Abstract

European colonial powers invaded and then dominated a large part of the African continent from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. The influence of colonialism did not cease after independence as it still impregnates the cultures and identities of both formerly colonising and formerly colonised peoples. The question of how inhabitants of formerly colonised and formerly colonising countries represent the colonial past is a key issue in understanding this lasting influence. Social representations of European colonial action were investigated among young people (*N*=1134) in three European countries and six African countries. Social representations of the colonial past were structured around two main dimensions across African and European samples: Exploitation and Development. Social representations of colonialism denoted by Exploitation were more strongly endorsed by the European compared to the African subsample, whereas those denoted by Development were more strongly endorsed by the African compared to the European subsample. However, while African participants considered colonialism less negatively than Europeans, they also had higher expectations concerning Europeans' collective guilt feeling and willingness to offer reparations. By contrast, European participants' social representations of colonialism were more negative but they were less likely to believe that present-day European peoples and governments are accountable for the misdeeds of colonialism in the past. Finally, national identification mediated the association between the Exploitation dimension of colonialism and both group-based emotions and support for reparation in the African, but not the European, subsample.

Key words: Colonialism; social representations; group-based emotions; national identification; support for reparation

Word count: 9.945

"*Today, it is still not clear to everyone that black slavery and colonial atrocities are part of the world's memory; even less that this memory, because of its shared nature, is not the property of the sole peoples who were victims of these events, but of humanity as a whole; or even that as long as we are unable to take responsibility for the memories of the "Whole-World", it will be impossible to imagine what could be a truly shared world, a truly universal humanity*"
(Mbembe, 2016, p. 104[1]).

According to Merle (2003), Westerners have experienced a shift of attitude regarding colonialism: when first introduced, people perceived it as a positive act (to some extent as a humanitarian project), then they started to perceive it more negatively, and finally tended to consider it as horrific. As Mbembe's quote powerfully illustrates, the colonial experience still deeply affects formerly colonising and colonised peoples, though the peak of colonisation has passed. The difficulties in defining and representing the colonial past contribute to political tensions both within formerly colonising and formerly colonised nations, and between these countries at the international level. Disagreement over how the colonial past should be interpreted has created various political and diplomatic tensions in Europe and overseas. For example, in France in 2005, a right-wing party tried to put forward a new law (Law n°2005-158 of 23 February, 2005, article 4) acknowledging the positive aspects and contributions of French colonialism in history textbooks. The project sparked strong reactions from both French historians and from inhabitants of French overseas territories and consequently the law was modified (Boiley, 2015). Belgium as well has a long history of controversies over its colonial past. For instance, in 2008, the former foreign minister of Belgium was banned from the Democratic Republic of Congo during an official visit as his speech was deemed "neo-colonialist" by the DRC's president (Vidal, 2008). Even Portugal, which has claimed a rather different position from other formerly colonising countries, cannot avoid discordant representations of the colonial past (Valentim, 2003; 2011). As explained by Castelo (1999; see also Vala, Lopes, & Lima, 2008; Valentim, 2011; Valentim & Heleno, 2017), the Salazar dictatorship used Luso-tropicalism theory (originally coined by Freyre, 1933) to legitimize its colonies. This theory suggests that the Portuguese have a particular empathy toward the "so-called inferior races" (p. 185) and consequently infers that harmonious and benevolent intergroup relations were experienced in Portuguese colonies. This assumption is still defended by some Portuguese citizens, although it is not

[1] Our translation.

shared by African students from former Portuguese colonies studying in Portugal (Valentim, 2003; 2011).

Disagreement over how colonialism should be presented has also brought animated debates among intellectuals. Although Western literature in the 19th and 20th centuries strongly defended a positive view of it (Said, 1993), postcolonial (Young, 2001) and decolonial (Mignolo, 2011) scholars present a rather negative image of this history. They hold colonialism accountable for present-day political injustices, which still disadvantage former colonies. In brief, social representations of colonialism correspond to what Moscovici (1988) named "polemic social representations": social representations that were formed within different subgroups in the context of a conflict or controversy (for empirical evidence, see Kus, Liu & Ward, 2013). Similarly, we contend that colonialism arouses different social representations among inhabitants of formerly colonised and colonising countries. This might be due, on the one hand, to antagonist roles and perspectives adopted in the past and, on the other hand, to the different needs these representations are aimed to fulfil in the present (Rimé, Bouchat, Klein, & Licata, 2015; Wohl, Matheson, Branscombe, & Anisman, 2013).

The opposition between positive vs. negative social representations of colonialism described above could imply that social representations of colonialism are one-dimensional, structured by a simple opposition between its positive and negative aspects. However, Licata and Klein (2010) showed that social representations of colonialism held by Belgian participants across three generations were structured by two orthogonal dimensions, which they labelled *exploitation* and *development*. This suggests that social representations of colonialism are more complex than a simple binary opposition. Yet, these analyses were based on a single sample from a formerly colonising country; to date, there is no evidence that social representations of colonialism are structured along the same lines among inhabitants of different – formerly colonising or formerly colonised – countries.

Perception of the past, and its effect on attitudes and behavioural intentions in the present, is a topic that has received significant attention from social psychologists, who argue that social representations of history are a critical ingredient in the social construction of identities, as they impart understandings of the origins of groups and their relations with other groups (Liu & Hilton, 2005). Research has indeed shown that representations of the past induce collective emotions, which in turn inspire intergroup attitudes and behavioural intentions (Branscombe & Doosje, 2004; Iyer & Leach, 2008). History is thus a critical topic for the study of social representations. However, although a substantial body of research has

examined the strategies and processes by which groups represent history (see Liu & Sibley, 2015, for a review), research into social representations of colonialism has attracted only scattered interest from social psychologists, signalling a need for theoretical and empirical attention (Volpato & Licata, 2010). Indeed, even simply time-framing European colonialism gives rise to debates (Cf. Boahen, 1985; Coquery-Vidrovitch, 2004; Ravlo, Gleditsch, & Dorussen, 2003), emphasising the fundamental and difficult role of narrating a conflictual past when trying to reach reconciliation (Liu & Laszlo, 2007; Liu & Sibley, 2009).

The present article tries to shed light on how colonialism is represented in the present in three formerly colonialist European countries (Belgium, France, and Portugal) and in six formerly colonised African countries (Angola, Burundi, Cape Verde, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique). We will first focus on the structure of the social representations of colonialism, and more precisely examine the extent to which the same bi-dimensional structure is stable across samples from these two groups of countries. In order to do so, we will compare social representations of colonialism by taking into account the status of each actor during the colonial period, hypothesizing that formerly colonised and colonising populations will emphasise different dimensions of the social representation. Following this, we will explore the way these dimensions relate with present-day group-based emotions (collective guilt and shame), attitudes towards reparation for colonial faults, and national identifications. More precisely, we will focus on the social identity functions of social representations of history (Liu & Hilton, 2005).

Given that ingroup favouritism is a basic component of group-based representations, we expect that nationals of formerly colonised countries will focus more on the negative aspects of colonialism than those of formerly colonising ones. Adopting different perspectives on the past has been shown to create difficult conditions for reconciliation (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Branscombe & Cronin, 2010). Thus we expect discordant social representations to induce discordant outcomes on how to deal with the consequences of the past.

The bi-dimensional structure of social representations of colonialism

Licata and Klein's study (2010) found that social representations of past colonialism (SRC) were structured by the crossing of two orthogonal dimensions, one denoting the exploitation and abuses imposed on colonised peoples by colonialists, and the other denoting the development in infrastructures and education that was brought by colonialism. They also

showed that elderly Belgian generations focused more on the *development* aspect of colonisation (civilizing missions, development of infrastructures, education, and health services), whereas younger generations were more concerned about the *exploitation* aspects (racism, exploitation of the natural resources and the workforce, physical and moral abuses), with the intermediate generation holding a more nuanced, mixed, representation including aspects of both exploitation and development.

