

**Surveying Folk Attributions of Moral
Responsibility in Collective Contexts**

Jessica Lazen

APSTA-GE 2139: Survey Research Methods

Dr. Daphna Harel

December 18, 2025

Introduction

Background

A collective is a group of individuals or entities organized around a shared objective. As social beings, we are embedded in a vast web of collectives: governments exercise political authority and allocate resources, corporations structure economic activity, and families and friends provide care and support. Within these collectives, the whole often becomes more than the sum of its parts, producing outcomes that no single member could achieve alone. This idea is foundational in sociology. As Émile Durkheim argued, social groups and institutions constitute *social facts*: collective realities that exist outside individual actors and exert constraint over them (Durkheim, 1893). From this perspective, collective action cannot be reduced to individual intentions or behaviors; instead, it emerges from shared norms, rules, and structures that shape what individuals can do.

In the United States, this principle is embedded in national identity: *e pluribus unum*—a phrase printed on U.S. currency and long used in the Great Seal of the United States—originally referred to the unification of thirteen colonies into a single nation to achieve independence from Britain. While collective power is often celebrated as a source of strength, it also enables greater capacity for harm. On a smaller scale, for example, a school district may adopt a curriculum that unintentionally disadvantages certain students—an outcome produced through dispersed decision-making and implementation rather than any single educator's actions. More broadly, modern institutions continue to operate within structures shaped by colonial legacies, reproducing widespread harm and systemic inequality that no individual actor controls.

Motivating the Research Question

Despite these structural forces, U.S. culture maintains strong beliefs in personal responsibility and individualism, emphasizing that outcomes are the product of individual effort

rather than systemic conditions. This cultural emphasis creates a tension: when collective outcomes cause harm, responsibility and blame are difficult to assign, since no single individual may be directly accountable. This ambiguity—over whether responsibility lies with individuals, the collective, or both—is a central concern in sociological theory and precisely what motivates the present study.

Building on this tension between structural forces and responsibility, the present study examines how people reason about moral responsibility in complex social contexts where groups of individuals act collectively. Rather than engaging in abstract sociological or moral theory, this project focuses on how lay adults actually assign responsibility in practice. While scholars of philosophy and sociology have long debated the legitimacy of collective agency (Bandura, 1997; Corlett, 2002; List & Pettit, 2011; Pettit, 2007; Narveson, 2002; Shockley, 2007; Smiley, 2010), empirical evidence on everyday judgments of collective responsibility remains limited. To address this gap, the present study asks: *Under what circumstances do people assign moral responsibility to collective entities versus individual members, and how do these judgements vary across participants' backgrounds?*

Justification for Survey Methodology

A survey is well-suited for this study because I am interested in people's perceptions and moral judgments about collective versus individual responsibility. Unlike direct measurements, surveys can capture these internal intuitions that aren't directly observable. Compared to qualitative methods, surveys allow us to collect data from a larger, more diverse sample in a systematic and comparable way. They also let us manipulate scenarios or vignettes to see how different contexts influence moral judgments, making a survey the most practical and effective tool for my research question.

Study Design

This study uses a cross-sectional, randomized experimental design in which participants read moral scenarios varying in key features (e.g., type of collective, mental state of actor, hierarchical standing of actor—whether they occupy a low, mid, or high position within the collective) and make responsibility judgments. This design allows causal inferences about the influence of scenario features on responsibility attributions, while collecting data at a single point in time. My target population is English-speaking non-institutionalized adults (age 18+) living in the United States and the United Kingdom in 2026. The sampling frame for this project will be Prolific: a non-probability online participant pool. Data will be collected via an online Qualtrics survey administered through Prolific during three 2-hour periods per country (morning, afternoon, and evening) in mid-2026.

Coverage Error

The Prolific sampling frame for this study is extensive but not without limitations that could result in coverage error. Certain groups are overcovered—included despite being ineligible—such as Prolific users who are influenced by financial incentives to provide dishonest answers about eligibility. This could include non-English speakers or people living in countries other than the U.S and U.K. Conversely, some populations are undercovered—including individuals who lack internet access or devices such as elderly, low-income, or rural participants. Additionally, people who do not participate in online research platforms are missing from the sampling frame. These coverage gaps may limit the generalizability of the findings and bias estimates of the effects of scenario and participant features on responsibility judgments.

