

Koster-Hale, J., Richardson, H., Velez-Alicea, N., Asaba, M., Young, L., Saxe, R. (in review). Mentalizing regions represent continuous, abstract dimensions of others' beliefs.

Experiment 2 Stimuli

(1) *Background:* Grace and her friend are taking a tour of a chemical plant. When Grace goes over to the coffee machine to pour some coffee, Grace's friend asks for some sugar in hers. There is white powder in a container by the coffee.

Belief/reason:

Good: Grace thinks the white powder is sugar, because the container is labeled 'sugar'.

Unspecified: Grace thinks the white powder is sugar.

Bad: Grace thinks the white powder is sugar, though there's no label on the container.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Grace puts the powder in her friend's coffee. It is in fact the sugar left out by the kitchen staff. It is meant for sweetening coffee. Her friend drinks the sweetened coffee, while they take the tour of the plant.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Grace puts the powder in her friend's coffee. It is actually a substance left behind by a scientist. It is toxic but only when ingested in large amounts. Her friend happens to have only a small sip, so she is absolutely fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Grace puts the powder in her friend's coffee. It is actually a substance left behind by a scientist. It is toxic when ingested in large amounts. Her friend happens to drink all of the coffee and needs her stomach pumped.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Grace for putting the powder in her friend's coffee?

(2) *Background:* Dan is organizing a self-directed tour of a lab. Before visitors enter the testing room, all test tubes containing disease antigens must be contained by flipping a switch. A repairman was contacted to fix the switch, which was broken.

Belief/reason:

Good: The records say that the repairman has recently come to fix the switch, so Dan assumes the switch is now working and that it is safe for the visitor to enter.

Unspecified: Dan assumes the switch is now working and that it is safe for the visitor to enter.

Bad: The records don't say whether the repairman has come to fix the switch, but Dan assumes the switch is now working and that it is safe for the visitor to enter.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Dan directs the visitor to the testing room. He flips the switch. It turns out the switch has been fixed and works properly. The disease antigens are contained, so the visitor does not contract any disease.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Dan directs the visitor to the testing room. He flips the switch. It turns out the switch has not been fixed and is still broken. Fortunately, the visitor just happens to be immune to the disease antigens, so he does not contract any disease.

False belief/Bad outcome: Dan directs the visitor to the testing room. He flips the switch. It turns out the switch has not been fixed and is still broken. Unfortunately, the visitor is exposed to the disease antigens and contracts a disease resulting in painful boils.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Dan for directing the visitor to the testing room?

(3) *Background:* Janet and her neighbor are kayaking in

a part of the ocean with dense populations of jellyfish. Janet's neighbor asks whether she should go for a swim.

Belief/reason:

Good: Janet's beach safety guide contains detailed information about this particular beach. As a result, Janet believes that these jellyfish are totally harmless and don't sting.

Unspecified: Janet believes that these jellyfish are totally harmless and don't sting.

Bad: Janet's beach safety guide doesn't cover this particular beach. But Janet believes anyway that these jellyfish are totally harmless and don't sting.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Janet encourages her neighbor to go for a swim. The jellyfish do not sting. Her neighbor swims up to many of the jellyfish in the waters and has a great time.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Janet encourages her neighbor to go for a swim. Actually, the jellyfish do sting. But her neighbor just happens to avoid the jellyfish and has a great time.

False belief/Bad outcome: Janet encourages her neighbor to go for a swim. Actually, the jellyfish do sting. Janet's neighbor gets stung on the face and neck.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Janet for encouraging her neighbor to go for a swim?

(4) *Background:* Ray and his girlfriend are on a weekend hike. They come across a narrow bridge that spans a rocky creek.

Belief/reason:

Good: Ray thinks that the bridge is safe to walk across, because it is marked with the same national park symbol as all the other footbridges.

Unspecified: Ray thinks that the bridge is safe to walk across.

