

## On Moral decision making pprtTitle

### Introduction

Typically, judgments are classified into two primary types: factual (descriptive or necessary) and normative (prescriptive or contingent). However, these categories, though fundamental, may not fully encompass the range of judgments humans engage with. Various disciplines, including philosophy, psychology, and mathematics, suggest other classifications or subcategories.

### Extended Types of Judgments

#### Value Judgments

Value judgments focus on the worth, importance, or intrinsic merit of a subject. As a subset of normative judgments, they often pertain to ethical or moral dimensions. However, their unique emphasis on 'value' might warrant a separate consideration.

#### Aesthetic Judgments

Aesthetic judgments concern beauty or other aesthetic attributes. Although they might be regarded as a form of value or normative judgments, the discipline of aesthetics often treats them as a distinct category due to their specialized focus.

#### Prudential Judgments

Prudential judgments, often used in economics, decision theory, and practical ethics, consider what is prudent or practically wise. These judgments typically involve an interplay of both descriptive and normative elements.

#### Probabilistic Judgments

Probabilistic judgments, prevalent in statistics, psychology, and decision theory, assess the likelihood or probability of a given event or condition. They often require a balance between empirical data and theoretical models.

#### Counterfactual Judgments

Counterfactual judgments, commonly used in philosophy and cognitive psychology, speculate on alternate realities or conditions. These judgments often hinge on the ability to imagine and reason about hypothetical situations.

#### Analytic Judgments

In Kantian philosophy, analytic judgments are those in which the predicate concept is included within the subject concept. These judgments are typically tautological and contrast with synthetic judgments.

#### Synthetic Judgments

Kant also proposed synthetic judgments, wherein the predicate concept is not contained within the subject concept. They can be classified further into *a priori* (based on reasoning independent of experience) and *a posteriori* (based on experience).

### Conclusion

While factual and normative categories provide a foundational classification of judgments, the diversity and complexity of human thought suggest the utility of additional categories. The appropriateness of any specific set of categories, however, depends on the nature of the subject matter and the research questions at hand.