Based upon these findings, we reasoned that these two basic dimensions would be deemed relevant among members of other national groups previously involved in colonial history, either as colonial powers or as colonised countries. Previous studies have already shown that social representations of the past are strongly influenced by group membership. For instance, recollections of the past were shown to vary according to social class (Gaskell & Wright, 1997), religious group membership (Sahdra & Ross, 2007), and even region/city-state (Hakim, Liu, & Woodward, 2015).

This attempt at better understanding social representations of colonialism was not only driven by academic theorizing; these representations are also linked with vivid societal controversies within and between formerly colonising and colonised nations about how the legacy of colonialism should be dealt with (Volpato & Licata, 2010).

National identification, support for reparations, and assigned/accepted negative emotions

Besides the aim of verifying the relevance of a two-dimensional structure of SRC among formerly colonised and colonising peoples, this study also aimed at assessing the extent to which these representations are associated with different emotional reactions and attitudes towards reparative actions for colonialism. For instance, Lastrego and Licata (2010) demonstrated that, through a change in the social representation of colonialism, Belgian participants who were informed that their Prime Minister had publicly apologized for colonial misdeeds were more willing to endorse guilt and finance reparations. Thus, we expect that differences in social representations of colonialism will be associated with different levels of – acceptation or assignment of – feelings of collective guilt and shame, and with different levels of support for reparation.

While remembering glorious past events, or more generally past situations in which the ingroup played a positive role, can induce a feeling of collective pride, facing episodes of one's group's inglorious past is extremely unpleasant (Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2004) because it can trigger feelings of collective guilt (Branscombe & Doosje, 2004) and/or collective shame (Lickel, Schmader, & Barquissau, 2004). Once collective guilt and/or shame

is experienced, people are generally more willing to offer reparations for their group's misdeeds in order to redress ensuing inequalities (Branscombe, Slugoski, & Kappen, 2004; Lickel, et al., 2004). Previous studies have shown that the evocation of past colonial misdeeds can induce collective guilt among the members of the colonising country (Licata & Klein, 2010). It should be noted that collective guilt and shame can either be accepted by the faulty group or be assigned by an outgroup to the members of the group that misbehaved (Wohl & Branscombe, 2004). Similarly, the intention to support reparations can be investigated directly among the guilty group, but it can also be investigated among the victims as a "duty to remember" assigned to the guilty group by the group formerly trespassed against (assigned reparation, see Hanke, Liu, Hilton, Bilewicz, Garber, Huang, Gastardo-Conaco, & Wang, 2013).

In studies on group-based emotions, social identification has classically been conceived as a moderating variable, i.e., a variable that conditions the link between the remembering of a negative past and group-based emotions such as guilt and shame. As stated by Wohl, Branscombe, and Klar (2006), in order to experience these emotions, individuals must, at least in some respect, identify with the group in question. Indeed, if they do not identify with their group, they are unlikely to take responsibility for the group's past actions. Yet, on the other hand, strongly identified individuals are more reluctant to accept collective guilt than those weakly identified (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Klein, Licata, & Pierucci, 2011; Wohl et al., 2006) because they are more motivated to maintain a positive ingroup social identity. In some situations, a dominant group may suppress, remain ignorant of, or deny the existence of a negative ingroup history (see Nora, 1989), thus producing moderation effects.

However, in some situations (typically, where a minority view cannot be silenced), the relationship between social representations of history and group-based emotions can be mediated by social identification. This is because historical narratives tend to be embedded within the strategies that 'entrepreneurs of identity' (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001) use in the construction and mobilization of identity projects – demarcating the 'essence' of a group's identity and intergroup relations through a historical lens (see Khan, Svensson, Jogdand, & Liu, 2016; Liu & Khan, 2014;). From this perspective, identity comes to be communicated and understood through the lens of social representations of history. Indeed, Rimé et al. (2015) found that differences in social representations of past relations between different generations in the two main Belgian linguistic groups predicted Dutch- and French-speaking participants' levels of identification with their linguistic community and with Belgium. It is

thus logical to infer that social representations of colonialism will impact national identification, which, in line with Branscombe and Doosje's (2004) model, will in turn affect group-based emotions, such as guilt and shame. In line with this reasoning, national identification should mediate, rather than moderate, the effect of SRC on collective emotions and on support for reparation. However, this effect should be stronger in formerly colonised countries than in formerly colonising countries. Indeed, the opposition to colonialism, and the struggles that led to independence, are foundational events for formerly colonised countries, especially in countries that lack a written pre-colonial history, such as most African countries. Even though colonialism was an important part of former European colonial powers, it is less central to the definition of their national identities – some authors even contended that colonial history was actively silenced (e.g. Bentley, 2016 ; Hochschild, 1998) – and should therefore play a less important role in structuring their beliefs about the implications of historical colonialism in the present.

In brief, the aim of the present study was (1) to test the relevance of a two-dimensional structure – exploitation and development – of SRC across European formerly colonising countries and African formerly colonised countries; (2) to assess their external validity by assessing the association between the two dimensions of SRC and other variables – collective guilt and shame acceptance or assignment; support for reparations; and national identification; (3) to test a mediation model that links the two dimensions of SRC to collective guilt and shame, or support for reparation, through their effect on national identification, and compare it between the two sub-samples (formerly colonised and formerly colonising countries).

Method

Sample

Data were collected from 1134 university students who were citizens of 9 countries. The 9 countries formed two clusters: 3 historically colonising European countries, including Belgium ($N = 215$, all French-speaking), France ($N = 92$) and Portugal ($N = 104$); and 6 historically colonised African countries, including Angola ($N = 74$); Burundi ($N = 177$); Cape Verde ($N = 63$); Democratic Republic of the Congo ($N = 141$); Guinea-Bissau ($N = 88$); and Mozambique ($N = 180$). The total sample consisted of 411 (36%) European and 723 (64%) African participants, 640 (56.4%) male and 484 (42.7%) female participants (Missing $N =$

10), with an age ranging between 17 and 55 years (M = 24 years; SD = 6 years). More specific demographic information for the samples from the respective countries is available in the supplementary materials.

Measures

All items and measures in the study were assessed using 1-7 point scales anchored by: 1 = "*Not at all*" and 7 = "*Very much*"; reliability coefficients for the measures are presented in Table 3.

Social Representations of Colonialism (SRC) were assessed using items based upon research conducted by Licata and Klein (2010). The measure asked participants to indicate the extent to which 10 statements matched their representation of colonialism. Using the question stem "When you think about colonialism, what comes to your mind?", the statements read as follows: (1) "Building of ways of communication and economic infrastructure"; (2) "Setting up of education and public health systems"; (3) "Exploitation of the colonial workforce by the colonising countries"; (4) "Exploitation of colonised countries' resources to the benefit of colonising countries"; (5) "Pacification of colonised countries"; (6) "Evangelization of colonised countries"; (7) "Destruction of colonised countries' cultures and ways of living"; (8) "The civilizing mission of the Europeans"; (9) "European colonisers' racist attitude towards colonised peoples"; and (10) "Bad treatments inflicted to colonised peoples by colonisers". Principal Component Analysis (PCA) conducted by Licata and Klein (2010) indicated that the statements fell into two distinguishable factors. The first factor captured statements representing colonialism as a negative phenomenon oppressive towards, exploitative of, and destructive for colonised countries, cultures and peoples (items: 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10). The second factor consisted of items representing colonialism as a positive force that led to the civilization and development of colonised countries (items: 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8).

