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Abstract: Social representations are values and ideas shared and transmitted by a group of individuals. This article aims to investigate how a researcher's social representations can influence his/her analysis of an interview. Data were collected with 28 students participating in a course on analysis of interview. Students were divided into three groups and each group received the same excerpt of a transcript, but with different characterizations of the interviewee.
For Group 1, it was a young man who had studied in a public school; for Group 2, the subject had attended a special education school for people with intellectual disabilities; for Group 3, he had studied at a private school. The three groups were asked to perform the analysis of interview and hand in a writing document describing their analysis. The data revealed that the students carried out interpretive synthesis, descriptive synthesis and thematic analysis.

Interpretations of content data indicated that participants in Groups 1 and 3 attributed negative representations to the interviewee and/or to public or private school. In contrast, participants in Group 2, who received the description that the interviewee had intellectual disabilities, attributed positive representations to the interviewee and to the special education school. The conclusion indicates the urgency for theoretical and practical training of young researchers regarding analysis of interviews so that the representations do not lead to biased results. The comparison of the results with an earlier similar study points to a probable change in representations of people with intellectual disabilities.
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**Influencia de las representaciones sociales del investigador en el análisis de los datos de las entrevistas: un estudio en el campo de la educación especial**

**Resumen:** Las representaciones sociales son valores y ideas socialmente compartidas y transmitidas por un grupo de personas. Este artículo tiene como objetivo investigar cómo la representación puede influir en el investigador en el análisis de una entrevista. Los datos fueron recolectados con 28 estudiantes que habían participado en un curso sobre análisis de la entrevista. Los estudiantes fueron divididos en tres grupos, cada uno recibiendo el mismo tramo de la transcripción, pero con diferentes caracterizaciones del entrevistado. Para el grupo 1, era un hombre joven que había estudiado en una escuela del gobierno, para el Grupo 2, el sujeto estudió en una escuela especial para personas con discapacidad intelectual, y para el grupo 3, que había estudiado en una escuela privada. Se pidió a los tres grupos para realizar el análisis de la entrevista y entregar un documento escrito sobre ella. Los datos revelaron que los estudiantes realizan síntesis interpretativas, síntesis descriptivas y análisis temático. Las interpretaciones de los datos de contenido indican que los participantes en el grupo 1 y 3 atribuyeron representaciones negativas para el entrevistado y/o a la escuela pública o privada. Por el contrario, los participantes en el Grupo 2, que recibieron la descripción que el entrevistado tenía una discapacidad intelectual leve, atribuyeron representaciones positivas para el entrevistado y a la escuela especializada. La conclusión indica la urgencia de la formación teórica y práctica de los jóvenes investigadores en relación con el análisis de las entrevistas a fin de que las representaciones no den lugar a resultados sesgados. La comparación de los resultados con un estudio similar anterior apunta a una posible transformación en las representaciones de las personas con discapacidad intelectual.

**Palabras-clave:** Educación Especial; Representación Social; Análisis de Entrevista.

**Influência das representações sociais do pesquisador na análise de dados de entrevistas: um estudo no campo da educação especial**

**Resumo:** Representações sociais são valores e ideias socialmente compartilhadas e transmitidas por um grupo de indivíduos. Este artigo pretende investigar como a representação pode influenciar o pesquisador na análise de uma entrevista. Os dados foram coletados com 28 estudantes que participavam de um curso sobre análise de entrevista. Estes foram divididos em três grupos, cada um recebendo o mesmo trecho de uma transcrição, porém com diferentes caracterizações sobre o entrevistado. Para o grupo 1, era um jovem que havia estudado numa escola pública; para o Grupo 2, o sujeito havia estudado numa escola especial para pessoas com deficiência intelectual; e, para o grupo 2,
ele havia estudado numa escola particular. Aos três grupos foi solicitado que realizassem a análise e entregassem um documento escrito sobre a mesma. Os dados revelaram que os estudantes realizaram sínteses interpretativas, sínteses descritivas e análise temática. As interpretações dos dados de conteúdo indicaram que os participantes do grupo 1 e 3 atribuíram representações negativas sobre o entrevistado e/ou sobre a escola pública ou particular. Contrariamente, os participantes do Grupo 2, que receberam a descrição de que o entrevistado possuía deficiência intelectual leve, atribuíram representações positivas sobre o entrevistado e sobre a escola especializada. A conclusão indica a necessidade de formação teórica e prática para jovens pesquisadores no que se refere à análise de entrevistas para que as representações não criem resultados enviesados. A comparação dos resultados com um estudo semelhante anterior aponta uma possível transformação nas representações sobre pessoas com deficiência intelectual.

