

Online Supplementary Materials for:

**Your Money or Your Life: Comparing judgments in trolley problems involving economic and emotional harms, injury, and death**

Natalie Gold, Kings College London

Briony D. Pulford, University of Leicester

Andrew M. Colman, University of Leicester

Correspondence should be addressed to Natalie Gold, Philosophy Department, King's College London, Strand, London, WC2R 2LS, United Kingdom. E-mail: [Natalie.gold@rocketmail.com](mailto:Natalie.gold@rocketmail.com)

This file contains the dilemmas that were presented to participants. We identify the dilemmas by *context-scenario-type of harm*. *Context* is trolley or sauna; *scenario* is the experimental factor footbridge vs. bystander. These titles were not seen by participants. Each participant responded to only one dilemma.

### *Trolley-bystander-death*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, they will be killed. The track has a side-track leading off to the left. Peter is standing next to a lever. If he pulls the lever, that will turn the trolley onto the side track and the five miners on the main track will not die. But there is one miner on the side track who does not have time to get out of the way. If the trolley goes onto the side track, then the miner on the side track will die. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can pull the lever, in which case the one miner will die but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pulling the lever, in which case the five miners will die but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to pull the lever?

### *Trolley-footbridge-death*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, they will be killed. Peter is standing on a bridge over the trolley tracks, next to a miner who is twice as large as Peter. If Peter pushes the miner off the footbridge and onto the tracks, the trolley will collide with the miner, who weighs just enough to make it stop, and the five miners on the main

track will not die. But the collision will cause the death of the large miner. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the miner, in which case the one miner will die but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the miner, in which case the five miners will die but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Trolley-bystander-limb loss*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, the trolley will roll over their legs and they will all lose their legs. The track has a side-track leading off to the left. Peter is standing next to a lever. If he pulls the lever, that will turn the trolley onto the side track and the five miners on the main track will not lose their legs. But one miner is on the side track. If the trolley goes onto the side track, then it will roll over the legs of the miner on the side track and he will lose his legs. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can pull the lever, in which case the one miner will lose his legs but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pulling the lever, in which case the five miners will each lose their legs but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to pull the lever?

### *Trolley-footbridge-limb loss*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, the trolley will roll over their legs and they will all lose their legs. Peter is standing on a bridge over the trolley tracks, next to a miner who is twice as large as Peter. If Peter pushes the miner off the

footbridge and onto the tracks, the trolley will collide with the miner, who weighs just enough to make it stop, and the five miners on the main track will not lose their legs. But the collision will cause the large miner to lose his legs. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the miner, in which case the one miner will lose his legs but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the miner, in which case the five miners will each lose their legs but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Trolley-bystander-broken legs*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, the trolley will roll over their legs and their legs will all be broken. The track has a side-track leading off to the left. Peter is standing next to a lever. If he pulls the lever, that will turn the trolley onto the side track and the five miners on the main track will not have their legs broken. But one miner is on the side track. If the trolley goes onto the side track, then it will roll over the legs of the miner on the side track and his legs will be broken. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can pull the lever, in which case the one miner will have their legs broken but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pulling the lever, in which case the five miners will have their legs broken but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to pull the lever?

### *Trolley-footbridge-broken legs*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, the trolley will roll over their legs and their legs will all be broken. Peter is standing on a bridge over the trolley tracks, next to a miner who is twice as large as Peter. If Peter pushes the miner off the footbridge and onto the tracks, the trolley will collide with the miner, who weighs just enough to make it stop, and the five miners on the main track will not have their legs broken. But the collision will cause the large miner to have his legs broken. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the miner, in which case the one miner will have his legs broken but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the miner, in which case the five miners will have their legs broken but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Trolley-bystander-bruising*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, they will be severely bruised and will be confined to bed for some weeks. The track has a side-track leading off to the left. Peter is standing next to a lever. If he pulls the lever, that will turn the trolley onto the side track and the five miners on the main track will not be bruised. But one miner is working on the side track and does not have time to get out of the way. If the trolley goes onto the side track, then the miner on the side track will be severely bruised and he will be confined to bed for some weeks. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can pull the lever, in which case the one miner will be severely bruised and confined to bed for some weeks but the five miners will not;

or Peter can refrain from pulling the lever, in which case the five miners will be severely bruised and confined to bed for some weeks but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to pull the lever?