Collective Guilt and Shame feelings for past colonialism were measured using two statements also adapted from Licata and Klein (2010). The two statements assessed the extent to which participants thought that present day Europeans should feel guilty and ashamed for their colonial actions in the past: "Europeans should feel guilty for their colonial actions" and "Europeans should feel ashamed of their colonial actions". It should be noted that this measure captures the acceptance of collective guilt and shame from the point of view of citizens of former colonising countries, whereas it captures the assignment of collective guilt and shame from the perspective of former colonised countries' citizens.

Likewise, *Support for Reparative Action* was assessed using two statements from Licata and Klein (2010). These two statements asked participants to indicate the extent to

which they thought that present European governments should apologize to their former colonies and compensate them for their past colonial actions: “European governments should publicly apologize for colonialism” and “European governments should offer compensation to their former colonies”.

Two items also assessed *National Identification*, measuring the extent to which participants identified with being citizens of their respective countries. Two items were adapted for each country and read as follows*:* “I'm glad to be [nationality]” and “I regret to be [nationality]”. The second item was reverse-coded for the purposes of the analyses, which means that higher scores indicate greater national identification.

Procedures

Data coming from Angola, Belgium, Burundi, Cape Verde, Congo, France, and Guinea-Bissau were collected as part of the World History Survey (WHS), a global survey of social representations of history and their connections to group identity (see Liu et al., 2005, 2009). Some of the researchers involved in this large-scale data collection agreed to include a set of questions on SRC in the questionnaire. For this reason, the choice of countries was based on convenience rather than on theoretical reasons. For example, we could not collect data from former French colonies, nor from the United Kingdom and former British colonies. However, data were collected separately for Mozambique and Portugal as part of a study of social representations of history and identity narratives (see Cabecinhas & Feijó, 2010). Data from Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique were collected in their respective capital cities’ universities, as local collaborators administered surveys during class. Burundi’s data also was collected from its capital’s university and surveys were administered during a psychology class. Meanwhile, Congo’s data was collected on the campus of its capital’s university. Nevertheless, the procedures were largely the same in the two episodes of data collection: 1) ethical approval for the research was obtained from the human ethics committee of Victoria University of Wellington for the data collection as part of the WHS, while scientific and ethical approval was obtained from University of Minho for research for the data collection in Mozambique and Portugal; 2) the survey was administered in the most prevalent language in French-speaking Belgium, Burundi, Congo, France, and Portugal, and the standard language of instruction in Angola, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique; 3) the survey was back-translated to ensure conceptual and linguistic equivalence in the two languages that it was administered (French and Portuguese); 3) data was collected from mainly social science students ; 4) participants were provided with an overview of the survey content before agreeing to participate, and were then debriefed about

the aims of the study upon completion of the survey; 5) no incentives were offered for participation; and 6) the questionnaires took 20 to 35 minutes to complete.

Results

The results section consists of two sub-sections: an examination of the psychometric properties of SRC, followed by an examination of the consequences of SRC in European formerly colonising countries, and African formerly colonised countries, for the acceptance and assignment of emotions (i.e., collective guilt and shame) and support for reparation (i.e., apologies and compensation) for past colonialism. The first sub-section presents the confirmatory factor analyses, which aim was to establish the SRC's factor structure, and to test it among participants from the two continents. The second sub-section consists of three steps of inferential statistics that examine differences in SRC between the two continents (MANOVA), the relationships between SRC, collective guilt and shame, and support for reparation, for past colonialism, and national identification (correlations), and the extent to which the relationship between SRC and collective guilt and shame, and support for reparation, for past colonialism, are mediated by national identification among participants from the two continents (indirect effects analyses).

SRC: Psychometric Properties. Above all, it was important to determine if the factor structure of the measure assessing SRC unearthed from Licata and Klein (2010) was supported in the current sample. This involved conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) that specified two factors, with the first factor representing colonisation characterised by *Exploitation* (items: 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10) and the second in terms of *Development* (items: 1, 2, 5, 6 and 8). We conducted the CFA in AMOS 22.0 (Arbuckle, 2013) and used the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Root Mean Squared Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardised Root Mean Squared Residual (SRMR) to evaluate model fit. Values of $> .90$ for the CFI and $< .08$ for the RMSEA and SRMR indicate acceptable fit between a specified model and observed data (Hu & Bentler, 1999; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). Although we report the chi-square statistic so as to compare nested models, we do not rely on it in evaluating model fit because of its sensitivity to large sample sizes (> 200; Kline, 2005); as an alternative, the normed chi-square statistic ($\chi 2/df$) is reported – values between 2 and 5 are indicative of acceptable fit (Schumacker & Lomax, 2004; Ullman, 2001).

The first step of analyses involved a redundancy test showing that a one-factor model, with all SRC items loading onto the same factor, had a poorer fit than the hypothesized two-factor model; these analyses were performed with the total sample. Although the fit of the two-factor model was significantly better than that of the one-factor model, it was not in and

of itself satisfactory (One-factor model: $\chi 2$ (35) = 1299.88, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df = 37.14$; CFI = .83, RMSEA = .18 (90% CI: .170 - .187), SRMR = .09; Two-factor model: $\chi 2$ (34) = 649.08, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df = 19.09$; CFI = .92, RMSEA = .13 (90% CI: .118 - .135), SRMR = .07; $\Delta\chi^2$ = 650.80, $p < .001$). However, inspection of the Modification Indices (MI) indicated that the fit could be improved by allowing the error variances of items 3 and 4 (see the Measures sub-section) to co-vary (MI = 304.06). This modification would also make conceptual sense as the two items literally pertain to the exploitation of colonised countries and may thereby share a significant proportion of variance. Allowing the two items to co-vary indeed improved the model significantly and resulted in an acceptable model fit ($\chi 2$ (33) = 260.68, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df = 7.90$; CFI = .97, RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .069 - .087), SRMR = .07; $\Delta\chi^2$ = 388.20, $p < .001$). Nevertheless, despite the improved fit of the model, three items in the Development factor had unsatisfactorily low loadings. The three items, 5, 6 and 8 (respective factor loadings: .37, .20, and .12), could be argued to consist of a separate third factor that captures representations of colonialism as a proselytizing force that pursues to indoctrinate those colonised with the morals and values of the colonisers. However, examination of the internal consistency of the three items revealed unacceptable Cronbach's alphas in the total sample ($\alpha = .42$) as well as the European ($\alpha = .33$) and African ($\alpha = .45$) subsamples. Based upon these findings it was decided to exclude these three items from the model and proceed with further analyses. Having removed the items, we re-ran the two-factor model including five items measuring Exploitation (items: 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10) and two items measuring Development (items: 1 and 2). This model had a good fit ($\chi 2$ (12) = 62.33, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df$ = 5.19; CFI = .99, RMSEA = .06 (90% CI: .046 - .076), SRMR = .02; $\Delta\chi^2 = 198.35$, $p < .001$)[2]; the model also had a good fit in the European and African subsamples, respectively (European subsample: $\chi 2$ (12) = 41.91, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df = 3.49$; CFI = .99, RMSEA = .08 (90% CI: .053 - .104), SRMR = .03; African subsample: ($\chi 2$ (12) = 43.80, $p < .001$; $\chi 2/df$ = 3.65; CFI = .99, RMSEA = .06 (90% CI: .042 - .080), SRMR = .02).