Sampling Error

Sample participants will be drawn from the Prolific frame using the built in “representative sample” feature, which uses Census data to proportionally allocate by sex (male and female), age (18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, and 55+), simplified ethnicity (White, Mixed, Asian, Black and Other), political affiliation (U.S: Republican, Democrat, and Independent; U.K: Conservative,

Labour, LibDem, Green, SNP, Reform, and Other), and country (U.S. and U.K.). Although Prolific refers to this as a “stratified sample,” based on limited publicly available information, it appears to employ a quota-based approach: researchers specify a total sample size, and subgroup quotas are determined using Census proportions. Additionally, the invitation algorithm is proprietary, so it is unclear whether all eligible participants have an equal chance of being invited. Consequently, the sample cannot be considered a probability-based sample.

Non-response Error

Prolific uses quota sampling to approximate a representative sample of the population, but not all invited users accept and participate in a given study. In practice, fast and frequent users often fill quotas first, which effectively produces a digital convenience sample from the Prolific frame. This introduces potential non-response error: the participants who respond may systematically differ from those who do not in ways that are relevant to moral responsibility judgments. Because the characteristics of non-respondents are largely unknown, it is difficult to determine the direction or magnitude of potential bias. As a result, the generalizability of findings may be limited.

General Statement on Error

This study relies on Prolific primarily for convenience, affordability, and its relative advantages over alternatives such as student-based frames like SONA. While student samples are common in psychological research, using Prolific allows me to access a larger and more diverse participant pool than a single university or local community. Additionally, the present research is largely exploratory and aims to generate preliminary insights into how people attribute moral responsibility in collective contexts. Nonetheless, it remains unclear whether participants’ sensitivity to vignette features or their ultimate moral responsibility judgments might vary systematically due to unmeasured gaps between the target population, sampling frame,

sample, and respondents. I will be transparent in reporting these limitations to contextualize the findings and avoid overstating their generalizability.

Measurement

Survey Design

The study employs a $3 \times 3 \times 3$ factorial vignette design to systematically vary the type of collective, the hierarchical standing of the actor, and the mental state or knowledge leading to harm. The three types of collectives include a hiking group, an insurance company, and a city government. Actor standing is manipulated at three levels—high-level, mid-level, and low-level—while the mental state is varied across intentional, unintentional, and negligent actions. These scenarios are designed to be realistic and plausible, and have been carefully written to be as similar as possible across conditions in terms of context, structure, and outcome, differing only in the manipulated features.

Measured Constructs

The primary constructs measured in this study are attributions of moral responsibility to collectives and individual actors. Participants are asked to evaluate responsibility for each actor described in the vignette, based solely on the actions presented. Responsibility ratings are collected for both the collective as an entity (e.g., the hiking club as an organization) and for individual members at different hierarchical levels, including low-, mid-level, and high-level members, as well as any affected individuals (e.g., the injured member). The order of actor presentation is randomized to reduce order effects. If a participant judges that an actor was not involved in the scenario or it is not meaningful to rate their responsibility, they can select “Not applicable.” This design allows measurement of both aggregate and actor-specific responsibility judgments, providing insight into how different vignette features influence moral responsibility attribution.

Additional participant-level constructs are measured to explore potential sources of variation in responsibility attributions. Demographic characteristics—including age, sex, religion, fluent languages, ethnicity, political affiliation, and country—are obtained from Prolific. Following the initial survey, participants will also complete the 16-item Individualism and Collectivism (INDCOL) scale developed by Triandis and Gelfand (1998) to assess cultural orientation, which may influence how they interpret collective dynamics and assign moral responsibility. Together, these measures enable analyses at both the actor level and the participant level, providing a more comprehensive exploration of moral judgment in collective contexts.

