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Thesis abstract

This research develops the social psychological study of lay perception of human rights and of rights-based reactions to perceived injustice. The pioneering work by social representation theorists is reviewed. Of particular interest is the use of rights-based responses to perceived relative subgroup disadvantage. It is argued that these responses are shaped by the historical development of the legal concept of unique subgroup rights; rights asserted by a subgroup that cannot be asserted by outgroup members or by members of a broader collective that includes all subgroups.

The assertion of unique subgroup rights in contrast to individual rights was studied by presenting participants with scenarios suggestive of human rights violations. These included possible violations of privacy rights of indigenous Australians (Study 1), civil and political rights of indigenous Australians under mandatory sentencing schemes (Study 2), privacy rights of students in comparison to public servants (Study 3), refugee rights (Study 4), and reproductive rights of lesbians and single women in comparison to married women and women in de facto relationships (Study 5). The scenarios were based on real policy issues being debated in Australia at the time of data collection. Human rights activists participated in Studies 4 and 5. In Study 5, these activists participated via an online, web-based experiment. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected.

A social identity theory perspective is used drawing on concepts from both social identity theory and self-categorization theory. The studies reveal a preference for an equality-driven construal of the purpose of human rights law (i.e. that all Australians be treated equally regardless of subgroup membership) in contrast to minority support...
for a *vulnerable groups construal* of the purpose of human rights (i.e. that the purpose of human rights law is to protect vulnerable subgroups within a broader collective).

Tajfelian social belief orientations of social mobility and social change are explicitly measured in Studies 3-5. Consistent with the social identity perspective, these ideological beliefs are conceptualised as background knowledge relevant to the subjective structuring of social reality (violation contexts) and to the process of motivated relative perception from the vantage point of the perceiver. There is some indication from these studies that social belief orientation may determine construals of the purpose of human rights. In Study 5 the observed preference for using inclusive human rights rhetoric in response to perceived subgroup injustice is explained as an identity-management strategy of social creativity. In Studies 4 and 5, explicit measurement of activist identification was also made in an attempt to further explain the apparently-dominant preference for an equality-driven construal of the purpose of human rights law and the preferred use of inclusive, individualised rights rhetoric in response to perceived subgroup injustice.

Activist identification explained some action preferences, but did not simply translate into preferences for using subgroup interest arguments. In Study 5, metastereotyping measures revealed that inclusive rights-based protest strategies were used in order to create positive impressions of social justice campaigners in the minds of both outgroup and ingroup audiences. Ideas for future social psychological research on human rights is discussed.
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