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Issue Study 1: Moral Machine

In this Moral Machine experiment, I found myself employing Deontology and Utilitarianism almost every single scenario. It could be because we just learned it or because I abide by these theories. It seems to be a mix of both. In some scenarios I would go with the “save the most people” or the Utilitarianism ethical theory if there was a balance between the options. In other cases, I would go with the “save the young/fit/working” people rather than the “elderly/homeless/nonfit” people, or the Deontology ethical theory. For this one case it was between two males dying or two females dying. Out of my good heart and faith, I chose the two men option because in my opinion men should protect women/children. I would like to say this is Deontology but it’s all about different perspectives. For the most part I feel my answers reflected what Social Contract would say because in most cases I chose the well being of people rather than pets. I feel that Social Contract would make the same choice due to the simple fact that they want the best for the people. A difference between my choice and a Social Contract choice would probably be the scenario where I chose five people (two elderly, one baby, a large male, and a female) over two people (a woman and a child). I went with the five people because I saw it that the elderly will have their time end soon regardless and possibly same with the unhealthy large male. As for the baby and female it’s unfortunate but I’d rather have saved the woman and child opposed to the Social Construct probably saving the majority of lives and not looking at who the lives they were going to save. As for the Positive and Negative Rights of the people and animals, I honestly didn’t think about these. Majority of my decisions came from the ethical theories. For the statistics, I was surprised at some of my answers as opposed to others. In the “Saving More Lives” category I found that my answer was far different than other’s choices. Mine was at the far left of the bar, in other words, my choice of saving more lives mattered a lot while others thought it sort of halfway mattered. For the “Protecting Passengers” category our answers were very similar where it halfway mattered about protecting passengers over pedestrians although in most scenarios, I was not paying much attention to that because there were other important factors. For the “Upholding the Law” category our answers were also similar because kind of mattered if they were abiding the law or not although there was no influence in my decisions from this. For the “Avoiding Intervention” category my answer was way off from other’s choices mainly because I might have misunderstood the category itself. Others also agreed with me with “Gender Preference” where we put females first in some cases. For the “Species Preference” I favored the human mostly over the pets and some might disagree however I wasn’t far off from what everyone else thought. For “Fitness Preference” and “Social Value Preference” I was moderately off compared to others. I chose higher social value and younger people as the favorite in the decision. For fitness I was most shocked at how far I was compared to other people. I chose fit people over unhealthy/large people while everyone else was in the middle. In total, I was surprised at how far I was compared to other people’s choices but it goes to show we all have similar yet different views on ethical situations and theories.