Measurement error

Measurement error is a concern in online, opt-in panels, as poor-quality responses are relatively common (Marlar, 2025; Mercer & Lau, 2023; Peer et al., 2021). Scaled questions are particularly vulnerable to issues such as “straight-lining,” where participants select the same response across multiple items, or responses from disengaged or “bogus” participants. To help mitigate these issues, participants are asked at the beginning of the study to commit to providing thoughtful and attentive answers. Survey comprehension can also vary, potentially affecting the accuracy of responses. Prolific allows participants to message researchers with any questions they have while taking the survey, so I will closely monitor this inbox during data collection. Additionally, randomization of questions and items are used to reduce the likelihood of order effect bias.

Survey Design Process

My survey instrument underwent multiple rounds of pretesting and revision over the semester. These revisions were informed by (1) feedback from the course grader, (2) in-class cognitive interviews, (3) peer reviews from classmates, and (4) informal discussions and instructor feedback throughout the design process. Below, I describe how they informed changes to my survey and submitted work.

Grader Feedback

Feedback from the course grader prompted me to make higher-level revisions to my survey's conceptual framing. Specifically, the grader noted that my original research question was overly broad and would benefit from being broken into more specific, measurable sub-questions. They also noted I should clarify my planned use of vignettes. In response, future assignments clearly specified how the vignettes operationalize distinct features related to moral responsibility (group type, actor status, and mental state). This feedback also made me realize I should include the INDCOL scale to more directly measure the second part of my research question (how do judgements vary across participants' backgrounds?) along with the demographic info I collect.

Cognitive Testing Feedback

Based on feedback from a think-aloud cognitive interview conducted with Genie K., the response format for responsibility judgments was changed from a 5-point Likert-type scale to a continuous slider from "Not at all responsible" to "Fully responsible." Genie noted that the Likert scale felt overly restrictive for capturing nuanced judgments of moral responsibility, and the slider format allows respondents to express more fine-grained distinctions and measures judgements on a continuous scale for ease of analysis.

Based on feedback from a think-aloud cognitive interview conducted with Huairui W., the health insurance vignette negligent condition was revised to improve realism. The original wording suggested that state guidelines were clearly established and simply ignored, which the Huairui noted felt unlikely in practice. To address this, the scenario was edited to specify that the relevant state guidelines had been recently updated. This change makes the situation more believable while preserving the intended structure of the scenario and the downstream consequences for patients.

Peer Review Feedback

Based on feedback from Laura T., the timing of data collection was adjusted to reduce potential bias. She noted that collecting data within a single short window could over-represent participants who happen to be active on Prolific at that time, such as individuals with more flexible schedules. In response, data collection for both the U.S. and U.K. samples will be spread across three time-zone sensitive time periods—morning, afternoon, and evening—to help reach a broader and more diverse set of participants.

Syed A. mentioned bolded text in scenarios was sometimes mistaken for instructions, so I removed the bolding to ensure participants focus on the content of the scenario rather than its formatting. Both reviewers also noted that participants may hold strong prior beliefs toward certain organizations, such as health insurance companies, which could influence responsibility judgements independent of the vignette manipulations. To address this, I included a more neutral local government scenario alongside the hiking group and insurance company scenarios. This provides a context less likely to evoke strong pre-existing opinions. However, whether highly salient or controversial organizations affects responsibility judgments is an interesting question that may warrant further investigation in follow-up studies.

Professor Feedback

Based on an informal discussion with Daphna, I added a cognitive anchor to each judgment question reminding participants to base their responses on their own perspective and the information provided in the scenario. Specifically, each question now includes the instruction: “Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.”

Future steps

If I were to conduct this study in real life, the first step would be to run additional pretests (likely with a convenience sample) to ensure that the vignettes are both clear and realistic, and that participants interpret the manipulated features as intended. Specifically, I would verify that

the type of collective, the hierarchical standing of the actor, and the actor's mental state leading to harm are perceived in the way they were designed, and that participants understand the scenarios consistently across conditions. I would also run a pilot test to confirm the randomization scheme and test the survey flow to ensure that participants can complete the survey without confusion or fatigue.

