Activity 1:

Scenario 1: Original Trolley Dilemma

If it were up to me, I would not choose to pull the lever to save one person while causing the death of five others. I believe that human life cannot be measured by numbers, and I do not want saving lives to rely on killing as a means. Moreover, I do not consider myself responsible for changing the fate of others. However, if among the five were my close friends or relatives, or if someone offered me a large sum of money to save them, I might reconsider my choice.

Scenario 2: Footbridge Dilemma

I would choose not to push the man off the bridge. While pulling a lever may seem like a simple act of redirection, pushing someone to their death is direct killing. I would not kill in order to save others, because killing should never be justified as a reason for any action. As in the trolley problem, I should not interfere in determining the fate of others.

Scenario 3: Real World Dilemma

I would not choose to kill a healthy person to harvest their organs in order to save five patients. For the healthy individual, this would mean undeserved harm, a violation of their human rights, and a tragic misfortune. Furthermore, even if their organs were used for transplantation, there is no guarantee that the five recipients would survive for as long or live as healthily as others.

Activity 2:

(a) Recruiting only friends and family introduces sampling bias, since they may not represent the broader user population and might avoid giving negative feedback.

(b) Asking “How do you feel about the layout and features of this fitness tracking site? Please be as honest as possible.” is too vague and may lead to superficial or socially desirable answers, limiting the depth and accuracy of feedback.

(c) To improve rigor, recruit a diverse sample of independent users and use structured tasks or specific questions to gather more reliable and valid usability data.

Activity 3:

(a) If a participant withdraws, I must respect their decision and remove their data from the study, even if it has already been collected. Since there are still 19 participants, the overall findings can remain valid, but I should report the updated sample size transparently.

(b) Because the analysis relies entirely on this participant’s data, I cannot ethically include it once they withdraw. I would need to exclude the case study, acknowledge the limitation, and either focus on aggregate results or redesign the analysis to avoid dependence on a single participant.

Activity 4:

(a)

A separate human research ethics approval is needed because the clinical cohort involves elderly individuals with mild cognitive impairment, a vulnerable population requiring additional protections. Existing approval for healthy subjects does not extend to cognitively impaired participants, so a new application ensures risks are minimised and ethical standards are met.

(b)

The ethics application step should be placed immediately after Step 4: Refinement of clinical cohort experimental plan based on pilot study results and before Step 5: conducting the clinical cohort study. This allows time to address any Human Research Ethics Committee recommendations and ensures the study cannot begin until formal approval is granted.

(c)

At the University of Queensland, the Human Research Ethics Committee is responsible for approving ethics applications. They must follow the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research to ensure all projects protect participants’ rights, welfare, and dignity.