Palavras-chave: Educação Especial; Representação Social; Análise de Entrevista.

Introduction

The analysis of verbal information from interview is not an easy task for young researchers experiencing this data collection procedure for the first time. In Brazil, interview is a very common procedure in research in education. Sometimes it is used as a single way to collect data, and other times as complementary to data collection through questionnaires, survey, and scales, among others (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006).

Despite its broad utilization, the analysis of interviews requires theoretical and practical knowledge from the researcher. Studies have shown that the theoretical basis for the analysis procedures is not always clearly stated in the reports of master’s or doctorate research (Manzini, 2009; 2012). When specified, Bardin (1977) is the most cited author who supports analysis of interview.

In her book, Bardin (1977) presented several practical examples for content analysis and theoretical bases modeled on authors who used interview to collect data. Among the practical procedures presented by the author, the use of “categorical analysis” and “thematic analysis” have been the most quoted in Brazil to work with information from interview.

More recently, other theoretical approaches have been implemented and have begun to appear in master’s and doctorate reports in education and special education, as the “Collective Subject Discourse” (Lefèvre, Lefèvre, & Teixeira, 2000; Lefèvre & Lefèvre, 2003) and “Propositional Analysis of Discourse” (Pires, 2008). When researchers use interview and other additional procedure such as documents, observation and/ or questionnaires, the methodology of “data triangulation” has also been used for analysis (Triviños, 1987).

Regardless the specific proposals, all of these theoretical approaches have two common denominators. First, the concern that the analysis of speech is transformed into scientific data, and second, that the data obtained from transcripts of interviews are not simply interpreted before a detailed analysis is presented demonstrating how such interpretation was performed. The objective is to search for a scientific validity through an analysis. This is the focus that differentiates an interview to obtain scientific data from a social or journalistic interview, for example.

When interview is used in the field of Special Education, this is not different. However, a new ingredient must be added: the research subject, who may be a disabled person, gifted student, student with autism or with other special needs, who are a priori, stigmatized individuals. In other words, the conception these research subjects have is usually embedded with derogatory preconceived ideas.
Several scientific publications have attempted to inform and challenge prejudices and preconceived ideas about this population, for example, the myths about gifted students (Fleith, 2009; Freitas & Pérez, 2011), or how social construction of disability occurs (Omote, 1990, 1994, 1999; Glat, 2009) or about the sexuality myths of people with disabilities (Glat; Freitas, 2007; Maia & Ribeiro, 2010).

Social representation constitutes a set of values, ideas, perceptions, concepts and practices shared and spread collectively in human relation. It is shaped according to different contexts and historical moments, influencing not only the collectivity, but also the subjects in their individuality (Antunes, 2012; Moscovici, 2003).

The question is how far this representation on an individual or group of individuals - for example, disabled people - may influence the researcher at the time of analyzing the information, the speech, or a report from that individual.

Ethnography approaches have highlighted the need for the researcher to deprive of his values to understand the other person from the viewpoint of that person's culture or that person's society (Romanelli, 1998). But to what extent can the researcher's values influence be avoided? This issue relates closely to the problematic of this article: how can misinterpretations and prejudices emerge in an analysis of interview?

Such reference study approaching this problematic was developed by Manzini (2006) who had ten students of Master's and Doctorate in Education as participants. Data collection was carried out in situations of practical lessons on analysis of interview. Participants were assigned to conduct an analysis of a small excerpt of an interview transcript on the insertion of a 22-year-old man into the labor market, to which they could use whatever criteria they wished.

The ten students were divided into three groups and a distracting stimulus was used for each group altering the characteristics of the interviewee. For one group, it was mentioned that the young man went to a public school. For the second group, it was informed that the young man went to a private school, and finally, for the third group, it was reported that the interviewee had mild intellectual disability and went to a Special Education institution.

The results indicated that some participants carried out a descriptive synthesis, others performed a descriptive and interpretative synthesis, and the third group performed a thematic analysis that divided and reorganized the transcribed excerpt in themes and subthemes. It was significant to note that the group receiving the description of the interviewee as a young man with mild intellectual disability tried to seek evidence of the disability in the text, but the other groups did not. The study indicated that the description of the interviewee as mildly intellectually disabled influenced negatively the interpretation of the data.