The data collected from the survey would be used primarily to explore how the manipulated features in the vignettes influence participants' attributions of moral responsibility, rather than to make population-level inferences. A straightforward analysis plan would begin by summarizing responsibility ratings across levels of each manipulated feature—type of collective, actor hierarchical level, and actor mental state—to examine main effects. To test interactions, I could use a mixed-effects model including all three factors and their interaction terms as fixed effects, with participants and vignettes as random effects to account for repeated measures. Optionally, principal component analysis (PCA) could be applied to the responsibility ratings to reduce dimensionality, and the resulting component scores could be used in exploratory analyses to examine how participant-level characteristics, such as demographics and INDCOL scores, relate to systematic variation in moral responsibility judgments. Because this is an exploratory study using a non-probability sample, the results would not be generalized to a broader population but would instead be used to identify patterns and inform the design of future, more definitive studies.

References

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W.H. Freeman.
- Corlett, J. A. (2002). Collective responsibility. *The Journal of Ethics*, 6(2), 179–198.
- Durkheim, E. (1938). *The rules of sociological method* (8th ed.). University of Chicago Press.

- Peer, E., Rothschild, D., Gordon, A., Evernden, Z., & Damer, E. (2021). Data quality of platforms and panels for online behavioral research. *Behavior Research Methods*, 54(4), 1643–1662.
- List, C., & Pettit, P. (2011). Group agency: The possibility, design, and status of corporate agents. Oxford University Press.
- Pettit, P. (2007). Responsibility incorporated. *Ethics*, 117(2), 171–201.
- Marlar, J. (2025, March 28). Gallup's approach to opt-in sampling. Gallup. [Link](#)
- Mercer, A., & Lau, A. (2023, September 7). Comparing two types of online survey samples. Pew Research Center. [Link](#)
- Narveson, J. (2002). Collective responsibility. *The Journal of Ethics*, 6(2), 179–198.
- Shockley, K. (2007). Programming collective control. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 38(3), 442–455.
- Smiley, M. (2010). From moral agency to collective wrongs: Re-thinking collective moral responsibility. *Journal of Law and Policy*, 19(1), 1–35.
- Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(1), 118–128.

preamble**Consent Form for IRB-FY20XX-XXXX**

You have been invited to take part in a research study titled "Judgements about Responsibility". This study will be conducted by Jessica Lazen, FAS - Psychology, Arts & Science, New York University.

If you agree to be in this study, you will watch read several short scenarios describing actions taken by individuals and organizations, and then answer questions about how responsible you think each party is. You will also complete a short 16-question questionnaire. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your honest judgments. The study will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

There are no known risks associated with your participation in this research beyond those encountered in everyday life. Some scenarios may involve descriptions of harm or wrongdoing, which some participants may find sensitive. Although you will receive no direct benefits from participating, this research may help the investigator better understand how people make judgments about moral responsibility. You will be paid \$2.50 for completing this survey. If you withdraw before the end of the study, no compensation will be provided.

Confidentiality of your research records will be strictly maintained by giving all subject data a random numerical code. Information not containing identifiers may be used in future research, shared with other researchers, or placed in a data repository without your additional consent.

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without penalty. You have the right to skip or not answer any questions you prefer not to answer.

If there is anything about the study or your participation that is unclear or that you do not understand, if you have questions or wish to report a research-related problem, you may contact Jessica Lazen at (212) 998-3546 or jds866@nyu.edu.

For questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University Committee on Activities Involving Human Subjects (UCAIHS), New York University, 665 Broadway, Suite 804, New York, New York, 10012, at ask.humansubjects@nyu.edu or (212) 998-4808. Please reference the study # (IRB-FY20XX-XXX) when contacting the IRB (UCAIHS). You may now print a copy of this consent document to keep.

consent

To consent to participate, please click “I consent” below, and enter your Prolific ID. If you do not consent to participate, you may exit the survey now.

- I consent. (1)
-

prolific_id

Prolific ID

---Page break---

quality

We care about the quality of our study data. For us to get the most accurate measures of your beliefs, it is important that you provide thoughtful answers to each question in this study. Do you commit to providing thoughtful answers to the questions in this study?