### *Trolley-footbridge-bruising*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five miners on the trolley track who do not have time to get out of the way. If nothing is done, they will be severely bruised and will be confined to bed for some weeks. Peter is standing on a bridge over the trolley tracks, next to a miner who is twice as large as Peter. If Peter pushes the miner off the footbridge and onto the tracks, the trolley will collide with the miner, who weighs just enough to make it stop, and the five miners on the main track will not be bruised. But the collision will cause the large miner to be severely bruised and he will be confined to bed for some weeks. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the miner, in which case the one miner will be severely bruised and confined to bed for some weeks but the five miners will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the miner, in which case the five miners will be severely bruised and confined to bed for some weeks but the one miner will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Trolley-bystander-property*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five rucksacks on the tracks, each containing personal items including phones and laptops, through no fault of their owners. It is not possible for Peter to get the rucksacks off the tracks in time. The speed of the trolley is such that, if nothing is done, the phones and the laptops will be

crushed. The track has a side-track leading off to the left. Peter is standing next to a lever. If he pulls the lever, that will turn the trolley onto the side track and the five rucksacks on the main track will not be crushed. But there is one rucksack on the side track, containing a phone and a laptop, through no fault of its owner. If the trolley goes onto the side track, then the phone and the laptop on the side-track will be crushed. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can pull the lever, in which case the one person's phone and laptop will be crushed but the five people's will not; or Peter can refrain from pulling the lever, in which case the five people's phones and laptops will be crushed but the one person's will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to pull the lever?

### *Trolley-footbridge-property*

Peter is visiting a mine when he sees an out of control trolley that is full of coal approaching. There are five rucksacks on the tracks, each containing personal items including phones and laptops, through no fault of their owners. It is not possible for Peter to get the rucksacks off the tracks in time. The speed of the trolley is such that, if nothing is done, the phones and the laptops will be crushed. Peter is standing on a footbridge over the trolley tracks, next to a rucksack containing the owner's phone and laptop. If Peter pushes the rucksack off the footbridge and onto the tracks, the trolley will collide with it and stop, and the five rucksacks on the main track will not be crushed. The weight of the phone and the laptop inside the rucksack are necessary to stop the trolley. But the collision will crush the phone and laptop in the rucksack from the bridge. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the rucksack, in which case the one person's phone and laptop will be crushed but the five people's will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the rucksack, in which case the five people's phones and laptops will be crushed but the one person's will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the rucksack?

### *Sauna-bystander-emotional distress*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. They all have strict principles of modesty but have each made an exception to their usual rule because nude saunas are the norm in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men will discover that they were nude in public. That will breach their principles of modesty and they will each suffer extreme emotional distress. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But by pressing a switch, he can make the five seconds of internet feed come from a surveillance camera in the spa's other sauna and therefore the five men will not suffer the extreme emotional distress that would result from their being nude in public. However, there is one man in the other sauna, who also has a strict principle of modesty and will suffer extreme emotional distress because he will be nude in public and people that he interacts with in daily life will see the pictures. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can press the switch, in which case one man will suffer extreme emotional distress but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pressing the switch, in which case the five men will each suffer extreme emotional distress but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to press the switch?

### *Sauna-footbridge-emotional distress*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. They all have strict principles of modesty but have each made an exception to their usual rule because nude saunas are the norm in



Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men will discover that they were nude in public. That will breach their principles of modesty and they will each suffer extreme emotional distress. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But he can push a sixth man, who is nude and waiting to go into the sauna, into the room. This man will be pushed right in front of the camera, obscuring the other five for the five seconds of internet feed and therefore the five men will not suffer the extreme emotional distress that would result from their being nude in public. However, the sixth man also has a strict principle of modesty and will suffer extreme emotional distress because he will be nude in public and people that he interacts with in daily life will see the pictures. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the man, in which case the one man will suffer extreme emotional distress but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the man, in which case the five men will each suffer extreme emotional distress but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Sauna-bystander-job loss*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily

life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se. However their jobs require that they be modest in public, so they will each lose their jobs as a result. Given their age and the economic conditions, they will not find new jobs. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But by pressing a switch, he can make the five seconds of internet feed come from a surveillance camera in the spa's other sauna and therefore the five men will not lose their jobs. However, there is one man in the other sauna, who also does not care about modesty or being nude on the internet per se, but who will lose his job if he appears nude on the internet. Given his age and the economic conditions, he will not find a new job. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can press the switch, in which case one man will lose his job but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pressing the switch, in which case the five men will each lose their jobs but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to press the switch?

