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A Truth Commission (TC) was carried out in Brazil (2012-2014) to investigate human rights violations perpetrated by state agents, especially during the military dictatorship (1964-1985). TCs are supposed to help societies on the reconstruction of social cohesion after authoritarian or violent periods. We conducted three studies with undergraduate students and adult samples between 2014 and 2017. Evaluating the TC as effective was related to higher punctuations on the variables of social cohesion, even controlling the effects of political positioning. The TC effectiveness perception was associated with the emotional reaction (both, negative or positive) and a positive attitude towards remembering the past. Nonetheless, we found some different results across the three studies. These differences are discussed.
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Efectos psicosociales de la Comisión de la Verdad en Brasil

Una Comisión de la Verdad – CV – se llevó a cabo en Brasil para investigar las violaciones de los derechos humanos perpetradas por agentes del Estado durante la dictadura militar (1964-1985). Se supone que las CV ayudan a reconstruir la cohesión social tras períodos autoritarios o violentos. Realizamos tres estudios con estudiantes y adultos entre 2014 y 2017. La evaluación de la CV como efectiva se relacionó con puntuaciones más altas de cohesión social. La percepción de la eficacia de la CV se asoció con la reacción emocional (negativa o positiva) y con una actitud positiva hacia el recuerdo del pasado. Las diferencias encontradas entre los tres estudios se discuten.

Palabras clave: comisiones de la verdad, autoritarismo, justicia transicional, derechos humanos, dictadura

Efeitos psicosociais da Comissão da Verdade no Brasil

Uma Comissão Nacional da Verdade – CNV – foi realizada no Brasil para investigar as violações dos direitos humanos perpetradas por agentes do Estado durante a ditadura militar (1964-1985). As CNVs supostamente ajudam a reconstruir a coesão social após períodos autoritários ou violentos. Realizamos três estudos com estudantes e adultos entre 2014 e 2017. A avaliação da CNV como eficaz estava relacionada a pontuações mais altas de coesão social. A percepção de eficácia da CNV foi associada à reação emocional (negativa ou positiva) e à uma atitude positiva em relação à recordar o passado. As diferenças encontradas entre os três estudos são discutidas.

Palavras-chave: comissões da verdade, autoritarismo, justiça transicional, direitos humanos, ditadura brasileira

Effets psychosociaux de la Commission de la Vérité au Brésil


Mots-clés: commissions de vérité, autoritarisme, justice transitionnelle, droits de l’homme, dictature
A military dictatorship ruled Brazil between 1964 and 1985. It was one of the many in Latin America in the second half of the 20th century as a consequence of Cold War ideological tensions between left-wing socialists or communists and right-wing conservatives (Agassiz, 2007). During this period, thousands of citizens were persecuted because of their political beliefs. In Brazil, more than 1800 were tortured, and 434 were killed or disappeared (Comissão Nacional da Verdade, 2014). The end of the dictatorship in Brazil was characterized by what the regime called as a “slow, gradual and safe opening”. An important turning point in this process was the Amnesty Law in 1979 for both, the government agents and the opposition armed groups (Comissão Nacional da Verdade, 2014).

Other South American countries ruled by dictatorships, such as Argentina and Chile, conducted Truth Commissions – TC – to investigate the human rights violations perpetrated by the state agents. The results of these investigations led to trials against the perpetrators and, sometimes, compensations for the victims. Moreover, these TCs allowed the societies to construct a new democratic order which acknowledges the importance of remembering the past mistakes and promotes memory policies in this regard (Hayner, 2011). In Brazil, however, the Amnesty Law prevented any trial to be carried out and any official memory policy that acknowledges the human rights violations was highly discouraged (Comissão Nacional da Verdade, 2014). Nonetheless, the seeking for the truth remained as a social demand in the following years after the end of the dictatorship (see, for instance, the “Tortura Nunca Mais – Torture Never Again” work: https://www.torturanuncamais-rj.org.br).

These demands were listened only 27 years after the end of the dictatorship, in 2012, when a TC was carried out. The Brazilian TC sought to find the truth about the violations perpetrated by the
dictatorial regime and the historical conditions which allowed the Coup d’État and the maintenance of the dictatorship. Brazilian TC, however, respecting the Amnesty Law, did not aim at leading to any trial (Comissão Nacional da Verdade, 2014).

Brazilian TC worked in difficult conditions. The long time passed since the events was a challenge to investigators. Moreover, many state agents refused to give testimony and even the Armed Forces as institution was accused of not collaborating with the investigations (Comissão Nacional da Verdade, 2014). The Army claimed that the TC had no legitimacy. Firstly, because the Amnesty Law would represent an official option for “not re-open old wounds” (Exército Brasileiro, 2012). Secondly, because the Brazilian president at the time (Dilma Rousseff) was accused of seeking a personal revenge, which she denied, due to she being a victim, arrested and tortured by state agents (Veja, 2012).

Another challenge the Brazilian TC faced was the context of political and social crisis starting with the June 2013 protests and reaching its peak in the beginning of 2015, right after the TC report release. At that time, Rousseff had just won a very polarized election during which she, and her party, was accused of leading a large corruption organization. This crisis ended up with Rousseff’s impeachment in 2016. In addition, after her impeachment, the current Brazilian President Jair Bolsonaro, who is an advocator of the former military regime, ascended as an important political figure, being eventually elected president in 2018. Brazilian TC, therefore, was carried out and released its report in a very special condition which presents a unique opportunity to understand the relations between the social contexts and the TC effects.

