

Data documentation sheet

This is the data documentation sheet of the article: *Of mice, men, and trolleys: Hypothetical judgment versus real-life behavior in trolley-style moral dilemmas*; Bostyn, Sevenhant, Roets (in prep).

The data of this study is available on Open Science Framework at <https://osf.io/kvb99>. Note that the current data-file does not contain a coded-version of the motivations subjects' gave for their decisions. This data is available upon request through the first author but not yet added as we did not formally analyze it in the current paper, and are still working on a finalized list of the most common motivations for each decision in future research.

The data file is a tab-delimited .txt file, with a header containing the following variables:

STUDY: Study 1 (Real life Dilemma) or Study 2 (Hypothetical)

AGE: Age of the participants

GENDER: Gender of the participants (0 = Female, 1 = Male)

DECISION: Decision on the Mouse dilemma (0 = Deont., 1 = Cons.)

DEO1-10: Subjects ratings of appropriateness for the deontological option on dilemma 1 – 10

DEO: Average of DEO 1-10

CON1-10: Subjects ratings of appropriateness for the consequentialist option on dilemma 1 – 10

CON: Average of CON 1-10

NFC1-18: Subjects ratings on the Need for Cognition items

NFC: Subjects NFC score

EC1-7: Subjects ratings on the Empathic Concern items

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

EC: Subjects EC score

PT1-7: Subjects ratings on the Perspective Taking items

PT: Subjects PT score

PP1-16: Subjects ratings on the Primary Psychopathy items

PP: Subjects PP score

MID1-10: Subjects ratings on the Moral Identity items

I1-5: Subjects ratings on the Internalization subscale of Moral Identity

I: Subjects Internalization score

S1-5: Subjects ratings on the Symbolization subscale of Moral Identity

S: Subjects Symbolization score

AE1-22: Subjects ratings on the Animal Empathy items

AE: Subjects Animal Empathy score

MOUSE1-3: Subjects ratings on the Empathy for Mice items

MOUSE: Subjects Empathy for Mice score

DOUBT: Subjects self-reported doubt for “Decision”

UNCOMFORTABLE: Subjects self-reported uncomfortableness with “Decision”

NOSHOCK: The extent to which subjects were certain no shocks would be given
(self-reported)

RT: Subjects reaction time if they made a consequentialist decision.

Appendix A

Moral Dilemma Battery

1.

A viral epidemic has spread across the globe killing millions of people. You have developed two substances in your home laboratory. You know that one of them is a vaccine, but you don't know which one. You also know that the other one is deadly. Once you figure out which substance is the vaccine you can use it to save millions of lives. You have with you two people who are under your care, and the only way to identify the vaccine is to inject each of these people with one of the two substances. One person will live, the other will die, and you will be able to start saving lives with your vaccine.

Is it morally appropriate for you to kill one of these people with a deadly injection in order to identify a vaccine that will save millions of lives?

Is it morally appropriate for you not to test the substance on the two people so that millions will die, but the two people will be saved?

2.

You are driving a small speedboat when you notice five swimmers drowning in the distance. If you do not drive toward them at top speed, you will not arrive in time, and all five will die. In order to drive at top speed, You must lighten the load on your boat. The only way to lighten the load is to push your passenger with your hands, causing the passenger to tumble off the back of the boat. Your passenger cannot swim and will drown. If you push the passenger, your passenger will drown, but you will save the five drowning swimmers. If you do not push the passenger, the passenger will not drown, but the five swimmers will drown.

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

Is it morally appropriate for you to push your passenger, drowning him but saving the five swimmers?

Is it morally appropriate for you not to push your passenger so that the five swimmers will die, but your passenger will be saved?

3.

You are a fireman trying to help five children out of a burning house. There is only one window from which the children can be safely evacuated, and it is jammed shut. You must immediately use an object to smash open this large, heavy window or else all five children will die. The only sufficiently large object is a man on his way towards safely escaping the burning house. Crashing through the window is certain to kill the man. If you push the man through the window and break it open, the man will fall out and die, but the five children will be safely evacuated. If you do not push the man into the window the man will safely escape, but the five children will die.

Is it morally appropriate for you to push the man, killing the man but saving the children?

Is it appropriate for you not to push the man so that the five children will die, but the man will be saved?

4.