Thus, aiming to check whether the same phenomenon happens nowadays, a new study was conducted applying the same procedure used by Manzini in 2006, which will be described and discussed as follows. Therefore, the objective is to investigate how young researchers interpret or produce biases from a content analysis of data from a transcribed interview.

**Method**

The study sample consisted of 28 students from undergraduate programs in pedagogy, master's and doctorate students in education who were attending a course on analysis of interview which included a practical part. The data collection for this experiment was the practical exercise that the students developed at that specific time of the course. As aforementioned, the same design was submitted by Manzini (2006).
The 28 students were randomly divided into three groups: Groups 1 and 2 with nine participants and Group 3 with ten. For each group, the same excerpt of transcription used by Manzini (2006) was assigned, with the same changes in relation to the criteria for the interviewee. The descriptions for each group (G) were:

G1: “You're getting an excerpt of an interview transcript for analysis. This is the story of a 22-year-old man who studied in a public school (indicated by the letter C, which means Training Center) to work as warehouseman, office boy, among other functions. You should do the analysis using the criteria you wish. In this exercise, there is no right or wrong answer. Therefore, you will establish whatever you deem necessary for the analysis. After you finish your analysis, you must submit it in a writing document.”

G2: “You're getting an excerpt of an interview transcript for analysis. This is the story of a 22-year-old man with mild intellectual disability who studied in a special education school (indicated by the letter C, which means Training Center) to work as warehouseman, office boy, among other functions. You should do the analysis using the criteria you wish. In this exercise, there is no right or wrong answer. Therefore, you will establish whatever you deem necessary for the analysis. After you finish your analysis, you must submit it in a writing document.”

G3: “You’re getting an excerpt of an interview transcript for analysis. This is the story of a 22-year-old man who studied in a private school (indicated by the letter C, which means Training Center) to work as warehouseman, office boy, among other functions. You should do the analysis using the criteria you wish. In this exercise, there is no right or wrong answer. Therefore, you will establish whatever you deem necessary for the analysis. After you finish your analysis, you must submit it in a writing document.”

The students handed in the writing document describing their analysis of interview at the end of the practical class. This document was subjected to content analysis to identify first whether the students performed a descriptive or interpretative or other kind of analysis, such as categorical or thematic analysis, according to the findings of Manzini (2006). This analysis allowed us to identify and quantify five categories: 1) Descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview content; 2) Descriptive synthesis of the interview content; 3) Descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview process; 4) Thematic analysis; 5) Thematic analysis with subsequent descriptive synthesis.

The second type of content analysis was meant to verify whether the possible interpretations the students made were related to deliberate changes on the characteristics of the interviewee: 1) young man that studied in public school; 2) Young man with mild intellectual disability that went to a special education institution; 3) Young man who studied in a private school. These interpretations could indicate positive or negative representations towards the interviewee and/or towards the work environment.

**Results**

The first analysis was on the type of analysis the students performed: descriptive, interpretive or thematic. The descriptive and interpretive category on the content of the interview relates to the
descriptions that highlighted the content of speech and incorporated value judgment to the descriptions. For example:

“The 22-year-old male interviewee presents, in his report, the subordinate position he occupies in contemporary society.” (Student 1, Group 1).

“The interviewee reveals inaccuracies in describing the work schedule... it seems he does not understand his working hours...” (Student 9, Group 2).

“Initially the interviewee appears to be nervous, missing the name of his function in his job.” (Student 19, Group 3).

The sentences: "presents, in his report, the subordinate position"; "it seems he does not understand"; "appears to be nervous" attribute value judgment or an interpretation that bias the information contained in the analyzed excerpt, which can be related to the social representation or subject stereotype (public school, special institution, private school student).

Descriptive synthesis of the interview content category highlighted the content, but does not incorporate value judgment on the speech of the interviewee:

“The young man worked operating a lathe, making candle and crayon machines... in his assessment, he took no advantage from the training offered by the institution... he considers it a hard work, for he gets dirty and makes too little money.” (Student 26, Group 3).

In his descriptive synthesis, student 26 uses words taken from the interview excerpt: hard work, gets dirty, makes little money.