**Transitional justice and the construction of an inclusive collective memory**

Along with the transition from an authoritarian to a democratic society, there is a necessity to come to terms with the past (Bar-Tal & Bennink, 2004). Societies can choose to simply forget and go on, such as was the case in Spain after Franco’s dictatorship, or they can conduct transitional justice activities to help the progress towards a
democratic regime. Transitional justice “refers to the ways countries, emerging from periods of conflict and repression, address large-scale or systematic human rights violations so numerous and so serious that the normal justice system will not be able to provide an adequate response” (International Center for Transitional Justice, 2023).

TCs are being diffused as the best transitional justice practice for coping with the human rights violations (Langenohl, 2008). There has been more than fifty official TCs established around the world since the 1970s (see Avruch, 2010; Hayner, 2011). They are instances in which the victims and the perpetrators can feel welcome to give their statements, share their experiences, maybe enhancing the sympathy between them (Beristain, 2005). The objective of these commissions is less the persecution of the perpetrators or the compensation of the victims but to establish a cornerstone to a new democratic order. The functions of TCs are: a) making efforts to discover the truth about the period of collective violence, b) recognizing and validating victims’ suffering, c) compensating those affected both materially and symbolically, d) contributing to the creation of an inclusive collective memory oriented to the future, e) avoiding new acts of violence, and f) seeking justice, in some cases, like in South African TC (Gibson, 2004). TCs are supposed to reinforce the rule of law and the respect of political rights contributing to strength the social norms and to reduce future human rights violations (Sikkink & Booth Walling, 2007). They seem to have positive effects for democracy and human rights, since its activities are followed by other transitional justice initiatives such as the trials. When carried out alone they may even be negative for the democracy (Olsen et al., 2010).

Even in these conditions, the memory of past conflicts can reinforce social cohesion as it documents factual atrocities committed by all sides involved and help to understand the origins of the past violence (Staub et al., 2005). There are three essential steps to the reconstruction of social cohesion by collective memory activities (Páez & Liu, 2015): first, the acceptance of the facts about the events, including others’ suffering, which is essential for the construction of shared representations
of the past; second, to remember what happened but not maintaining hatred – which means to acknowledge the reality of crimes and victims to learn from the past, but, at the same time, preventing the awakening of emotions of hate and the justification of future aggression based on the past of suffering; finally, the third step to the reconstruction of social cohesion is the creation of an inclusive narrative that describes different meanings, experiences, and perspectives of the past in a single story.

Studies on the effects of TCs on collective memory have shown mixed evidence. On the positive side, Gibson’s (2004) study in South Africa found that people who were more willing to accept the TCs version of the truth agreed more with reconciliation, even if this “truth effect” was stronger for dominant and vicarious perpetrator groups. In the same way, Rwanda’s Gacaca has had positive inter-group effects, such as more positive out-group stereotypes and a less homogeneity perception although with an affective cost for the victims (Kanyangara et al., 2007; Rimé et al., 2011). However, at the same time, TCs provides opportunities for disclosure of past mistakes they may also threat a new democratic order provoking hostility and division (Allen, 1999). Another obstacle to the establishment of a new democratic order can be the memory of a glorious past that occurred alongside the atrocities, that it is common to be accompanied by a denial of the violations. For instance, in the Soviet Union, the memory of the victory against the Nazis tend to go along with denials of the atrocities committed by the Stalinism (Langenohl, 2008).

Transitional justice rituals have been showed as positive to build reconciliation or at least a peaceful coexistence. They help the social sharing of blame and victimhood which may prevent processes of selective victimization, in-group idealization, opening a space towards a dialogue (Gibson, 2004). Also, these rituals can fortify the social cohesion in a long-term process (Lillie & Janoff-Bulman, 2007), promoting intergroup empathy, trust, and forgiveness, and reinforcing instrumental and socio-emotional reconciliation, which help to overcome the negative impact of past collective violence, (Brown et al., 2008;
Nadler, 2006). On the other hand, the experience of testimony could be risky to survivors in terms of re-experimentation of trauma or even harassment (Brounéus, 2008, 2010; Rimé et al., 2011). Therefore, these rituals face a challenge in promoting a social reconciliation at the same time of caring about the negative effects they may cause.

The support for reparation policies is related to the acknowledge of responsibility by a group for wrongdoings and collective guilt (Brown et al., 2008; Cehajić-Clancy et al., 2011; Meernik et al., 2016; Páez, 2010; Valencia et al., 2010) as well as feeling empathy towards the outgroup (González et al., 2013). On the other hand, competitive victimhood mediated by high group-identification, low empathy and low trust in the out-group is associated with the justification of past violence and less disposition to forgiveness (Noor et al., 2008). In this sense, a meta-analytical study showed that collective guilt and trust are the strongest facilitators to forgiveness, while negative emotions and in-group identity are the most substantial obstacles (Van Tongeren et al., 2014).