A small plane has had to put down in the desert. The passengers comprise you (a surgeon), and a party of five people with a rare genetic disease: they are unable to produce a vital enzyme but must instead get it in supplements to their diet every day or die that day. You know you will be rescued in two days and you have plenty of water but none of the needed supplement. Normal human kidneys contain large amounts of the enzyme they need. The only

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

way to save the lives of the five people is to remove one of the pilot's kidneys and feed it to them. He will not die if you do this, and you have a workable anaesthetic, but his health will be compromised. The pilot is opposed to this plan, but you have the power to do as you see fit.

Is it morally appropriate to remove the pilot's kidney in order to save the lives of the five people?

Is it morally appropriate not to remove the pilot's kidney, so that the five people will die but the pilot's health will not be compromised?

5.

You are an undercover agent that has infiltrated a terrorist group. The terrorist have taken a large group of tourists, including eight children, hostage. Your contact within the terrorist group informs you their leader is planning on killing all hostages the next morning. Your contact wants to help you free the children but, as a sign of good faith, desires that you kill one of the other hostages. If you refuse his offer all hostages, including the children, will die. If you accept his offer you will have to kill a hostage but you will be able to free the eight children.

Is it morally appropriate for you to kill one of the hostages to save the lives of the eight children?

Is it morally appropriate for you not to kill one of the hostages, so that you will not be able to save the lives of the eight children, but you will not have to kill one of the hostages yourself?

6.

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

You are the leader of a small group of soldiers. You are on your way back from a completed mission deep in enemy territory when one of your men has stepped in a trap that has been set by the enemy. The man is badly injured and it is impossible to free him. The trap is connected to a radio device that by now has alerted the enemy to your presence. They will soon be on their way. If the enemy finds your injured man they will torture him and kill him. The only way to prevent this injured soldier from being tortured is to shoot him yourself.

Is it morally appropriate for you to shoot the injured soldier, killing him but sparing him from being tortured and killed by the enemy?

Is it morally appropriate for you not to shoot the injured soldier, so that the enemy will torture and kill him, but you won't have to shoot the soldier yourself.

7.

You are a general burdened with the war on terrorism in the Middle-East. You have received intelligence on a temporary hideout place for the leaders of a terrorist group. The leaders of this terrorist group move every few days and this is a unique opportunity to eliminate them. You know that if you can eliminate the terrorist leaders the nearby city will be spared of terrorist attacks for at least six months, saving hundreds of lives. However, the only way you can eliminate the terrorists is by the use of a drone strike. The hideout is right next to a kindergarten and you know that this kindergarten will be damaged in the strike, resulting in as much as ten casualties.

Is it morally appropriate for you to order the drone strike, causing civilian casualties but avoiding future terrorist attacks?

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

Is it morally appropriate for you not to order the drone strike so that the terrorist attacks will continue but civilian casualties will be avoided?

8.

A runaway trolley is heading down the tracks toward five workmen who will be killed if the trolley proceeds on its present course. You are on a footbridge over the tracks, in between the approaching trolley and the five workmen. Next to you on this footbridge is a stranger who happens to be very large. The only way to save the lives of the five workmen is to push this stranger off the bridge and onto the tracks below where his large body will stop the trolley. The stranger will die if you do this, but the five workmen will be saved.

Is it morally appropriate for you to push the stranger on to the tracks in order to save the five workmen?

It is appropriate for you not to push the stranger on the tracks so that the five workmen will die but the stranger will survive?

9.

Enemy soldiers have taken over your village. They have orders to kill all the children but leave the adults alive. You and a large group of children have sought refuge in the cellar of a large house. Outside you hear the voices of soldiers who have come to search the house for valuables. One of the children, an orphaned baby, begins to cry loudly. You cover his mouth to block the sound. If you remove your hand from his mouth his crying will summon the attention of the soldiers who will kill all the children, though they will leave you alive. To save the other children you must smother the orphaned child.

OF MICE, MEN, AND TROLLEYS

Is it morally appropriate for you to smother the orphaned child in order to save yourself and the other townspeople?

Is it morally appropriate not to smother the orphaned child so that all the children will die but you won't have to kill the orphaned child?

10.

You are negotiating with a powerful and determined terrorist who is about to set off a bomb in a crowded area. Your one advantage is that you have his teenage son in your custody. There is only one thing that you can do to stop him from detonating his bomb, which will kill thousands of people if detonated. To stop him, you must contact him over the satellite hook-up that he has established and, in front of the camera, break one of his son's arms and then threaten to break the other one if he does not give himself up.

Is it morally appropriate for you to break the terrorist's son's arm in order to prevent the terrorist from killing thousands of people with his bomb?

Is it morally appropriate for you not to break the terrorist's son's arm so that the terrorist will set off the bomb, but you won't have to break the terrorist's son's arm?