Finally, having established a psychometrically sound factor structure of SRC in the total sample and the two subsamples, we examined whether the same two-factor structure was invariant between the European and African subsamples – that is, whether the factor structure was equivalent between European formerly colonising countries and African formerly colonised countries. This entailed conducting a Multigroup Analysis (MGA; also in

[2] This model also had a significantly better fit than a one-factor model including the same seven items ($\chi 2$ (13) = 686.82, $p < .001$; CFI = .90, RMSEA = .21 (90% CI: .200 - .228), SRMR = .10; $\Delta\chi 2 = 624.49$, $p < .001$; ΔCFI = .09).

AMOS 22.0). The first step of the MGA involved establishing a baseline model in which the parameters were estimated freely between the two subsamples. This model is referred to as the configural model and establishes if there is a good fit in the factor structure between samples (or subsamples) when no constraints are imposed; configural invariance is also a requirement for the comparison of increasingly constrained model parameters between samples. The results from the MGA provided evidence for configural invariance between the European and African samples (see Table 1).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

The configural model was in turn used as a baseline for comparisons with nested models in which parameters were increasingly constrained (see Fischer & Fontaine, 2010; Milfont & Fischer, 2010; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000). We increasingly constrained the measurement weights and measurement intercepts in MGA that was performed for the purposes of the current study; invariance at these two levels of measurement respectively establishes "weak" versus "strong" evidence for invariance. Regarding the evaluation of invariance (vs. non-invariance), Cheung and Rensvold (2002) recommend that a CFI difference of less than .01 between each progressively constrained model with each respectively preceding model (beginning with the unconstrained model) suggests that the null hypothesis of invariance should be accepted. Following these criteria, both metric and scalar invariance between the two subsamples could be inferred. This finding means that participants' understanding of the items comprising the SRC measure, as well as their clustering, were comparable between the European and African subsamples (see Table 2).

[Insert Table 2 about here]

The descriptive and reliability statistics for the SRC measure, but also the other measures, are presented in Table 3. The country-wise means and standard deviations are available in the supplementary materials (Table A).

Main Analysis

Mean differences in SRC between European and African samples. The first step of the main analysis comprised a MANOVA comparing the European and African participants' responses to the measures in the study. The omnibus MANOVA was significant (Pillai's Trace: $F(5, 1080) = 51.13$, $p < .001$, $\eta_{\pi}^{2} = .19$), which indicates one or more significant differences in the specific measures between the European and African participants. Further inspection of the tests of between-subjects effects in fact revealed

significant differences for all measures between the two subsamples. The results from these between-subjects effects are presented in Table 3.

[Insert Table 3 about here]

The results show mixed results for SRC: social representations of colonialism denoted by exploitation were endorsed more strongly by European than by African participants, whereas social representations of colonialism denoted by development were endorsed more strongly by African than by European participants. The results for the remaining measures were unidirectional: African participants endorsed the views that present day Europeans should feel collective guilt and shame for past colonialism, and that European governments should apologise and compensate former colonies for their past colonial actions, to a greater extent than European participants; African participants also exhibited significantly higher levels of national identification compared to European participants. The results suggest that while African participants represented colonialism as being benign to a greater extent than European participants, their views about the implications of past colonialism for the present, in terms of both emotions and reparation, were stronger than among European participants. Likewise, while European participants represented colonialism as being malign to a greater extent than African participants, they were less likely than African participants to endorse the view that European people and governments in the present were accountable for colonialism in the past.

Correlations. The second step of the main analysis involved examining correlations between the measures, which is presented in a matrix in Table 4. The results show that both dimensions of SRC correlated negatively and significantly among both European and African participants. SRC denoted by exploitation were positively and significantly correlated with the view that present day Europeans should feel collective guilt and shame for past colonialism, whereas SRC denoted by development were negatively and significantly correlated with these measures. This pattern of findings could be observed among both European and African participants. Likewise, acceptance and assignment of emotions (i.e., collective guilt and shame) and support for reparation (i.e., apologies and compensation) for past colonialisms were positively and significantly correlated among both European and African participants.

However, differences could be observed in the two subsamples' correlation patterns with regard to their support for reparative action and levels of national identification. On the one hand, SRC denoted by exploitation were positively and significantly correlated with the

view that present day European governments should apologise and compensate for their past colonial actions among European but not African participants. Likewise, SRC denoted by development were negatively correlated with support for reparation among only European participants. On the other hand, SRC denoted by both exploitation and development divergently correlated with national identification among African but not European participants, with SRC denoted by exploitation being positively correlated with national identification, and SRC denoted by development being negatively correlated with national identification.

[Insert Table 4 about here]

Indirect effects analyses.

The third and final step of the main analysis examined whether the respective relationships between SRC, denoted by both exploitation and development, and emotions and support for reparation for past colonialism were mediated by participants' national identification. That is, we examined if the effects of SRC upon group-based emotions and support for reparation for past colonialism were indirect via national identification.

We tested four models per group of countries: 1) the first model tested whether the effect of SRC denoted by *exploitation* upon *emotions* was indirect and mediated via national identification; 2) the second model tested whether the effect of SRC denoted by *exploitation* upon *support for reparation* was indirect and mediated via national identification; 3) the third model tested whether the effect of SRC denoted by *development* upon *emotions* was indirect and mediated via national identification; and 4) the fourth model tested whether the effect of SRC denoted by *development* upon *support for reparation* was indirect and mediated via national identification. In order to examine the unique indirect effects of the two dimensions of SRC via national identification, the dimension of SRC not entered as an independent variable in the respective four models was instead included as a covariate. This means that SRC denoted by development was entered as a covariate in the first and second models, whereas SRC denoted by exploitation was entered as a covariate in the third and fourth models. The four models were run separately for the two subsamples. All indirect effects analyses were conducted using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013), with the specification of 95% confidence intervals and 5000 bootstrap resamples. The results from the indirect effects analyses are presented in Table 5.

[Insert Table 5 about here]

Indirect effects analyses showed diverging result patterns with regard to SRC denoted by exploitation between the two subsamples. More precisely, for the European subsample, SRC denoted by exploitation had direct (positive) effects but not indirect effects via national identification on the acceptance of collective guilt and shame (model one), and support for reparation (model two), for past colonialism. However, for the African subsample, SRC denoted by exploitation had indirect (positive) effects on the assignment of collective guilt and shame (model one), and support for reparation (model two), for past colonialism; only one direct effect could be observed for the African subsample – the effect of SRC denoted by exploitation on the assignment of collective guilt and shame for past colonialism (model one)[3]. These results indicate that, while the implications of SRC for the present, in terms of collective emotions and reparations, were stronger among European compared to African participants, this stance was not embedded in national identification. In contrast, among African participants, the assignment of collective guilt and shame, and support for apologies and compensation in the present for exploitative colonialism in the past was, at least in part, entrenched in national identification.

However, when regarding SRC denoted by development, national identification did not mediate the relationship with acceptance versus assignment of collective guilt and shame (model three), nor support for apologies and compensation (model four) for past colonialism in either the European and African subsamples. Direct effects of SRC denoted by development onto collective guilt and shame (model three), and support for reparation (model four), for past colonialism, could only be observed in the European subsample, and these effects were negative in both models.

Discussion

The present study was designed to investigate the structure of social representations of colonialism. More precisely, we sought to test the validity of Licata and Klein's (2010) bi-

[3] We also examined the viability of four alternative models in which the functions of SRC and national identification were exchanged – specifically, when national identification was entered as the independent variable and SRC as the mediating variable. No direct or indirect effects could be observed in these models for the European subsample. However, for the African subsample, an indirect effect could be observed in the first alternative model and direct effects could be observed in the second and fourth alternative models. No direct or indirect effects could be observed in the third alternative model. Taken together with the results from the hypothesised indirect effects models, the results indicate that the respective effects of SRC denoted by exploitation and national identification on the assignment of collective guilt and shame for past colonialism are closely intertwined: the effects of SRC denoted by exploitation were both direct and indirect via national identification, whereas the effect of national identification was indirect via SRC denoted by exploitation. Furthermore, national identification had direct effects upon support for reparative action for colonialism, and also mediated the effect of SRC denoted by exploitation on support for reparation for past colonial action. The results from the alternative indirect effects models are presented in the supplementary materials.

dimensional structure of SRC, comprising representations of both exploitation and development dimensions, across samples from European formerly colonizing countries and African formerly colonized countries. The study also examined how this bi-dimensional structure of SRC interacted with acceptance and assignment of negative emotions, support for symbolic and financial reparations, as well as national identification, within and between both subsamples.