**South American Truth Commissions’ evaluations and their impact on the institutional trust and the socio-emotional climate**

In South America, different Truth Commissions were carried out in Argentina (1983-1984), Uruguay (1985 and 2000-2003), Chile (1990-1991 and 2003-2005), Ecuador (1996-1997 and 2008-2010), Peru (2001-2003), Paraguay (2004-2008), Brazil (2012-2014) and Colombia (2017-2022) for the purpose of documenting facts related to the collective violence perpetrated during the last decades, especially by the dictatorial regimes ruling in some of these countries (Hayner, 2011). TCs in South America differentiate from the ones carried out in other societies because they mostly investigated dictatorship human rights violations rather than conflicts between civil or ethnic groups (Mathias et al., 2020). Exception were Peru and Colombia, where there were many human rights violations committed by both the right-wing government and paramilitary and left-wing organizations (see Espinosa et al., 2017 about Peru; Ruiz et al., 2022 about Colombia).
Many studies have been done in the countries which carried out TCs in South America to investigate their impact and the aspects related to their positive evaluation in each context. In Argentina, participants presented a positive attitude towards remembering the violent past and a positive evaluation about the TC activities as well as a positive perception about its efficacy (Zubieta et al., 2015). In Uruguay, different from other countries, TC was perceived as not very effective being the perception of TC effectiveness associated with victimization (Arnoso & Da Costa, 2015). Studies in Chile showed that a better evaluation of the TC work was associated with the rejection of oblivion, institutional trust, and a positive socio-emotional climate. Ideological closeness to the victims was associated with more social sharing and a better evaluation of TC work and its efficacy (Cárdenas et al., 2013, 2014). Similar results were found in Ecuador (Reyes et al., 2015) and Paraguay (Arnoso et al., 2014). Finally, even in Peru where there was a tremendous violent conflict, the attitude towards remembering the past and the positive evaluation on the TC effectiveness was associated to more positive socio-emotional climate (Espinosa et al., 2017).

A study conducted in five South American countries found that people generally agreed with the idea of remembering from the past mistakes rather than forgetting about it (Arnoso et al., 2015). They also presented very high levels of knowledge about the TC activities in Argentina and Uruguay (about 90%) and quite high levels in Chile, Paraguay, and Peru (roughly 50%). However, the social sharing about the TCs activities and their emotional impact were low across the five countries. TCs effectiveness perception was very different across the countries. Meanwhile, in Argentina and Paraguay, most of the samples affirmed to perceive the local TC as effective, in Chile, Uruguay, and especially in Peru, a minority perceived it in this way. The knowledge about the TCs work, their emotional impact, the social sharing about it, the preference for remembering the past as well as the perception of TCs as effective were associated to being a victim or ideologically close to the victims.
To summarize, most of the studies in different South American contexts seems to point out the low impact of TCs, although they are quite well known. The knowledge and emotional reaction, as well as the positive evaluation of the TCs and their effectiveness perception, are related to ideological closeness to the victims. However, a positive evaluation of TC outcomes is usually associated with more trust in institutions and positive socio-emotional climate (Mathias et al., 2020).

In this paper, we aimed at investigating the impact of Brazilian TC, its relation with psychosocial variables as well as its effects on the social cohesion.

Across three studies with different samples, we expected that:

Hypothesis 1: information, participation, emotional reactions and social sharing, as well as a more positive view of the TC, associate with age (because of time closeness to the dictatorship) and left-wing political position (the primary victims of dictatorial repression and politically opposed to the regime) (Arnoso et al., 2014; Cárdenas et al., 2013; Cárdenas et al., 2014; Reyes et al., 2015).

Hypothesis 2: TC effectiveness perception predict social cohesion, conceived off as rejection of violence, trust in institutions, and positive socio-emotional climate (Cárdenas et al., 2013; Espinosa et al., 2017).

Hypothesis 3: TC effectiveness perception is predicted by information, participation, emotional reactions, social sharing about the TC and a positive attitude towards remembering (Arnoso et al., 2014; Cárdenas et al., 2014; Cárdenas et al., 2013; Espinosa et al., 2017; Reyes et al., 2015).

Method

Sample

Three cross-sectional studies were conducted. A sensitivity power analysis was carried out using the software GPower to determine the minimum sample size required to conduct correlation and multiple
regression analyses. We assumed an alpha significance criterion of .05 (one-tailed), and a standard power criterion of 80%. Previous studies about the effects of TCs in South America showed medium effects sizes of age (Arnoso et al., 2012; Cárdenas et al., 2013) and political positioning (Arnoso et al., 2014, 2015) on the perception of TC effectiveness. Studies also showed medium effect size of TCs effectiveness perception on the socio-emotional climate (Arnoso et al., 2014; Cárdenas et al., 2013). Therefore, we calculated the minimum sample size using an estimated effect size of .30. The minimum sample size found was 64 participants.

The first study was carried out in 2014 with 191 undergraduate students (64.2% women) of the University of Paraíba – João Pessoa. University departments (mostly in social sciences) were contacted to reach the students. Participants were between 18 and 58 years-old (M = 24.75, SD = 9.35). This study was conducted during the TC work and just before the TC final report release. Due to time and resources limitations, a convenient sample of undergraduate students were collected. In that time, only partial reports had been published.

The second study was conducted, in 2015, with an adult sample of 80 participants (60.0% women) mostly from São Paulo. Participants were contacted at the street or their homes. Age varied from 19 to 74 years-old (M = 39.86, SD = 14.97).

Finally, the third study replicated the second study with a larger sample of 188 participants (53.2% women) from many cities (mostly from Florianópolis, João Pessoa, Salvador, and Rio de Janeiro). Participants were contacted at the street or their homes. Online questionnaires were also set through e-mail lists. Age ranged from 18 to 85 years-old (M = 32.47, SD = 14.08).