- I can't promise either way
- Yes, I will
- No, I will not

---Page break---

Study Instructions

Thank you for agreeing to participate.

In this study, you will read [X] short scenarios describing actions taken by individuals working within organizations. After each scenario, you will be asked a few questions about how you interpret what happened and how responsible different parties are.

There are no right or wrong answers—we are only interested in your personal judgments.
Please read each scenario carefully.

Click **Next** to begin the study.

---Page break---

Start of Block: club_high, randomly show 1 vignette

club_high_intent

The president of a hiking club deliberately organized a hike knowing the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of the trail the president knew was hazardous.

club_high_unintendt

The president of a hiking club organized a hike unaware the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of the trail that was hazardous.

club_high_negligent

The president of a hiking club organized a hike without reviewing the club's safety guidelines, which noted that the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of trail that was listed as hazardous in the safety guidelines.

club_high_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	Not Applicable
The hiking club as an organization			<input type="checkbox"/>
A mid-level member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
The injured member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
The president of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
A new member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>

--Page break--

Start of Block: club_mid randomly show 1 vignette

club_mid_intent

A mid-level member of a hiking club deliberately led the group down a trail knowing the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of the trail the mid-level member knew was hazardous.

club_mid_uninintent

A mid-level member of a hiking club led the group down a trail unaware the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of the trail that was hazardous.

club_mid_negligent

A mid-level member of a hiking club led the group down a trail without reviewing the club's safety guidelines, which noted that the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of trail that was listed as hazardous in the safety guidelines.

Club_mid_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	Not Applicable
The hiking club as an organization		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The involved mid-level member of the hiking club		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The injured member of the hiking club		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The president of the hiking club		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A new member of the hiking club		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: club_low randomly show 1 vignette

club_low_intent

A new member in a hiking club deliberately suggested a member take a shortcut knowing that storm damage made that route dangerous. The member was injured on a section of trail that the new member knew was hazardous.

club_low_unintendt

A new member in a hiking club suggested a member take a shortcut unaware that storm damage made that route dangerous. The member was injured on a section of the trail that was hazardous.

club_low_negligent

A new member in a hiking club suggested a member take a shortcut without reviewing the club's safety guidelines, which noted that the trail conditions were poor due to a storm. One member was injured on a section of trail that was listed as hazardous in the safety guidelines.

club_low_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	Not Applicable
The hiking club as an organization			<input type="checkbox"/>
A mid-level member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
The injured member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
The president of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>
The involved new member of the hiking club			<input type="checkbox"/>

---Page break---

Start of Block: corp_high randomly show 1 vignette

corp_high_intent

The CEO of a health insurance company deliberately approved a new claims processing policy knowing that it would deny coverage for certain patients. Several patients were denied needed care on claims the CEO knew should be covered.

corp_high_uninintent

The CEO of a health insurance company approved a new claims processing policy unaware that it would deny coverage for certain patients. Several patients were denied needed care under the new policy.

corp_high_negligent

The CEO of a health insurance company approved a new claims processing policy without reviewing recently updated state guidelines, which noted that this type of claim should be covered. Several patients were denied needed care that the state guidelines indicated should be covered.

corp_high_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

<i>Actor (randomized order)</i>	<i>Not at all responsible</i>	<i>Completely responsible</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The insurance company itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The CEO of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The patients who were denied care		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A mid-level manager of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A claims processor at the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: corp_mid randomly show 1 vignette

corp_mid_intent

A mid-level manager at a health insurance company deliberately implemented a new claims processing policy knowing that it would deny coverage for certain patients. Several patients were denied needed care on claims the senior manager knew should be covered.

corp_mid_unintend

A mid-level manager at a health insurance company implemented a new claims processing policy unaware that it would deny coverage for certain patients. Several patients were denied needed care under the new policy.

