which often has a greater impact on the perception of objects, ideas, and phenomena than scientific thinking.

References

- Bruner J., *Kultura edukacji*, Kraków 2006.
- Höjjer B., *Social Representations Theory. A New Theory for Media Research*, "Nordicom Review" 2011, vol. 32, pp. 3-16.
- Jovchelovitch S., Priego-Hernandez J., *Cognitive polyphasia, knowledge encounters and public spheres*, [in:] *The Cambridge Handbook of Social Representations*, ed. G. Sammut, E. Andreouli, G. Gaskell, J. Valsiner, Cambridge 2015, pp. 163-178.
- Marková I., *Dialogicality and Social Representations. The Dynamics of Mind*, Cambridge 2003.
- Moscovici S., *On social representations*, [in:] *Social Cognition: Perspectives on everyday understanding*, ed. J. P. Forgas, New York 1981, pp. 181-210.
- Moscovici S., *The Phenomenon of Social Representations*, [in:] *Social Representations*, Cambridge 1984, pp. 3-69 .
- Moscovici S., *Notes Towards a Description of Social Representations*, "European Journal of Social Psychology" 1988, vol. 18, pp. 211-250.
- Moscovici S., *Social Representations. Explorations in Social Psychology*, Cambridge 2000.
- Zbróg P., Zbróg Z., *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznej zapożyczeń w polszczyźnie do wieku XVIII*, Kraków 2018.
- Zbróg Z., Zbróg P., *Konstruowanie reprezentacji społecznych naukowca w tytułach prasowych*, „Horyzonty Wychowania”, 2017, vol. 2, pp. 75-95.
- Zbróg Z., Zbróg P., *Reprezentacja społeczna wulgaryzmów*, „Socjolingwistyka” 2017, vol. 31, pp. 207-230.