In the three studies, political positioning was balanced (study 1: M = 3.97, SD = 1.11; study 2: M = 3.86, SD = 1.58; study 3: M = 3.96, SD = 1.21; range 1-7, median point = 4) being similar to the results found in polls about this topic in Brazil (Corporación Latino-barómetro, 2016).
**Procedure**

The studies followed all the ethical procedures required for studies with human beings. They were approved by an Ethics Committee (Reference Number: 5188 – Research Ethics Committee – University of Paraíba). Interviewers were volunteer university students trained in the application of the scale. To be included, participants had to sign an “informed consent” letter that explained the study objectives and guaranteed response anonymity and confidentiality. Participants took in average 30 minutes to complete the survey.

**Measures**

They answered a questionnaire comprised of the questions described below.

**Preliminary questions**

**Socio-demographic information.** Questions about their age, gender, and city of residence.

**Political self-categorization.** The scale consisted of seven alternatives, from 1 = extreme-left to 7 = extreme-right. Respondents were asked: ‘In political matters, people frequently speak of left and right. Where would you place your ideas on the following scale?’

**Information and attitudes about the Brazilian Truth Commission**

**Knowledge about the TC.** Participants were asked whether they knew about the commission’s work: “Do you know about the TC’s activities?” (Yes/No).

**Level of information about the TC.** A single item asked participants about how much information they have about the TC. A Likert-type scale was used, ranging from 1 = “very little” to 4 = “very much.”

**Participation in TC activities.** Seven items assessed the participation in TC activities. Examples of items are “Have you seen the TC audiences on TV or news coverage,” “Have you read about the TC
in the press” or “Have you participated in rituals for the victims.” A Likert-type scale was used ranging from 1 = “not at all” to 4 = “very much” (study 1: $\alpha = 0.68$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.81$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.76$). Next, the participants were invited to read a summary of facts about the dictatorship period and the commission’s activities.

**TC overall evaluation.** An item adapted from Gibson (2004) to assess respondents’ global attitude and evaluation of the commission’s activities: “Would you say that you: strongly approve of what the TC has done / somewhat approve / somewhat disapprove / strongly disapprove.”

**Social sharing of emotions associated with the past violence and the TC activities.** An item adapted from studies on the social sharing of emotions (Rimé, 2009) inquired about the extent to which respondents talk about the commissions’ activities: “Have you ever spoken about TC since the publication of its report?” The response scales ranged from 1 = “not at all” to 4 = “a great deal.”

**TC functions effectiveness.** Respondents were next asked to evaluate three of the TC goals via the following items: “The TC is often said to have several important jobs. Would you say that it has done an excellent job/pretty good job/pretty bad job/poor job, regarding to (1) “Letting the families know about what happened to their loved ones” (i.e., aim of providing truth about the victims); (2) “Helping to create an inclusive history integrating the ‘two nations’ or opposing groups in a shared narrative” (aim of creating a comprehensive history) and; (3) “Ensuring that the human rights abuses will not occur again in the country (aim of preventing new conflicts to arise). These items were joined in a single variable named “TC functions effectiveness” (study 1: $\alpha = 0.80$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.87$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.81$).

**Emotions associated with the TC activities.** Participants rated their emotional reactions when thinking about the past events and the commissions’ activities: “To what extent do you feel the following emotions about the TC reports?” They were then given a list, including three positive emotions (Hope, Happiness, and Pride) and four negative emotions (Sadness, Guilt, Anger, Fear, and Shame). Response
scales ranged from 1= “not at all” to 7= “a great deal.” Study 1 sample only answered regarding partial reports. Samples in studies 2 and 3 were collected after the final report release and therefore, answered the question regarding the final report. Reliabilities were satisfactory for both, the negative (study 1: $\alpha = 0.80$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.81$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.87$) and, the positive emotions (study 1: $\alpha = 0.81$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.93$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.87$).

**Attitudes towards social remembering.** An item assessing the attitudes towards learning from the past mistakes: “about the national past, we should learn from the past to avoid repeating the same mistakes.” A Likert-type scale was used, ranging from 1 = “totally false” to 4 = “totally true.”

Reconstruction social cohesion: the rejection of violence, trust in institutions, and positive emotional climate

**Attitude towards violence as a means of social change.** A Likert-type item ranging from 1 = totally disagree to 4 = totally agree asked participants whether “sometimes violence is necessary to achieve changes in society.”

**Trust in the government institutions.** Participants were asked to evaluate five institutions (executive, legislative, courts of justice, local and regional governments) on a scale with response options ranging from 1 (“nothing”) to 4 (“a lot”). Reliabilities were satisfactory in the first and third studies but not so much in the second one (study 1: $\alpha = 0.81$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.55$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.85$). Still, we decided to maintaining the variable in the subsequent analyses.

**Socio-emotional climate**

Perceptions of the socio-emotional climate was measured using two different instruments.

**Positive-Negative Emotional Climate (PNEC).** Four items taken from the Positive-Negative Emotional Climate scale (Páez et al., 1997) were used to evaluate the positive emotional climate (“I think that in general people trust their institutions” and “People
show solidarity and help one another; they feel solidarity in general”). A Likert-type response scale was used, with anchors 1 = “Not at all” to 5 = “very much.”

**Climate Dimension Scale (CD24).** Four items from the Climate Dimension Scale (De Rivera and Páez, 2007) were used to assess the perception of a positive social climate. Examples of items include: “People feel that the various political groups in this country trust each other and will work together for the progress of the country” or “People have hope because things in this country are improving.” A Likert-type response scale was used, ranging from 1 = “Totally disagree” to 7 = “Totally agree.”

From the items of the two scales (PNEC and CD24), we created a single variable named positive socio-emotional climate. Firstly, we transformed the scores from the two scales into a scale ranging from 0 to 100. Then, we created the new variable obtained from the scores mean for the six items (study 1: $\alpha = 0.72$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.64$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.69$).