Corp_mid_negligent

A mid-level manager at a health insurance company implemented a new claims processing policy without reviewing recently updated state guidelines, which noted that this type of claim should be covered. Several patients were denied needed care that the state guidelines indicated should be covered.

corp_mid_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	N/A
The insurance company itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The CEO of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The patients who were denied care		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The involved mid-level manager of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A claims processor at the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: corp_low randomly show 1 vignette

corp_low_intent

A claims processor at a health insurance company deliberately followed a new claims processing policy knowing that some patients' coverage would be affected. Several patients were denied needed care on claims the claims processor knew should be covered.

corp_low_unintent

A claims processor at a health insurance company followed a new claims processing policy unaware that it would deny coverage for certain patients. Several patients were denied needed care under the new policy.

Corp_low_negligent

A claims processor at a health insurance company followed a new claims processing policy without reviewing recently updated state guidelines, which noted that this type of claim should be covered. Several patients were denied needed care that the state guidelines indicated should be covered.

Corp_low_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

<i>Actor (randomized order)</i>	<i>Not at all responsible</i>	<i>Completely responsible</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The insurance company itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The CEO of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The patients who were denied care		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A mid-level manager of the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The involved claims processor at the insurance company		<input type="checkbox"/>	

--Page break--

Start of Block: gov_high randomly show 1 vignette

gov_high_intent

The mayor of a city deliberately approved a new public works policy knowing that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that the mayor knew were hazardous.

gov_high_unintent

The mayor approved a new public works policy unaware that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that were hazardous.

gov_high_negligent

The mayor approved a new public works policy without reviewing recent safety reports, which noted that several streets were hazardous. Several residents were injured on streets that had been flagged as unsafe.

gov_high_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

<i>Actor (randomized order)</i>	<i>Not at all responsible</i>	<i>Completely responsible</i>	<i>N/A</i>
The city government itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The mayor of the city		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The residents who were injured		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The city administrative manager		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A city employee		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: gov_mid randomly show 1 vignette

gov_mid_intent

The administrative manager of a city deliberately implemented a new public works policy knowing that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that the administrative manager knew were hazardous.

gov_mid_unintent

The administrative manager of a city implemented a new public works policy unaware that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that were hazardous.

gov_mid_negligent

The administrative manager of a city implemented a new public works policy without reviewing recent safety reports, which noted that several streets were hazardous. Several residents were injured on streets that had been flagged as unsafe.

Gov_mid_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	N/A
The city government itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The mayor of the city		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The residents who were injured		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The involved city administrative manager		<input type="checkbox"/>	
A city employee		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: gov_low randomly show 1 vignette

gov_low_intent

A city employee enforced a new public works policy knowing that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that the city employee knew were hazardous.

gov_low_unintendt

A city employee enforced a new public works policy unaware that it would create unsafe conditions on several streets. Several residents were injured on streets that were hazardous.

gov_low_negligent

A city employee enforced a new public works policy without reviewing recent safety reports, which noted that several streets were hazardous. Several residents were injured on streets that had been flagged as unsafe.

gov_low_q

Please answer the following questions from your own perspective, using the information in the scenario you just read. You may reread the scenario if needed.

How responsible do you believe each person is for the hiking club member's injury?

If you believe someone was not involved in this scenario or it does not make sense to rate their responsibility, please select "Not applicable".

Actor (randomized order)	Not at all responsible	Completely responsible	N/A
The city government itself		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The mayor of the city		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The residents who were injured		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The city administrative manager		<input type="checkbox"/>	
The involved city employee		<input type="checkbox"/>	

---Page break---

Start of Block: INDCOL (randomize order)

1. *I'd rather depend on myself than others.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. *I rely on myself most of the time; I rarely rely on others.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. *I often do "my own thing."*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. *My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. *It is important that I do my job better than others.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. *Winning is everything.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. *Competition is the law of nature.*

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. When another person does better than I do, I get tense and aroused.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

9. If a coworker gets a prize, I would feel proud

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. The well-being of my coworkers is important to me.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. To me, pleasure is spending time with others.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. I feel good when I cooperate with others

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Parents and children must stay together as much as possible.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. It is my duty to take care of my family, even when I have to sacrifice what I want.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. Family members should stick together, no matter what sacrifices are required.

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16. *It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups.*

<i>Strongly disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat disagree</i>	<i>Neither agree nor disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat agree</i>	<i>Strongly agree</i>
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>