Social Representations of Colonialism

The study indeed brought validation to Licata and Klein's (2010) structure of social representation of colonialism, as these were found to be structured along the same two dimensions – exploitation and development – across participants from three formerly colonising countries and six formerly colonised countries. However, it is worth noticing that the African subsample's representation was more nuanced than the European one. That is, African participants tended to include both dimensions in their SRC, while Europeans represented past colonialism more in terms of exploitation. This more nuanced representation of colonialism expressed by African participants seems to contradict the contention that African national identities were built in contrast to colonial projects, before and after their independence. This should have led to radically anti-colonial positions, which we did not observe.

As an object of representation, colonialism is probably more complex for Africans than for Europeans. For the latter, colonialism is relatively remote both in time and space, whereas the former live in an environment that is more clearly perceived as shaped by colonialism. In addition, most African countries currently face particularly difficult economic and political situations. Some Africans have criticized their current governments by pointing to the deterioration of their country's economic, health, and education infrastructures, and political stability, since the end of the colonial era (Bissel, 2005). Further research is needed to identify the factors that shape current representations of colonialism in contemporary African societies.

Beyond the remoteness of colonialism for contemporary young Europeans, their more exclusively negative representation of colonialism could also be attributed to the normative pressure to condemn colonialism that has been described as pervasive in Western democratic countries (Bruckner, 2010). The age of the sample might also partly explain this observation. Indeed, Licata and Klein (2010) found that young Belgians focused more on the exploitation

aspect of the social representations of colonialism than older generations, who rather stressed the development dimension. As we used exclusively student samples, it is not surprising that European participants expressed a more negative representation. However, Portuguese participants expressed a relatively less negative representation of colonialism as they stressed its exploitation dimension less than the other European countries (see Table B in the supplementary materials). This, as proposed in the introduction to this article, might be explained by the historically imposed Luso-tropicalist representation of their relation with their colonies – which portrays the Portuguese as possessing a particular ability to respect cultural differences – and their permanence in Portuguese contemporary common sense (Castelo, 1999; Valentim, 2011; Valentim & Heleno, 2017).

Further research on social representations of colonialism should collect data from a more representative sample (i.e. not only students) in order to be able to test it with different generations and social categories. It must also be added that our subsample from formerly colonised countries was exclusively composed of participants from African countries. However, research on social representations of colonialism should not only take into consideration this geographic area, and the imperialist version of colonialism that characterized that of the 19th and 20th centuries. Furthermore, it would have been interesting to include measures of African and European identification. Indeed, although social representations of colonialism are linked with national identities, to the extent that colonialism was a transnational phenomenon that opposed groups of countries, these "continental" identities might also be at stake.

Assigned or accepted emotions and support for reparation

Social representations of colonialism denoted by exploitation were associated with a stronger view that present-day Europeans should feel guilty and shameful for their past colonial actions, whereas social representations of colonialism denoted by development were negatively associated with these negative collective emotions amongst both European and African participants. Similarly, the European participants who expressed social representations of colonialism denoted by exploitation seemed more willing to offer reparations, probably to compensate for their past misdeeds and thus restore their social identity (Branscombe, et al., 2004; Lickel, et al., 2004). Yet, this was not the case among African participants: they assigned more reparation to Europeans than European participants, but it did not correlate with their social representations of colonialism.

Indirect effects via national identification

However, indirect effects of social representations of colonialism on negative collective emotions and on support for reparation via national identification were observed only in the African subsample, and only for the exploitation dimension of the representation. This could be due to various causes. First, the African national identities are probably more tightly linked to the colonial past than the European ones (see Cabecinhas, Liu, Licata, Klein, Mendes, Feijó, & Niyubahwe, 2011). As argued above, the colonial past is more importantly embedded in the present life of African countries than of European ones. As suggested by Rothberg (2013), colonialism did not only takeover space, but also time: consequences of colonialism are obviously more linked to present issues for the formerly colonised countries than for formerly colonising ones. Moreover, as suggested by Liu and Khan (2014), colonialism is also more strongly linked to the national identities of formerly colonised country's inhabitants. Thus, young African participants probably consider past colonialism as more strongly affecting their situation and identity than European participants (see also Sibley, Liu, Duckitt, & Khan, 2008).

Secondly, results showed that European participants acknowledged the negative aspects of colonialism, probably due to a normative pressure (Licata & Klein, 2010). However, in contrast with African participants, they did not consider this historical period as being relevant to their social identity. Based on social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), one could argue that, since ingroup favouritism could not be directly expressed because colonialism's exploitation dimension is difficult to dismiss, young and educated citizens of formerly colonising countries do not try to deny past misdeeds. However, in order to protect their social identity, they distance themselves from this past and do not consider it as being relevant for their present social identity. This apparent need for historical closure seems to appeal to various historical perpetrator groups (Imhoff, Bilewicz, Hanke, Kahn, Henkel-Guembel, Halabi, Shani-Sherman, & Hirschberger, 2016; Sibley et al., 2008). Indeed, members of perpetrator groups generally tend to place historical misdeeds much more in historical perspective than members of offended groups (Pennekamp, Doosje, Zebel, & Fischer, 2007). Hanke et al. (2013) found that perpetrator groups from World War II were more likely to "draw a dividing line" separating the past and present than formerly victimised groups. Similarly, Figueiredo, Valentim, and Doosje's study (2015) showed that Portuguese and Dutch participants' intention to compensate for colonialism was significantly weaker among participants who considered that too much time had passed since colonial times.

Admittedly, our measure of SRC might also have corroborated the idea that formerly colonised countries are stuck in the past as the items tended to present the colonisers in an active role, and the colonised in a passive one. Future research should include more agentic representations of the colonised (which better fits reality as colonised peoples always resisted, sometimes throughout the whole colonial period. See Ferro, 2003).

Limitations

It is worth noting that the samples used in these studies were not representative of their national populations. The data were collected among university students, mostly for reasons of convenience. Students form a very specific section of national populations (Highhouse & Gillespie, 2009), especially in African countries, where access to higher education is more restricted than in European ones. Due to this non-representativeness, mean values, and mean comparisons between formerly colonised and colonising countries, should be interpreted with caution. Hence, European students might hold a more critical stance towards colonialism than the general population, whereas African students, generally originating from more privileged social classes, might hold more lenient representations of colonialism than more socially disadvantaged co-nationals. In addition, these findings cannot be generalized to citizens of other European and African countries. Further research is needed to test the stability of our finding across representative samples from more countries.