### *Sauna-footbridge-job loss*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se. However their jobs require that they be modest in public, so they will each lose their jobs as a result. Given their age and the economic conditions, they will not find new jobs. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or

the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But he has just enough time to push a sixth man, who is nude and waiting to go into the sauna, into the room. This man will be pushed right in front of the camera, obscuring the other five for the five seconds of internet feed and therefore the five men will not lose their jobs. The sixth man also does not care about modesty or being nude on the internet per se, but who will lose his job if he appears nude on the internet. Given his age and the economic conditions, he will not find a new job. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the man, in which case the man will lose his job but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the man, in which case the five men will each lose their jobs but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Saunas-bystander-financial loss*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se, but each one will lose a contract worth £10,000 as a result of having been nude on the internet. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But by pressing a switch, he can make the five seconds of internet feed come from a surveillance camera in the spa's other sauna and therefore the five men will not lose their contracts. However, there is one man in the other sauna, who also does not care about modesty or being nude on the internet per se, but who

will lose a contract worth £10,000 as a result of having been nude in public. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can press the switch, in which case the one man will lose £10,000 but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pressing the switch, in which case the five men will each lose £10,000 but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to press the switch?

### *Sauna-footbridge-financial loss*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se, but each one will lose a contract worth £10,000 as a result of having been nude on the internet. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But he has just enough time to push a sixth man, who is nude and waiting to go into the sauna, into the room. This man will be pushed right in front of the camera, obscuring the other five for the five seconds of internet feed and therefore the five men will not lose their contracts. However, the sixth man, who also does not care about modesty or being nude on the internet per se, will lose a contract worth £10,000 as a result of having been nude in public. None of the men will get any compensation because the sauna will go bankrupt due to the negative publicity. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the man, in which case the one man will lose £10,000 but the five men will

not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the man, in which case the five men will each lose £10,000 but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?

### *Sauna-bystander-death*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se. However the five are each members of a religious sect and extremists from the sect will object to the nudity and assassinate them as a result. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But, by pressing a switch, he can make the five seconds of internet feed come from a surveillance camera in the spa's other sauna and therefore the five men will not be killed. However, there is one man in the other sauna, who is also a member of the religious sect, who doesn't mind about nudity per se, but who will be assassinated as a result of appearing nude in public. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can press the switch, in which case one man will die but the five men will not; or Peter can refrain from pressing the switch, in which case the five men will die but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to press the switch?

### *Sauna-footbridge-death*

Five strangers are having a nude sauna in a spa in Finland. Unknown to them the spa keeps surveillance cameras in the sauna. The camera has malfunctioned and is about to feed live to the internet. There will be five seconds of internet feed before the camera automatically switches off. The nudity of those in the sauna will be exposed in public and people that they interact with in daily life will be able to see the pictures. The five men in the sauna do not care about modesty, or being nude on the internet per se. However the five are each members of a religious sect and extremists from the sect will object to the nudity and assassinate them as a result. Peter is outside the sauna and knows what is about to happen. He cannot turn off the camera or the internet feed any faster than it will turn off by itself. But he has just enough time to push a sixth man, who is nude and waiting to go into the sauna, into the room. This man will be pushed right in front of the camera, obscuring the other five for the five seconds of internet feed and therefore the five men will not be killed. However, the sixth man is also a member of the religious sect, who doesn't mind about nudity per se, but who will be assassinated as a result of appearing nude in public. Peter is aware of all these facts. Thus, Peter can push the man, in which case the one man will die but the five man will not; or Peter can refrain from pushing the man, in which case the five man will die but the one man will not.

Is it morally wrong for Peter to push the man?