In the descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview process, the focus was on the behavior of the interviewer during the interview. The possible interpretations contain flaws in the questions or the answers. To illustrate this category, some examples follow:

“The researcher uses jargon to communicate ... some questions are not direct ...” (Student 8, Group 1).

“There are informal questions asked by the interviewee ... he (the interviewer) is not clear in the questions ...” (Student 15, Group 2).

The thematic analysis category consisted in presenting a classification of the content in themes. For each theme, the students illustrated the classification from selected transcription lines. An excerpt of the thematic analysis follows:

“Profession: lathe operator
Tasks: drilling, branding plate
Work hours: 6 am to 7 pm...
Opinion on the job: it is very heavy
Relationship with other co-workers: [...]” (Student 28, Group 3)

Thematic analysis with subsequent descriptive synthesis category consisted in a thematic analysis previously described added by a descriptive text built by the students (descriptive synthesis).
Therefore, it is about the construction of a system of categories to support a synthesis, considered one of the most scientific, valid documents.

From the descriptive synthesis it would be possible to enter at the discussion and data interpretation level, a task that was not requested during the activities carried out by the participant students in the research.

The five categories were identified and quantified and the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview content</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview process</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic analysis with subsequent descriptive synthesis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive synthesis of the interview content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Produced by the authors.

Table 1 shows that the descriptive and interpretive synthesis (whether on the content or process of interview) were the most common categories in the activities elaborated by the participants to analyze the interview transcript. The other categories were rarely used by the students.

The second type of analysis on the documents was to verify whether the interpretations the students performed in relation to the deliberate changes on the characteristics of the interviewee would indicate a positive or negative representation in relation to the interviewee and/or the work environment.

This type of interpretation is visible when the students related to the content, i.e., in the category of descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview content. Thirteen participants composed their analysis within this category, which is the first line of Table 1.

Four students from Group 1, received the information that the interviewee had attended a public school, described and interpreted the content of the interview. Some interpretations of these excerpts were selected:

“We noted that there is a mistake in selecting the course because the student does not like the office boy job and cannot work in the warehouse because he is allergic to dust.” (Student 2).

“The interviewee had no previous experience on the profession he currently works.” (Student 3).

“He does not consider working on the job he is trained for.” (Student 3).

“Taking the criterion of socialization, work environment allows us to conclude that the young man rarely interacts with colleagues.” (Student 4).

“There is no interaction between the co-workers outside the work environment.” (Student 4).
“There was a lack of compatibility - between the training and the work – because he claims health problems, such as allergy.” (Student 4).

Six students from Group 2, who received the information that the interviewee had mild intellectual disability, carried out descriptive and interpretive synthesis of the interview content. Here are some examples:

“(The interviewee) reports having previously worked in a supermarket chain as an office assistant for a short period of 3 months. This seems to reveal that he was included in the labor market, according to information provided by the special education school where he studied.” (Student 10).

“He knows how to report step by step (the activities he carries) in his work as a lathe operator; he identifies the number of people he works with and the person who taught his current job.” (Student 10).

“We realized, in this report, that he interacts very well with the owner of the company.” (Student 10).

“The interviewee is experienced. The fact that he was experienced contributed to his adaptation to the labor market.” (Student 12).

“The institution (especial education school) does not analyze the interests and desires of the interviewee when offering the course, because the young man claims he learned how to stock, but he cannot work because he is allergic to dust.” (Student 12).

“The interviewee is dissatisfied with his working conditions, because he gets dirty and makes little money - concept of money.” (Student 12).

“It was also noted that he is not satisfied with the salary (he makes little money).” (Student 18).

“This young man went to a training center that contributed to his autonomy.” (Student 17).

“We realized that the companies where he has worked have some kind of inclusion process for people with special needs.” (Student 17).

“We can say that this young man is pursuing his emancipation and preparing for obstacles ...” (Student 17).

“The interviewee resumes the conversation about being a lathe operator, then we realize this good relationship with the machines, with the production of crayons and candles, and personal relationships with the boss and other colleagues.” (Student 18).
“The interviewee reveals inaccuracy in (establishing) his working hours... ... it seems he does not understand his period of work.” (Student 10).

“The report on the work schedule is confusing.” (Student 11).