Conclusion

The present study has brought internal and external validation to a bi-dimensional structure of social representations of colonialism, comprising both the aspects of exploitation and development of past colonialism, across samples from formerly coloniser European and formerly colonised African countries. This model could be used in future research investigating social representations of colonialism and their current implications in different settings, from international relations involving formerly colonised or colonising countries, to intercultural relations within European or African countries. Importantly, it also showed that young Europeans tended to represent colonialism in a more negative way than did young Africans, who held more nuanced representations of colonialism. However, African participants tended to perceive more significant relationships between these representations of the past and current intergroup relations than Europeans. These representations of colonialism were significantly connected with their national identification, with their assignment of collective guilt and shame to present-day Europeans, and with their support for

reparative actions. Whereas these connections were expected among Africans, the apparent disjunction between representations of the colonial past and its present-day implications among young Europeans is more challenging. It raises the question of the teaching of colonial history and of its effectiveness. Our results showed that European students tended to express mainly the negative aspects of colonialism, but at the same time to see it as a closed history unconnected with their present identities and with their moral engagement with formerly colonised peoples. How to help them make this connection, thus raising their awareness that the memory of colonialism is not “the property of the sole peoples who were victims of these events” is a crucial question if one wishes to respond to Mbembe’s (2016, p. 104) invitation to reach “a truly universal humanity”.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests in publishing this article.

This work was conducted within the framework of COST Action IS1205 “Social psychological dynamics of historical representations in the enlarged European Union".

References

Arbuckle, J. L. (2013). *Amos* (Version 22.0) [Computer Program]. Chicago: SPSS.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representation of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bentley, T. (2015). *Empires of Remorse: Narrative, Postcolonialism and Apologies for Colonial Atrocity*. New York: Routledge.

Boahen, A. (1985). *General History of Africa, VII: Africa under colonial domination, 1880-1935*. Paris: UNESCO; Berkley, CA: University of California Press; London: Heinemann Educational.

Boilley, P. (2015). Loi du 23 Février 2005, colonisation, indigènes, victimisations. Evocations binaires, représentations primaires. *Politique Africaine, 2(98),* 131-140.

Bissell, W. C. (2005). Engaging colonial nostalgia. *Cultural Anthropology*, *20*(2), 215–248.

Branscombe, N. R., & Cronin, T. (2010). Confronting the past to create a better future: The antecedents and benefits of intergroup forgiveness. In A. Azzi, X. Chryssochoou, B. Klandermans, & B. Simon (Eds.), *Identity and participation in culturally diverse societies* (pp. 338–358). New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

Branscombe, N.R., & Doosje, B. (eds) (2004). *Collective Guilt: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Branscombe, N. R., Slugoski, B. & Kappen, D. M. (2004). The Measurement of Collective Guilt. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 16-34). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruckner, P. (2010). *The Tyranny of Guilt: An essay on western masochism.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cabecinhas, R., & Feijó, J. (2010). "Collective memories of Portuguese colonial action in Africa: Representations of the colonial past among Mozambicans and Portuguese youths". *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 4 (1), 28-44. http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0070-ijcv-2010111

Cabecinhas, R., Liu, J. H., Licata, L., Klein, O., Mendes, J., Feijó, J., & Niyubahwe, A. (2011). "Hope in Africa? Social representations of world history and the future in six African countries". *International Journal of Psychology*, 46(5), 354-367. doi: 10.1080/00207594.2011.560268.

Castelo, C. (1999). *O modo português de estar no mundo: O luso-tropicalismo e a ideologia colonial portuguesa—1933–1961* [The Portuguese way of relating to the world: *Luso-tropicalism* and the Portuguese colonial ideology]. Porto, Portugal: Afrontamento.

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*, 233-255. DOI:10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

Coquery-Vidrovitch, C. (2004). *A descoberta de África* (2a ed.). Lisboa: Edições 70.

Corbel, L., & Falaize, B. (2004). L'enseignement de l'histoire et les mémoires douloureuses du XXème sciècle. Enquête sur les representations enseignantes. *Revue française de pédagogie, 147*, 43-55.

Doosje, B., Branscombe, N.R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A.R. (1998). Guilty by association : When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(4), 872-886. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.4.872.

Ferro, M. (2003). *Le livre noir du colonialisme, XVIe-XXIe siècle : de l'extermination à la repentance*. Paris: R. Laffont.

Figueiredo, A., Valentim, J.P., & Doosje, B. (2015). Too Long to Compensate? Time Perceptions, Emotions, and Compensation for Colonial Conflicts. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21 (3)*, 500-504. doi.org/10.1037/pac0000114

Fischer, R., & Fontaine, J. (2010). Methods for investigating structural equivalence. In D. Matsumoto & F. J. van de Vijver (Eds.), *Cross-cultural research methods in psychology* (pp. 179–215). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Freyre, G. (1933/1986). The masters and the slaves. Formation of the Brazilian family under the patriarcal economy regime. Berkeley: University of California [translation of *Casa-grande & senzala. Formação da família brasileira sob o regime de economia patriarcal* Lisboa: Livros do Brasil].

Gaskell, G. D., & Wright, D. B. (1997). Group differences in memory for a political event. In J. W. Pennebaker, D. Paez, & B. Rime (Eds.), *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives*. (pp. 175 - 189). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hakim, M.A., Liu, J.H., Isler, L., & Woodward, M. (2015). Monarchism, national identity and social representations of history in Indonesia: Intersections of the local and national in the Sultanates of Yogyakarta and Surakarta. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 18,* 259-269. DOI: 10.1111/ajsp.12109

Hanke, K., Liu, J. H., Hilton, D. J., Bilewicz, M., Garber, I., Huang, L.-L., Gastardo-Conaco, C., & Wang, F. (2013). When the past haunts the present: Intergroup forgiveness and historical closure in post World War II societies in Asia and in Europe. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *37*(3), 287–301.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to Mediation, Moderation, and Conditional Process Analysis: A Regression-Based Approach*. New York: Guilford Press.

Highhouse, S., & Gillespie, J. Z. (2009). Do samples really matter that much? In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Ed.), *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences* (p. 247–265). New York: Routledge.

Hochschild, A. (1999). *King Leopold's ghost: A story of greed, terror, and heroism in colonial Africa*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118

Imhoff, R., Bilewicz, M., Hanke, K., Kahn, D.T., Henkel-Guembel, N., Halabi, S., Shani-Sherman, T., & Hirschberger, G. (2016). Explaining the Inexplicable: Differences in Attributions for the Holocaust in Germany, Israel, and Poland. Political Psychology, online first. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/pops.12348.

Iyer, A., & Leach, C. W. (2008). Emotion in inter-group relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *19*, 86-125.

Khan, S. S., Svensson, T., Jogdand, Y. A., & Liu, J. H. (2016). Lessons from the past for the future: The definition and mobilisation of Hindu nationhood by the Hindu nationalist movement of India. Manuscript under review.

Klein, O., Licata, L., & Pierucci, S. (2011). Does Group Identification Facilitate or Prevent Collective Guilt about Past Misdeeds? Resolving the Paradox. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 563-572.

Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. Guilford Press.

Kus, L., Liu, J.H., & Ward, C. (2013). Relative deprivation versus system justification: Polemical social representations and identity positioning in a post-Soviet society. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43(5),* 423-437. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.1958

Lastrego, S., & Licata, L. (2010). *Should a Country's Leaders Apologize for its Past Misdeeds?* Revista de Psicología Social 25:61–72.

Licata, L., & Klein, O. (2010). Holocaust or benevolent paternalism? Intergenerational comparisons on collective memories and emotions about Belgium's colonial past. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 4*, 45-57. doi : :0070 -ijcv-2010163

Lickel, B., Schmader, T. & Barquissau, M. (2004). The Evocation of Moral Emotions in Intergroup Contexts: The Distinction between Collective Guilt and Collective Shame. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 35-55). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Liu, J. H., Goldstein-Hawes, R., Hilton, D., Huang, L.-L., Gastardo-Conaco, C., Dresler-Hawke, E., Pittolo, F., Hong, Y.Y., Ward, C., Abraham, S., Kashima, Y., Ohashi, M.M., Yuki, M., & Hidaka, Y. (2005). Social Representations of Events and People in World History Across 12 Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*(2), 171–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022104272900

Liu, H.J, & Hilton, D.J. (2005). How the past weights on the present: Social representations of history and their role in identity politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*, 537-356.doi: 10.1348/014466605X27162

Liu, H.J., & Khan, S.S. (2014). Nation building through historical narratives in pre-independence India: Gandhi, Savarkar, and Golwalkar as entrepreneurs of identity. In M. Hanne (Ed.) *Warring with Words: Narrative and Metaphor in Domestic and International Politics* (pp. 211-237). New York: Psychology Press.