Social cohesion. A new variable created from the positive socio-emotional climate, trust in the government institutions, and disbelief in violence as a means of social change. Firstly, we inverted the score for the item of belief in violence. Then, we transformed all the scores into a 0-100 scale. Finally, we joined the total of each dimension into a single variable called social cohesion (study 1: $\alpha = 0.75$; study 2: $\alpha = 0.63$; study 3: $\alpha = 0.79$).

**Statistical Model**

We carried out descriptive statistics, comparisons of means, and correlation analyses. Additionally, we conducted multiple linear regression analyses across the three studies in order to identify the variables that could predict the social cohesion and the TC effectiveness perception.
Results

Study 1

The TC activities were known by 67.4% of the undergraduate student’s sample. Level of information and participation on TC activities were below the central point of the scales (see Table 1). TC overall evaluation was positive, and the evaluation of TC functions effectiveness was quite positive, being around the central point. Although participants presented an overall positive evaluation of the TC, they affirmed to not have talked much about it and that the TC did not elicit much emotion on them. Participants presented a positive attitude towards learning from the past mistakes, and the social cohesion presented a mean about the central point of the scale.

Few TC variables were associated with age. Only the level of information, participation, as well as the negative emotions, showed significant positive associations with age. Social sharing, TC evaluation, and effectiveness perception, as well as the positive emotions on the TC and the attitudes towards remembering did not show associations with age. Similarly, social cohesion did not show significant associations with age.

On the contrary, political positioning was associated with most of the variables. Left-wing positioning was associated with TC positive evaluation, negative emotions, and a positive attitude towards remembering. Weaker associations were also found between left-wing position and participation on TC activities, as well as with the social sharing of emotions about the TC and the perception of TC as effective (significant only at p < 0.10). Finally, information and positive emotions on the TC report as well as the social cohesion did not show associations with political positioning.

Next, we conducted a multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the social cohesion could be predicted by the TC effectiveness perception. A significant regression equation was found (see Table 2, also for comparisons between the three studies). TC effectiveness perception was a significant predictor of social cohesion while age and political positioning were not.
## Table 1

**Correlation matrix of the psychosocial and Truth Commission variables (undergraduate sample 2014; N=191)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-58</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>-1.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.30, -.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.02, .26]</td>
<td>[-.20, .08]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.11+</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.09, .36]</td>
<td>[-.25, .03]</td>
<td>[.47, .66]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.10, .37]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10+</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.02, .30]</td>
<td>[.27, .51]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.05, .32]</td>
<td>[.04, .31]</td>
<td>[.06, .33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.19, .09]</td>
<td>[-.26, .02]</td>
<td>[-.10, .18]</td>
<td>[.10, .16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.07, .34]</td>
<td>[-.37, -.10]</td>
<td>[.06, .33]</td>
<td>[.12, .39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.08, .20]</td>
<td>[-.20, .08]</td>
<td>[.12, .16]</td>
<td>[.05, .32]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.13, .15]</td>
<td>[.28, .00]</td>
<td>[.10, .16]</td>
<td>[.12, .16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.23, .05]</td>
<td>[-.23, .05]</td>
<td>[-.26, .02]</td>
<td>[-.15, .13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01, *p < .05, † p < .10 one-tailed. [] 95% C.I. For political position 1 = extreme-left to 7 = extreme-right.
Table 2  
*Results of the multiple linear regression analysis for social cohesion across the three studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Undergraduates 14 (N = 170)</th>
<th>Adults 15 (N = 65)</th>
<th>Adults 17 (N = 115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE (B)</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>41.36</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC effectiveness</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>4.73**</td>
<td>4.10*</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01, *p < .05, † p < .10

Then, we conducted another multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the attitude towards remembering the past, the emotions elicited by the TC, the level of information and participation as well as the social sharing about the TC could predict the perception of TC effectiveness. A significant regression equation was found (see Table 3, also for comparisons between the three studies). A positive attitude towards remembering, positive emotions on the TC and the social sharing of emotions about the TC were found as significant predictors of the TC effectiveness perception. Once again, age and political positioning did not show significant effects. Also, information, participation, and negative emotions regarding the TC did not show significant effects on the TC effectiveness perception.
Table 3

Results of the multiple linear regression analysis for Truth Commission effectiveness perception across the three Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Undergraduates 14 (N = 151)</th>
<th>Adults 15 (N = 66)</th>
<th>Adults 17 (N = 115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE (B)</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(constant)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** p < .01, *p < .05, † p < .10

Study 2

The TC activities were known by 81.3% of the adult sample in São Paulo (2015). Level of information and participation on TC activities were below the median point of the scales (see Table 4). Similar to study 1, participants presented an overall positive evaluation of the TC and its effectiveness, although they affirmed to not have talked much about it and that the TC did not elicit much positive emotion on them. Participants presented a very positive attitude towards learning from the past, and the social cohesion presented a mean a bit lower than the central point of the scale.
### Table 4

**Correlation matrix of the psychosocial and Truth Commission variables (adults’ sample 2015)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19-74</td>
<td>39.86</td>
<td>14.97</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.16, .28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.16, .28</td>
<td>[-.48, -.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.18, .26]</td>
<td>[-.48, -.07]</td>
<td>[.48, .75]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[.20, .24]</td>
<td>[.44, -.02]</td>
<td>[.54, .78]</td>
<td>[.45, .73]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-.53, -.14]</td>
<td>[-.51, -.12]</td>
<td>[-.05, .38]</td>
<td>[.07, .44]</td>
<td>[-.10, .33]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.60**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.17†</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16†</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>38.66</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.20†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01, *p < .05, †p < .10 one-tailed. [] 95% C.I. For political position 1 = extreme-left to 7 = extreme-right.
Differently from the findings in the undergraduate sample in 2014, being young was associated with the TC positive evaluation, its effectiveness perception, and negative emotions on the TC report. On the other hand, being older was associated with reporting positive emotions on the TC report (see Table 2). Age was also positively associated with a positive attitude towards remembering the past mistakes at \( p < 0.10 \). Finally, the information, participation, and social sharing of emotions about the TC did not show significant associations with age. Similarly, social cohesion did not show significant associations with age.

