While taking the test using the Moral Machine, I noticed that I had set preferences or was biased on certain decisions. For example, preferring young people over those who were older. According to the results, my preference for younger ages was at the highest position. It's not that I dislike elderly people, but if I had to choose between the two, I'd save the younger people. I feel sad when a young person or child passes away, as they didn't get to experience life as they deserved. An elderly person's death doesn't affect me as much since the elderly have lived a full life; whether it was good or bad. Another example was having a higher preference for saving females over males. My approach while making the decision mainly comes from the possibility of children being left orphaned. As for the rest of the scenarios, I didn't have much preference besides holding onto set rules and least number of deaths. I personally didn't feel any bias or favor over a person's status or their overall health. As stated before, my concern was to have the least number of deaths. As for the scenarios involving animals and a person or group, I mainly chose to save the humans because I value their life more over a random animal.

After reviewing the results based on my decisions, I believe the analysis to be mostly inaccurate. While there were some results that appeared accurate to some degree, the rest seemed far less accurate than what I was aiming towards. For example, the results state that I had the highest preference towards high social value, which I found confusing because I'd made decisions that would say otherwise. I believe that result should've been more towards the center/neutral area. Another example showed having the highest preference for fit people over larger people. Again, I had made decisions where it didn't matter the person's size or social value, but the results show that I had a preference. Moreover, I find that the results and scenarios to be unfair and biased towards larger individuals and lower ranked individuals. First of all, it contained scenarios of people violating a red stop light. Those individuals just happened to be of a low value class or an unhealthy person. Secondly, some groups didn't appear to be fairly divided. While random groups do appear in real life situations, the type of people should not be a major indicator on who to save. I even reattempted the Moral Machine using

the same tactics as before; however, the results were the opposite. Lastly, I thought it was ridiculous to show either a baby or child alone in a self-driving vehicle. I don't find it to be a realistic situation. In general, I find that the analysis isn't as accurate as it could be. It would be better if there were more questions with multiple variations to see if there is a preference for the result to be more precise. Especially in situations where the type of individual is only used once.