Liu, J.H. & László, J. (2007). A narrative theory of history and identity: Social identity, social representations, society and the individual. In G. Moloney & I. Walker (eds*.) Social*

representations and identity: Content, process and power, p 85-107. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Liu, J. H., Paez, D., Slawuta, P., Cabecinhas, R., Techio, E., Kokdemir, D., Sen, R., Vincze, O., Muluk, H., Wang, F., & Zlobina, A. (2009). Representing World History in the 21st Century: The Impact of 9/11, the Iraq War, and the Nation-State on Dynamics of Collective Remembering. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*(4), 667–692. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022109335557

Liu, J.H., & Sibley, C.G. (2009). Culture, social representations, and peacemaking: A symbolic theory of history and identity. In C. Montiel & N. Noor (eds.) *Peace Psychology in Asia*, pp. 21-42. New York: Springer.

Liu, J.H., & Sibley, C.J. (2015). Representations of world history. In (Ed) G. Sammut, E., Andreouli, G., Gaskell, & J., Valsiner*, The Cambridge Handbook of Social Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, *1*, 130–149.

Mbembe, A. (2016). *Politiques de l'inimitié*. Paris : Editions La Découverte.

Merle, M. (2003). L'anticolonialisme. In M. Ferro (Ed*), Le livre noir du colonialisme, XVI-XXI siècle : de l'extermination à la repentance* (pp. 611-645). Paris: Editions Robert Laffont.

Mignolo, W. (2011). *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options (Latin America Otherwise)*. Duke University Press Books.

Milfont, T. L., & Fischer, R., (2010). Testing measurement invariance across groups: Applications in cross-cultural research. *International Journal of Psychological Research*, *3,* 111-121.

Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*(3), 211–250.

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: Les lieux de memoire. *Representations, 0(26),* 7-26.

Pennekamp, S.J., Doosje, B., Zebel, S., & Fischer, A.H. (2007). The Past and the Pending: The Antecedents and Consequences of Group-Based Anger in Historically and Currently Disadvantaged Groups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10(1)*, 41-55.

Ravlo, H., Gleditsch, N.P., and Dorussen, H. (2003). Colonial War and the Democratic Peace. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47 (4): 520–48.

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation.* London : Sage.

Rimé, B., Bouchat, P., Klein, O., & Licata, L. (2015). When collective memories of victimhood fade: Generational evolution of intergroup attitudes and political aspirations in Belgium. *European Journal of Social Psychology, (45)*, 515-532.

Roccas, S., Klar, Y. & Liviatan, I. (2004). Exonerating Cognitions, Group Identification, and Personal Values as Predictors of Collective Guilt among Jewish- Israelis. In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 130-147). Cambridge University Press.

Rothberg, M. (2013). Rembering back. Cultural Memory, Colonial Legacies, and Postcolonial studies. In G. Huggan (Ed) *The Oxford handbook of Postcolonial Studies* (pp. 359-379). Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Sahdra, B., & Ross, M. (2007). Group identification and historical memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 384-395.

Said, E. (1993). *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2004). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modelling* (2nd edition). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sibley, C.S., Liu, J.H., Duckitt, J., & Khan, S.S. (2008). Social representations of history and the legitimation of social inequality: The form and function of historical negation. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38,* 542-565.

Ullman, J. B. (2001). Structural equation modeling. In B. G. Tabachnick & L. S. Fidell (Eds.). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (4th edition; pp 653- 771). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Vala, J., Lopes, D., & Lima, M. (2008). Black immigrants in Portugal: luso–tropicalism and prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 287-302.

Valentim, J. P. (2003). *Identidade e lusofonia nas representações sociais de portugueses e de africanos* [Identity and lusophony in social representations of Portuguese and Africans]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.

Valentim, J. P. (2011). Social psychology and colonialism: Luso-tropicalism as a social representation in the context of contemporary Portuguese society. In J. P. Valentim (Ed.), *Societal approaches in social psychology* (pp. 180-194). Berne: Peter Lang.

Valentim, J. P., & Heleno, A. M. (2017). Luso-tropicalism as a social representation in Portuguese society: variations and anchoring. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*.

Vandenberg, R.J., & Lance, C.E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance literature: Suggestions, practices and recommendations for organizational research. *Organizational Research Methods, 3,* 4-70. DOI: 10.1177/109442810031002

Vidal, K. (2008). Kabila woest op De Gucht. De Morgen, 20 November.

Volpato, C., & Licata, L. (2010). Introduction: Collective memories of colonial violence. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 4*(1), 4-10.

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2004). Importance of social categorization for forgiveness and collective guilt assignment for the Holocaust. In N. R. Branscombe and B. Dooje (Eds.) *Collective guilt: International perspectives* (pp. 284-305). Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9781139106931.017.

Wohl, M. J. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Klar, Y. (2006). Collective guilt: An emotional response to perceived ingroup misdeeds. *European Review of Social Psychology, 17*, 1-37. doi:10.1080/10463280600574815.

Wohl, M. J. A., Matheson, K., Branscombe, N. R., & Anisman, H. (2013). Victim and Perpetrator Groups' Responses to the Canadian Government's Apology for the Head Tax on Chinese Immigrants and the Moderating Influence of Collective Guilt. *Political Psychology, 34 (5)*, 713-729.

Young, R. J. C. (2001). Postcolonialism: an historical introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.

Table A:
Country-Wise Demographic Information

Country	*N*	*Gender*			*Age*		
		Female	*Male*	*Missing*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range*	*Missing*
Belgium	215	184 (86%)	29 (13%)	2	20.60 (3.98)	18-53	
Portugal	104	56 (54%)	48 (44%)		20.20 (4.00)	18-45	
France	92	83 (90%)	9 (10%)		20.60 (4.84)	18-44	
Mozambique	180	99 (55%)	81 (45%)		26.60 (6.64)	18-54	1
Burundi	177	82(46%)	92 (52%)	3	24.60 (3.12)	19-38	5
Congo	141	42 (30%)	94 (67%)	5	27.90 (8.31)	18-55	7
Guinea	88	23(26%)	65 (74%)		26.30 (6.49)	18-48	2
Angola	74	33 (45%)	41 (55%)		20.30 (3.65)	18-35	
Cape Verde	63	38 (60%)	25 (40%)		24.90 (4.67)	18-39	3

Table B:

Country-Wise Means and Standard Deviations

Country	*N*	*SRC: Exploitation Mean (SD)*	*SRC: Development Mean (SD)*	*Collective Guilt and Shame Mean (SD)*	*Support for Reparative Action Mean (SD)*	*National Identification Mean (SD)*
Belgium	215	5.80 (1.04)	4.43 (1.40)	4.57 (1.20)	4.39 (1.30)	3.66 (.82)
Portugal	104	3.96 (2.03)	3.05 (1.53)	4.19 (1.32)	3.69 (1.56)	4.10 (.75)
France	92	5.95 (.79)	4.68 (1.40)	4.52 (1.22)	4.16 (1.32)	3.71 (.62)
Mozambique	180	4.51 (2.40)	3.49 (1.94)	4.92 (2.03)	5.18 (1.82)	4.27 (1.01)
Burundi	177	5.82 (1.34)	4.47 (2.07)	5.23 (1.73)	5.49 (1.67)	3.93 (.95)
Congo	141	5.42 (1.62)	3.47 (1.98)	4.57 (1.78)	5.05 (1.63)	3.97 (.89)
Guinea	88	2.66 (2.11)	2.47 (2.11)	5.44 (2.07)	6.03 (1.41)	4.64 (1.25)
Angola	74	4.12 (2.62)	3.63 (2.41)	4.80 (1.95)	5.45 (1.50)	4.54 (1.11)
Cape Verde	63	4.36 (2.42)	3.84 (2.21)	4.99 (1.97)	5.68 (1.33)	4.23 (.96)

Table C:
Summary of Direct and Indirect Effects from Alternative Indirect Effects Analysis

		European Subsample		*African Subsample*	
Model		*Effect*	*LLCI – ULCI*	*Effect*	*LLCI – ULCI*
1	*Direct Effect*	-.0119	-.0896 – .0658	.0928	-.0082 – .1938
	Indirect Effect	-.0064	-.0323 – .0198	. 0097	.0007 – .0285
2	*Direct Effect*	-.0262	-.1145 – .0621	.0970	.0093 – .1847
	Indirect Effect	-.0077	-.0369 – .0204	.0000	-.0093 – .0086
3	*Direct Effect*	.1296	-.0188 – .2781	.0928	-.0082 – .1938
	Indirect Effect	-.0152	-.0467 – .0004	-.0042	-.0011 – .0179
4	*Direct Effect*	-.0262	-.1145 – .0621	.0970	.0093 – .1847
	Indirect Effect	.0014	-.0028 – .0132	.0001	-.0063 – .0071

Model 1: PROCESS Model 4; IV= National Identification; DV = Collective Guilt and Shame; Mediator = SRC Exploitation
Model 2: PROCESS Model 4; IV= National Identification; DV = Support for Reparative Action; Mediator = SRC Exploitation
Model 3: PROCESS Model 4; IV= National Identification; DV = Collective Guilt and Shame; Mediator = SRC Development
Model 4: PROCESS Model 4; IV= National Identification; DV = Support for Reparative Action; Mediator = SRC Development

Table 1:
Standardised Measurement Weights in the Unconstrained Multigroup Analysis (MGA) Model

Country Cluster	*Factor*						
	Exploitation					*Development*	
	Items					*Items*	
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*1*	*2*
European	.75***	.77***	.82***	.92***	.96***	.84***	.76***
African	.84***	.88***	.75***	.93***	.96***	.87***	.87***

Table 2:
Results from the MGA of the (Revised) Two-Factor Structure of Social Representations of Colonisation (SRC) Measure

Model	*df*	χ^2	χ^2/df	*CFI*	*RMSEA*	*SRMR*	$\Delta\chi^2$	ΔCFI
Unconstrained (Configural)	644	85.72	0.13	.99	.05	.03		
Measurement Weights	664	138.07	0.21	.98	.06	.04	25.61ns	.01
Measurement Intercepts	692	190.50	0.28	.98	.06	.04	68.39***	.00

Table 3:
Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alphas and Between-Subjects Effects

Measure	*Sample*	*N*	*M*	*SD*	α	*MANOVA - Between-Subjects Effects**
SRC: Exploitation	*Complete*	1134	4.96	2.06	.94	$F(1,1084) = 25.72, p < .001, \eta_{\pi}^2 = .02$
	European	411	5.37	1.56	.93	
	African	723	4.73	2.26	.95	
SRC: Development	*Complete*	1134	4.19	1.99	.84	$F(1,1084) = 16.57, p < .001, \eta_{\pi}^2 = .02$
	European	411	3.87	1.58	.78	
	African	723	4.37	2.18	.86	
Collective Guilt and Shame	*Complete*	1134	4.80	1.72	.73	$F(1,1084) = 24.43, p < .001, \eta_{\pi}^2 = .02$
	European	411	4.46	1.24	.74	
	African	723	4.98	1.92	.72	
Support for Reparative Action	*Complete*	1134	4.96	1.67	.69	$F(1,1084) = 167.38, p < .001, \eta_{\pi}^2 = .13$
	European	411	4.16	1.40	.72	
	African	723	5.41	1.65	.61	
National Identification	*Complete*	1134	5.86	1.46	.59	$F(1,1084) = 43.02, p < .001, \eta_{\pi}^2 = .04$
	European	411	5.49	1.48	.72	
	African	723	6.08	1.41	.53	

* The between-subjects effects pertain to comparison between the European and African subsamples.

Table 4:

Correlation Matrix

Measure	*Sample*	*SRC: Exploitation*	*SRC: Development*	*Collective Guilt and Shame*	*Support for Reparative Action*	*National Identification*
SRC: Exploitation	*Complete*		-.50***	.15***	.03	.06
	European		-.52***	.36***	.33***	-.02
	African		-.48***	.13**	.02	.13***
SRC: Development	*Complete*			-.11***	-.02	-.06
	European			-.25***	-.21***	-.02
	African			-.10**	-.02	-.11**
Collective Guilt and Shame	*Complete*				.48***	.08**
	European				.48***	-.02
	African				.47***	.09*
Support for Reparative Action	*Complete*					.11***
	European					-.03
	African					.08*

** = p < .05, ** = p < .01, *** = p < .001*

Table 5:
Summary of Direct and Indirect Effects from Indirect Effects Analysis

		European Subsample		*African Subsample*	
Model		*Effect*	*LLCI – ULCI*	*Effect*	*LLCI – ULCI*
1	*Direct Effect*	.2659	.1788 – .3529	.0800	.0084 – .1516
	Indirect Effect	.0004	-.0034 – .0101	.0056	.0000 – 0185
2	*Direct Effect*	.2988	.2006 – .3970	.0002	-.0619 – .0624
	Indirect Effect	.0008	-.0033 – .0142	.0060	.0005 – .0170
3	*Direct Effect*	-.0748	-.1608 – -.0111	-.0520	-.1313 – .0174
	Indirect Effect	.0003	-.0033 – .0094	-.0040	-.0136 – .0004
4	*Direct Effect*	-.0558	-.1527 – -.0412	-.0007	-.0653 – .0639
	Indirect Effect	.0008	-.0026 – .0134	-.0042	-.0132 – .0002

Model 1: PROCESS Model 4; IV= SRC Exploitation; DV = Collective Guilt and Shame; Mediator = National Identification
Model 2: PROCESS Model 4; IV= SRC Exploitation; DV = Support for Reparative Action; Mediator = National Identification
Model 3: PROCESS Model 4; IV= SRC Development; DV = Collective Guilt and Shame; Mediator = National Identification
Model 4: PROCESS Model 4; IV= SRC Development; DV = Support for Reparative Action; Mediator = National Identification

Note. The exact same pattern of findings for the indirect effects was unearthed when the measures were standardised.

Social representations of colonialism in Africa and in Europe: Structure and relevance for contemporary intergroup relations

Laurent Licata[1], Sammyh S. Khan[2], Simona Lastrego[1], Rosa Cabecinhas[3], Joaquim Pires Valentim[4], and James H. Liu[5]

[1] Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Belgium

[2] School of Psychology, Keele University, United Kingdom

[3] Communication and Society Research Centre, University of Minho, Portugal

[4] University of Coimbra, Portugal

[5] Massey University, New Zealand

Contact info: Laurent.Licata@ulb.ac.be

Université libre de Bruxelles (ULB)
Av. F. Roosevelt 50, CP 122
Bureau DC 8 123
1050 Brussels, Belgium