Similarly to the results found on the undergraduate sample, political positioning was associated with most of the TC variables. A left-wing positioning was positively associated with: information, participation, the TC positive evaluation, effectiveness perception, and social sharing of emotions. On the other hand, right-wing positioning was associated with positive emotions elicited by the TC report. Finally, a positive attitude towards remembering and the social cohesion did not show significant associations with political positioning.

As in the study 1, we carried out a multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the social cohesion could be predicted by the TC effectiveness perception. Once again, a significant regression equation was found (see Table 2). Similar to the results found in the study 1, the TC effectiveness perception was found as a significant predictor of social cohesion. Once again, age and political positioning did not show significant effects.

Then, we conducted another multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the attitude towards remembering the past, the emotions elicited by the TC, the level of information and participation as well as the social sharing about the TC could predict the perception of TC effectiveness. A significant regression equation was found (see Table 3). Different from the results found in the study 1 with an undergraduate sample, only the emotions regarding the TC report – both negative and positive, were found as significant predictors of TC effectiveness perception.
Study 3

Since studies 2 and 3 were comprised of adult samples, we compared the means found in these two studies for the TC and psychosocial variables. Levene’s F test showed that the homoscedasticity assumption was not met for most of the variables. Therefore, we conducted independent-samples t-tests adjusted for unequal variances to compare the pairs of means. An alpha level of .05 was used for all subsequent analysis. Effect sizes were calculated through Cohen’s d.

The means for TC variables were generally lower in the study 3 in 2017 than in the study 2 in 2015. The knowledge about the TC activities was quite low in the adult sample in 2017 (36.2%) presenting lower mean than in the study 2 (t(184.66) = 7.92, p < 0.001; d = -.100, 95%CI [-1.07, -0.94]). Means for information (t(125.78) = 4.92, p < 0.001; d = -0.71, 95%CI [-0.83, -0.49]), participation (t(96.36) = 5.56, p < 0.001; d = -.89, 95%CI [-0.95, -0.76]) and the social sharing of emotions about the TC (t(113.04) = 2.83, p = 0.006; d = -.45, 95%CI [-0.55, -0.21]) were also lower in the study 3 comparing with study 2 (see Table 5).

Contrary to study 2, age did not show a consistent association with the TC variables. Age was negatively associated with the social sharing of emotions about the TC. Also, age was positively associated with positive emotions regarding the TC at p < 0.10. Information, participation, TC evaluation, effectiveness perception and the negative emotions on the TC did not show significant associations with age. Accordingly, age was not significantly associated with the attitude towards remembering or the social cohesion.

Still contrary to the results found in study 2, political positioning did not show a consistent association to the variables regarding the TC. Only the TC overall evaluation was associated with left-wing political positioning. Also, negative emotions on the TC report was associated with left-wing political positioning at p < 0.10. On the other hand, the positive emotions on the TC were associated with right-wing positioning. Social cohesion also showed an association with right-wing political positioning at p < 0.10. Finally, information, participation, TC effectiveness perception, and preference for remembering were not associated with political positioning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-85</td>
<td>32.47</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sharing</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pos. emotions</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembering</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>0-100</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16†</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* **p < .01, *p < .05, † p < .10 one-tailed. [ ] 95% C.I. For political position 1 = extreme-left to 7 = extreme-right.
As in the studies 1 and 2, we conducted a multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the social cohesion could be predicted by the TC effectiveness perception. Different from the results found in the two previous studies, a significant regression equation was not found (see Table 2).

Then, we conducted another multiple linear regression analysis to test whether the attitude towards remembering the past, the emotions elicited by the TC, the level of information and participation as well as the social sharing about the TC could predict the perception of TC effectiveness. A significant regression equation was found (see Table 3). Accordingly, with study 1 but differently than the study 2, a positive attitude towards remembering was a significant predictor of the TC effectiveness perception. A weaker effect of positive emotions on the TC effectiveness perception was also found at p < 0.10.

Discussion

Results across the three studies showed that TC effectiveness perception was related to social cohesion variables. They also showed the TC effectiveness perception to be related to its impact and a positive attitude towards remembering the past mistakes. The hypotheses stated, however, were not fully supported.

H1 was partially confirmed. It stated that older age and left-wing political positioning would associate with more TC impact and a positive evaluation of it as well as with the preference for remembering the past mistakes due to generational and ideological closeness to the victims.