Students in Group 3 received the information that the interviewee had attended a private school. In this group, three participants performed the interpretation of content. Here are some examples:

“Initially the interviewee appears to be nervous, missing the name of his last job ... has also shown low self-esteem when he reported that he stayed in his previous job because he was not adapting ...” (Student 19).

“Although it is a friendly work environment, relationships are just professional.” (Student 20).

“He seemed to be nervous during the interview.” (Student 21).

Discussion

The first question for discussion relates to the type of analysis adopted by the participants to interpret an interview transcript excerpt. The analysis process consists of separating parts of a whole, reorganizing the verbal material into themes, categories or other form, to reach the goal of the research. With the development of an analysis system, it is possible to present the material (raw data) for more experienced researchers (André, 1983) or judges who will give scientific credibility to the classification system. Subsequently, a synthesis and interpretation of the data follows.

However, it was found that 25 participants (89%) produced a synthesis, and did not create a classification system to perform the analysis, i.e., they did not separate or organize the speech to understand the content. In addition, the word “analysis” is mistaken by the students, who see it as a synonym for data interpretation. The danger for the researcher to skip the analysis phase and immediately set up a synthesis is to separate only whatever draws his attention the most, whatever is more controversial, ignoring information that does not draw attention, but whose latent messages may be present and hidden in a first reading. Furthermore, it is known that at first sight, the data that the researcher firstly highlights depend on the concepts and representations of the object or phenomenon of the study.

Perhaps one of the most important results of the experiment is that only three students (10%) presented a thematic analysis. Certainly the fact that the students addressed directly to the synthesis shows that the group did not dominate the procedures and analysis of interview techniques, and, exactly because of that they had been interested in the course. However, even though around 60% the participants were master's and doctorate students, they were poorly prepared to deal with data coming from interviews.

The data corroborate the study of Manzini (2006). That study had a smaller sample than the present study, however, the participants elaborated the same categories discussed here: descriptive, interpretive or thematic synthesis. Surely, the researcher working with interviews will urge theoretical and practical training to perform the treatment of the collected data. Unfortunately, that demand is not always highlighted in our graduate programs in education. Paradoxically, according to what was
pointed previously, interview is one of the most common data collection procedure in Master's and Doctorate research in the area.

A second issue to be discussed is why did 11 participants (39%) make an analysis of the interview process and not the interview content? Surely, this fact is closely related to the dynamics of the course within the sphere this study was carried out. In other words, the participants were under the control of the course syllabus. The initial content of the course was on defining and conceptualizing interview; subsequently, how to make an interview guide and use it in an interview. Therefore, the content on "content analysis" had not been studied yet. Thus, the students used the knowledge acquired from the course to perform an analysis of the collected data. This trend was not found in Manzini (2006), for the collection of documents in response to the task occurred at the beginning of a short course on analysis of interview. Again, the influence of preconceived ideas or knowledge is verified, i.e., the participants used the information from the course to perform the analysis.

The third point of discussion concerns the highest purpose of the study: which biases and misinterpretations may emerge from an analysis of interview in which the interviewer brings a positive or negative social representation of his research subject?

Observing the selected excerpts of each group, it is possible to verify that Group 1 - which received the information that the interviewee had attended a public school - the students attributed the highest number of negative representations: incorrect choice of course; the interviewee had no previous experience on the job; the interviewee had no prior domain on the profession; he did not intend to perform the duties for which he was trained; the young man had little interaction with coworkers, etc.

Interpretive synthesis presented by Group 3 - which received the information that the young interviewee had attended a private school - were also replete with negative representations in relation to the interviewee and the environment: the interviewee seemed nervous; demonstrated low self-esteem; although it was a friendly work environment, relationships were just professional.

The data presented by Group 2, which received information that the 22 year-old man was intellectually disabled, were totally different. The analysis revealed almost all positive representations in relation to the interviewee. The two analyses that revealed negative representations were related to the description of work hours: the interviewee does not seem to understand the working hours and “says” that the work schedule is confusing.

It is interesting to observe that the positive representations made by this group were extensive to the institution that provided the training: he was included in the labor market as orientation provided by the special education school where he studied; this young man went to a training center that contributed to his autonomy. However, in some cases, the institution received criticism: “The institution (special education) does not analyze the interests and desires of the subject when offering the course, because the young man claims he learned to stock, but he cannot work because he is allergic to dust” (Student 12). It is noted here that the failure was addressed to the institution and not to the interviewee.

