



---

## Training Exercises E1 (Intro)

---

Training Exercises are meant to give you the opportunity to engage with the course topics in interesting and helpful ways. They help you to train important skills, deepen your knowledge of the course content, or to explore new topics. It is not mandatory to do these exercises, but we nevertheless strongly recommend to do them. Training exercises do not necessarily have a style that is similar to exam questions. They are still helpful to get better in the course.

**Note:** This particular exercise sheet does not come with solutions on purpose. Just make up your mind on the questions! :)

### Issue 1: *Gamification*

Tim is the manager of a supermarket. He ponders on introducing a gamification system in order to increase customer satisfaction. The system is supposed to work as follows: Every customer is asked to rate their cashier on a scale from 1 to 5 after checkout by pressing one of five buttons. The average of those ratings is calculated for every cashier and the employee with the highest rating gets a week of extra holiday as a bonus, while everybody else gets just their regular holidays. This results in them being a little less happy with their own number of days off than they otherwise would have been. Cashiers can always see their own average rating as well as the currently highest average, but not whom it belongs to.

1. Is Tim morally allowed to introduce this system according to your moral intuition? Write down your opinion and the reasons why you think so.
2. Discuss your results in your discussion group. Take notes of their opinion as well as their reasons to think so.
3. Make a pairwise comparison. Where are similarities and differences between your positions? Two people may have similar intuitions for similar reasons, they may have similar intuitions for different reasons, different intuitions for different reasons, and even different intuitions for similar reasons. What is the case here?
4. Can you think of other positions that people might plausibly have that did not come up in your group?

### Issue 2: *Moral Machine*

Take a look at <http://moralmachine.mit.edu/> and <https://mygoodness.mit.edu> and play around

with it. What did you learn? Take screenshots of your results and save them for later.

### Issue 3: *Zombie Apocalypse*

Sophie and Kris are talking about a post-apocalyptic zombie movie. In the movie-world, society broke down entirely and the two main characters, a man and his son, are fighting to stay alive. There is a large population of humans left, but most of them are likely to die soon if the zombies are not stopped. They get into a situation where the man has to make a decision: he can very likely stop the zombies, or he can save his son from a certain death. If he stops the zombies, his son will die in agony, and if he saves his son, the zombies are likely to prevail. If the man lets the chance pass and does not stop the zombies, there is no other known way of stopping the zombies. In the end, he decides to save his son. Look at the following three snippets from the conversation of Sophie and Kris:

- (I) *Sophie*: Well, the main character can follow his own, egoistic motives and save his son, or he could contribute to stopping the zombie infection and potentially save hundreds or thousands of lives. I think it is easy to decide what he ought to do: he ought to sacrifice his son in order to stop the apocalypse.

*Kris*: Hm, I think this is a lot more difficult and heavily depends on the circumstances. But my opinion is this: Living in this post-apocalyptic world is very hard and if you are living a very hard life, putting yourself and your own interests first is both rational and morally permitted. So he is under no obligation to do anything he does not want to do. And if he wants to save his son, then so should he do.

- (II) *Sophie*: If he did not save his son, the son is likely to die anyway. But if he stops the zombies, he is likely to save all the rest of humanity. That looks like a clear case to me.

*Kris*: Yes, but firstly, he does not *know* that his son would die later if the zombies are not stopped, he just believes it to be likely.

- (III) *Sophie*: I think the man could do *way* more good, if he stopped the zombies.

*Kris*: Yes, but that does not count. He has an obligation to try to save his son, no matter what, because it is his son!

- (IV) *Sophie*: The zombies should be stopped as they are a huge hazard to humans!

*Kris*: Yes, but so are road accidents. But we are not prohibiting cars.

For each snippet, come up with a reply for Sophie, if you think what Kris said is flawed. Come up with an additional support of Kris' claim, if you think he is right. Discuss your results in your group.

### Issue 4: *Reading*

Read "What is Computer Ethics?" by James H. Moor. (You can find the text [here](#)) Then answer the following questions:

1. The text was written in 1985. Do you think that it is still up to date? Why or why not?
2. What does Moor mean when he says that there is a conceptual vacuum? Describe in your own words.

3. What does he mean when he says that there is a policy vacuum? Describe in your own words.
4. Briefly describe in your own words what he means with “invisibility factor”.
5. How do you, overall, like the text and why?