Age showed inconclusive results being associated with different variables across the three studies. A previous study in Chile found age to be associated with emotional reactions and a better evaluation of TC’s effectiveness (Arnoso et al., 2012). In this regard, the Amnesty Law in Brazil encouraged a forgetting about the past and forbidden any trial in the years after the dictatorship, the opposite that occurred in Chile.
(as well as in Argentina). Therefore, the dictatorship period remained a forgotten issue in the Brazilian society until the establishment of the TC. Moreover, it is important to bear in mind the overall low impact of Brazilian dictatorship and TC compared to other South American countries (Mathias et al., 2020). Collective memory studies showed that the dictatorship is not mentioned as a social event which had an impact in Brazilian participants, contrary to other countries where this event is central to people’s lives (Páez et al., 2018). Therefore, the dictatorship seems to be a less critical issue in the overall Brazilian society, not marking the generation who lived it in the same way that it did in other countries. Thus, we could expect that TC perceived impact and evaluation would associate more to political and social attitudes and beliefs than to generation belonging.

Indeed, political positioning showed more clear associations with the TC perceived impact and evaluations. Left-wing positioning was associated with more perceived impact and positive evaluations, especially in the study 2, with an adult sample in 2015. We could speculate that the time of data collection could have affected these results, but that is hard to demonstrate it in the present study. Only the associations of the TC overall evaluation and the emotions elicited by the TC presented clear associations with left-wing political positioning across the three studies. These results are in line with previous studies on the TC evaluations in South America (Arnoso & Da Costa, 2015; Arnoso et al., 2015; Cárdenas et al., 2013, 2014; Cárdenas et al., 2016; Reyes et al., 2015). However, the strength of the associations of political positioning with the TC variables varied across the different countries in these studies leading to the idea that contextual factors might be related to a positive evaluation of the TCs (see Mathias et al., 2020 for a meta-analytical integration of studies about South America’s TC impact).

The study 3 presented less conclusive results regarding the relation of political positioning to TC perceived impact and evaluations. The study 3 was conducted two years after the TC report release. These results may indicate a long-term perceived impact of the TC activities less anchored on political positioning. In other words, it may
indicate a process in which the first to be impacted by the TC activities are those who are ideologically close to the victims but, then, a couple of years later, this impact is spread over the political spectrum. That should occur, especially where the TC activities had low impact. Information and social sharing about the TCs are generally low and superficial in South America (Arnoso et al., 2015). In addition, the Brazilian TC was carried out a long time after the end of the dictatorship (29 years since the end of the dictatorship until the final report release), and the level of violence perpetrated by the dictatorship in Brazil was comparatively lower than in other countries such as Argentina and Chile. Therefore, it is reasonable to expect a lower impact of the TC in Brazil than in these countries and lower associations of political positioning to the TC variables due to its comparative lesser importance to the current social milieu.

However, an important aspect to consider is that our studies were conducted just before the ascension of Jair Bolsonaro as an important political figure in Brazil. Bolsonaro is very critical against the TC work, and he is an advocator of the former dictatorship (G1, 2019a, 2019b). As occurred in Peru (see Heilman, 2018), TC work did not prevent the ascension of political figures linked to the previous authoritarian regime in Brazil. Moreover, it could have boosted discussions on this topic mainly in online environments where radicalized opinions are expressed easily (Mathias et al., 2020).

The construction of a shared narrative about the past is an essential part of the transition to a democratic rule (Páez & Liu, 2015). Moreover, the acknowledge of responsibilities, and the collective guilt for the past wrong-doings are decisive steps towards the social cohesion reconstruction (Gibson, 2004; Van Tongeren et al., 2014). The denial of the past human rights violations by a president could undermine the TC efforts towards the construction of a shared narrative about the past increasing the differences between the narratives as well as their associations with political positioning. Therefore, the acknowledge of the past violations risks becoming a matter of opinion rather than a recognized part of history. Besides, the ex-president Dilma Rousseff,
who established the TC, was herself a victim of the dictatorship. In the long run, the TC could be perceived as a personal project of hers rather than an official memory policy. Further studies may be conducted in the future to investigate the effect of the TC in the long run considering the current challenging context to transitional justice in Brazil. So far, our results presented a brighter picture for the reconstruction of the social cohesion more the 30 years after the end of the dictatorship and after the TC activities.

The H2 stating that the social cohesion would be predicted by the TC effectiveness perception was confirmed in studies 1 and 2, but not in study 3. Previous studies in other South American countries found the TC effectiveness perception to be related to positive social climate and trust in institutions (Cárdenas et al., 2014; Espinosa et al., 2017). The results found in Brazil could indicate that the effects of the TC may not last in the long run if continuous memory policies are insufficient. The aftermath of a TC is the time when the lessons about the past are established. Thus, if the society can construct a shared narrative from which to learn these lessons in order to avoid future conflicts, then, the mistakes may not be repeated (Páez & Liu, 2015). Otherwise, if the TC revive hostility and division (Allen, 1999) increasing competitive victimhood and in-group identification (Noor et al., 2008), thus the past violence may be justified by the people ideologically identified with the perpetrators, which threatens the new democratic order. Results across the three studies suggest that the political positioning does not have a substantial effect on social cohesion. In other words, people's trust in the institutions, evaluation of social climate, and rejection of violence as a means of social change seem to be independent of their political identification.

Partially confirming H3, we found support for the idea that the TC impact and a positive attitude towards remembering the past are essential variables to evaluate a TC as effective. These associations were also found in other studies (Arnosso et al., 2015; Cárdenas et al., 2013, 2014). However, our study furthers the knowledge about this topic finding evidence that more TC perceived impact and a positive attitude
towards remembering the past could predict a better evaluation of TC even considering the effects of political positioning and generational belonging. Nonetheless, different variables were associated with TC effectiveness perception across the three studies. In the studies 1 and 3, the positive emotions regarding the TC report and a positive attitude towards remembering the past were significant predictors of TC effectiveness. However, in study 2, only the emotions (negative and positive) regarding the TC report were significant predictors. This result could have occurred due to a transitory emotional effect of the TC report rehearsal.

