This quiz was created by Thomas Pölzler | Download: https://www.thomaspoelzler.com/teaching/materials | It may be freely used, adapted and shared without any restrictions (public domain under CC0 1.0).

Quiz Norman Frohlich, Joe Oppenheimer and Cheryl Eavey: Choices of Principles of Distributive Justice in Experimental Groups

○ one correct answer · ▢ one or more correct answers

1. Philosophers distinguish different areas of justice. In their text, Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey address...

- ○ a. retributive justice
- ○ b. distributive justice
- ○ c. compensatory justice

2. The title of John Rawls' most famous book is...

Answer: _____

3. What is the main purpose of Rawls' „veil of ignorance“ thought experiment (in which people are asked to choose a principle of justice while lacking certain information that they normally have)?

- ○ a. to increase the impartiality of people's reasoning
- ○ b. to increase people's motivation to comply with their chosen principle
- ○ c. to increase people's empathy towards the less well-off
- ○ d. to increase people's capacity for imagining alternative (social) realities

4. In their study Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey address certain aspects of Rawls' theory. Which of the following hypotheses do they purport to test?

- ▢ a. People in the original position will be fully self-interested.
- ▢ b. People in the original position will always reach unanimous agreement.
- ▢ c. People in the original position will choose the „difference principle“.
- ▢ d. People in the original position will always choose the same principle.

5. Participants could earn real money for completing the study, depending on their choices of income distributions and lotteries that determined their assignment to income classes.

- ○ True
- ○ False

6. Why was it important for the validity of Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey's experiment that the stakes were high, i.e., that from participants' perspective there was a chance to end up being really badly off?

- ○ a. because only then participants will be motivated to take sufficient effort in completing the study
- ○ b. because only then participants' aversity to risks will lead them to reason in favor of the difference principle
- ○ c. because only then sufficient anxiety will be triggered in participants
- ○ d. because only then participants will be able to understand the implications of the underlying principles of justice

7. Please assign each income distribution to one of the principles tested in Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey (the principle that implies this distribution).

Maximizing the average with a range constraint _____

Maximizing the average _____

Maximizing the average with a floor constraint _____

Maximizing the floor _____

8. Across all experiments, which principle was chosen most often?

- ○ a. Maximizing the floor
- ○ b. Maximizing the average with a floor constraint
- ○ c. Maximizing the average with a range constraint
- ○ d. Maximizing the average

9. How often did the groups reach consensus in their choice of principles?

- ○ a. sometimes
- ○ b. never
- ○ c. often
- ○ d. always

10. How many groups chose the principle that Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey associated with Rawls' difference principle (i.e., maximizing the floor)?

- ○ a. some groups
- ○ b. all groups
- ○ c. no group
- ○ d. most groups

11. How did participants' support for maximizing the average with a floor constraint change over the course of the tasks that they were asked to complete?

- ○ a. support for this principle became stronger
- ○ b. support for this principle stayed the same
- ○ c. support for this principle became weaker

12. In Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey's interpretation, participants' choices of income distributions were driven by the attempt to reconcile the following two values or concerns: (1) sufficient welfare for the poor, (2) equality of distributions.

- ○ True
- ○ False

13. From the fact that participants‘ risk propensity, political ideology, salary aspirations and socioeconomic status where not (or only mildly) correlated with their choices of income distributions Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey inferred...

- ○ a. that the original position as a whole, and the veil of ignorance in particular cannot be operationalized in the context of scientific studies
- ○ b. that Rawls' requirement of reaching consensus behind the veil of ignorance was too strong, and hence philosophically untenable
- ○ c. that participants had understood the principles of justice that were entailed by the presented income distributions
- ○ d. that their operationalization of Rawls' veil of ignorance (even in a thick sense) was largely successful

14. Frohlich, Oppenheimer and Eavey argue that the result of their study contradicts Rawls‘ claim that people behind the veil of ignorance would reach consensus on the difference principle. The study is hence regarded as providing evidence against this principle. Suppose you wanted to defend Rawls. What could be plausible ways of casting doubt on the study’s relevance for an assessment of Rawls‘ difference principle? In other words, and more generally, what could be criticized about the study? (< 400 words)