The participants also made positive comments in relation to the companies: the companies where he has worked have some kind of inclusion process for people with special needs. However, most positive attributions were directed at the young man described as with mild intellectual disability: 1) he knows how to report step by step (the activities he carries) his work; 2) he can identify the number of people in his work environment; 3) he interacts with the company’s owner very well; 4) he has experience a previous job, which contributed to his adaption in the labor market; 5) he is dissatisfied with his working conditions, because he gets dirty and makes little money, which demonstrates notion about money; 6) he is pursuing his emancipation and preparing for the
obstacles; 7) he gets along well with machines, with the production of crayons and candles, and has good personal relationships with the boss and other colleagues.

The data collected in this study show an opposite trend to the data collected by Manzini (2006). In that study, the attributions in relation to the intellectually disabled young man were all negative, although data collection was quite similar and the material for analysis was the same.

Even though there was no systematic control of variable in the two samples to allow comparison scientifically proved (which was not the intention of this study), the data show that there seems to be a change in the conception of a negative representation to a more positive representation regarding the inclusion of people with disabilities in the labor market. It is noted that data from Manzini (2006) were collected more than seven years ago. And, over the last few years, Brazil has been marked by a series of legal and social changes that certainly influenced the representation and expectations in relation to these individuals.

Undoubtedly today, the policies in Brazil on inclusive education are consolidated by the Federal Government. Several laws (Brasil, 2007; 2008; 2009; 2009a; 2011, among others) and sponsoring agencies have gradually transformed the structure of services to disabled and other special needs students as well as the organization of the school system. The field of Special Education, where most participants of both studies come from, have been suffering an intense process of reframing its proposals and programmatic objectives. (Glat & Blanco, 2011; Glat & Pletsch, 2012).

In addition to the education field, a broad policy articulation is part of this scenario, programs and actions targeted to social inclusion of people with disabilities, highlighting the National Plan of Rights for People with Disabilities, also known as Plan Living Without Limits (Brasil, 2011a). Its promulgation strengthen the former legislation, especially inclusion in labor market (theme on the proposed interview) as Federal Law 8.213/91 de 24/07/91 (Brasil, 1991), known as “Quotas Act.”

Regardless the public policies and legal warrants, it is also necessary to recognize the great impact caused by publicity campaigns, developed by Ministries of Justice, Education, Labor and Sport, aimed at clarifying the rights of persons with disabilities for the general public. Such campaigns, also adopted by private businesses inserting people with disabilities, are constantly in the media, on TV, blogs among other communication media and have gradually provoked a transformation in people’s representations and opinions.

Probably, these aforementioned factors contributed for the discourse in relation to persons with disabilities to change, shown by the documents submitted by the research participants when compared to the previous study. Curiously, the representation addressed about the subject with intellectual disability, contrary to the public sense, was very generous and produced what has been named in Brazil as a politically correct discourse. Thus, while in groups 1 and 3 most of the participants had negative representations in relation to the training and the difficulties of the 22 year-old man, the students in Group 2 attenuated the criticism, tried to seek interpretations that do not denigrate the interview excerpt - object analysis - and built a text full of positive representations regarding the interviewee and the special education school.

Final Considerations

Briefly, the collected data revealed that the researcher’s social representations on the subjects of the study may change the perception about these subjects, which reflects that the researcher’s

---

1This law predicts that companies with more than 100 employees hires 2 to 5% of people with disabilities.
social representation may lead to a biased interpretation. This was confirmed in the study of Manzini (2006), in which the trends were negative interpretations of the interviewee with intellectual disability, whereas in this study, the interpretations have tended to optimize the qualities of the young man.

A second conclusion, inferred from the obtained results, is that the conceptions about “inclusion of people with disabilities in society” may be through a moment of changes in the Brazilian reality, at least among students and professionals in education. It is noted from the participants' analysis, as mentioned before, a predominance of positive representations regarding inclusion of a young man with intellectual disability in labor market, in comparison with the original study carried out almost a decade ago. In this context, it would be interesting to reproduce these procedures in future research, with stricter experimental control on the sample, including, for example, students from areas other than special education.

Therefore, the greater contribution brought by this study is the confirmation of the need for researchers' methodological and conceptual training to address the challenge of using systematic analysis procedures, ensuring that bias is avoided so that the data from the interview is analyzed in a scientific and valid manner.
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