Moreover, the effects found for positive emotions were in the opposite direction than in studies 1 and 3. Considering this result and the ones found for the relations of political positioning to TC perceived impact and evaluation, we could speculate that, in the time of the report release, left-wing participants would be more impacted by the negative content of the report. The details of numerous human rights violations could have led them to declare more negative and less positive emotions than the center or right-wing participants. As times passes, a long-term positivity bias may act to turn the emotions of left-wing participants about the TC report into more positive ones, recognizing its positive outcomes. Thus, in the long run, the primary variable to perceive the TC as effective seems to be holding a positive attitude towards remembering a violent past. Also, feeling positive emotions regarding the TC outcomes may have effects to evaluate them as positive.

**Conclusion**

We investigated the Brazilian Truth Commission perceived impact and evaluations across three studies, the first with undergraduate students in 2014 during the TC work and just before its final report release, the second in 2015 just after the report release and the third in 2017, both with adult samples. Across the three studies, the results showed a low perceived impact of the Brazilian TC. Nonetheless, participants evaluated the commission’s work positively as well as its effectiveness. Ideological closeness to the victims (left-wing) was related to more TC
perceived impact and a positive evaluation of its effectiveness. Results from multiple regression analysis showed that TC effectiveness perception was a predictor of social cohesion even considering the effects of political positioning and age.

Comparing Brazilian results with those from other societies is tortuous. TCs are mechanisms designed to improve the relations between groups once in conflict. Nonetheless, each society has its particularities, and the conflicts which led to the establishment of a TC are distinct around the world. For instance, it is hard to compare Brazilian TC with Rwanda’s. In that country, a genocide took place opposing an ethnic group to kill the other. Another example is South Africa, wherein the apartheid regime people received different legal treatment based on their ethnicity.

In South America, different kinds of conflict took place. Following ideological conflicts in the Cold War, Coup d’état, authoritarianism and state persecutions occurred against people holding different ideas of society. The groups in the conflicts were ideological, and most people lived their lives unaware of the political conflicts and restrictions. At that time in Brazil, roughly half of the population lived in rural areas, and about a third were illiterate (IBGE, 2019a, 2019b). Moreover, in Brazil the effect of “not get involved” is stronger due to the low impact of the violence, its hidden character (that means there were no public executions such as in Chile) and the little power of guerrillas. This fact and the official propaganda during the dictatorship period may explain why people who lived during the regime may hold less critical or even positive representations about it than younger people (see Mathias et al, 2023; Sá et al., 2009). That may also explain why we did not find clear associations between age and the TC perceived impact and evaluations. We expected to find these relations due to the generational closeness to the subject, which could lead to more interest in discovering the truth. Nonetheless, the younger criticism against the dictatorship may have canceled the effect of generational closeness on the TC perceived impact and evaluations.
Thus, TC discussion in Brazil is more focused on the narrative about the past (and its use in current politics) than in reconciliation. In this regard, although Sá et al. (2009) found the positive representations about the Brazilian dictatorship are minority, online discussions after the TC work were characterized by discourses justifying the human rights violations and even denying the existence of a dictatorship (Mathias et al., 2021). Similarly to Sá’s et al. (2009) study, Mathias et al. (2023) showed that only about 15% of a representative sample held positive representations about the Brazilian dictatorship and agreed with its restoration. However, they also found a mute zone effect (that means, about 20% of the sample silenced themselves about this topic, and this silence was related to many variables that indicate that these people could hold polemical representations about the past).

Establishment of the factual truth about the past violations is a crucial step towards the construction of a stable democracy. In that sense, our results provide hope showing that the TC can have effects on the social cohesion independently of political positioning. The polarization of a society is based on holding different beliefs about its underlying foundations which could not co-exist. The construction of a shared narrative about the past, recognizing wrong-doings and compromising to respect the human rights in the future has been shown as an effective way to found a new democratic order and to prevent future conflicts. The Brazilian TC represents a step “towards breaking the military’s veto power and affirming human rights”, allowing the establishment of new memory policies (Torelly, 2018). However, some authors argue for a distinction between the improvement TCs have in democratic behavior but not in democratic institutions (see Dancy and Thoms, 2022). Therefore, future studies could address this distinction as well.

Moreover, further studies on the social representations of history could help to understand the effects of TCs in the long run to achieve these goals. Mathias et al. (2023) found the social representations of history as a key variable for supporting and authoritarian restoration. Previous conflicts may arise again if the “truth” is not known or
accepted by large parts of the population, especially those holding different political opinions. This study showed that the time elapsed could be an important variable to understand the psychosocial effects of TCs. The positive effects achieved by the Brazilian TC even after the long time passed between the Brazilian dictatorship and the TC showed that it is never late to come to terms with the past. On the other hand, our three studies conducted in three different times indicate that future studies could pay special attention to changes in the perceptions about the TC process over time.

Author’s Note

This project started in 2014 and due to time limitation to collect data with a more representative sample we chose to conduct the first study only with undergraduates. Ideally, longitudinal studies with adult samples would be preferable but due to resource limitations, transversal designs were chosen instead. Comparisons between samples should be taken carefully, especially between the undergraduate and the adult samples because they represent different populations. The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Open Science Framework at https://osf.io/sw56x/?view_only=c384b3a40d1640d48eabf2b74a0acaee
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