Bad: Ray thinks that the bridge is safe to walk across, though it is not marked with the same national park symbol as all the other footbridges. Ray thinks that the bridge is safe to walk across.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Ray encourages his girlfriend to walk across the bridge, which is indeed very safe and sturdy. It is the product of a company contracted by the national park. His girlfriend reaches the other side just fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Ray encourages his girlfriend to walk across the bridge, which is actually very unstable. It is a makeshift bridge put together by other hikers without much care. Fortunately, it doesn't collapse, so Ray's girlfriend reaches the other side just fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Ray encourages his girlfriend to walk across the bridge, which is actually very unstable. It is a makeshift bridge put together by other hikers without much care. Unfortunately, it collapses, and Ray's girlfriend falls and shatters her ankle.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Ray for encouraging his girlfriend to walk across the bridge?

(5) *Background:* Leah is walking by a neighbor's swimming pool when she sees a young child running towards the pool.

Belief/reason:

Good: The depth of the pool is clearly marked 8 feet, so Leah assumes that the pool is deep enough for the child to dive in head-first.

Unspecified: Leah assumes that the pool is deep enough for the child to dive in head-first.

Bad: The depth of the pool is not marked, but Leah assumes that the pool is deep enough for the child to dive in head-first.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Leah walks by, without saying anything to the child. The pool is plenty deep at that end of the pool. The child dives in head-first and has a safe and fun swim.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Leah walks by, without saying anything to the child. The pool is actually only 3 feet deep at that end. Fortunately, the child jumps in feet-first, and has a safe and fun swim.

False belief/Bad outcome: Leah walks by, without saying anything to the child. The pool is actually only 3 feet deep at that end. Unfortunately, the child dives in head-first, and snaps her spine.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Leah for walking by without saying anything to the child?

(6) *Background:* Lauren and an acquaintance are camping in the woods. Lauren spots some wild mushrooms growing along the campsite. Lauren takes a look at the mushrooms.

Belief/reason:

Good: After consulting her plant life guide, Lauren believes that the mushrooms are edible.

Unspecified: Lauren believes that the mushrooms are edible.

Bad: Lauren forgot her plant life guide at home, but she believes that the mushrooms are edible.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Lauren's not a fan of mushrooms, so she offers the mushrooms to her acquaintance. The mushrooms are the kind one puts in salad. Her acquaintance eats a couple of the mushrooms.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Lauren's not a fan of mushrooms, so she offers the mushrooms to her acquaintance. The mushrooms are actually quite poisonous. But her acquaintance isn't hungry, so she doesn't eat them.

False belief/Bad outcome: Lauren's not a fan of mushrooms, so she offers the mushrooms to her acquaintance. The mushrooms are actually quite poisonous. Her acquaintance eats the mushrooms, breaks into a sweat, and starts shaking.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Lauren for offering the mushrooms to her acquaintance?

(7) *Background:* Anne sees a new patient for a check-up. Anne typically uses latex gloves to examine her patients.

Belief/reason:

Good: After going through the patient's records, Anne assumes that this patient doesn't have a latex allergy.

Unspecified: Anne assumes that this patient doesn't have a latex allergy.

Bad: The patient's records haven't been transferred to the hospital yet, but Anne assumes that this patient doesn't have a latex allergy.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Anne examines the patient, who is in fact not allergic to latex. Anne puts on latex gloves for the exam, which goes just fine for the patient.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Anne examines the patient, who actually has a fatal allergy to latex. Anne has run out of latex gloves though, so she uses a latex substitute instead.

False belief/Bad outcome: Anne examines the patient, who actually has a fatal allergy to latex. Anne puts on latex gloves for the exam. The patient goes into shock.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Anne for examining the patient?

(8) *Background:* George is driving his motorboat in the bay, on his way home. He spots a swimmer waving at him in the far distance.

Belief/reason:

Good: George thinks the swimmer is waving an enthusiastic 'hello' and not for help, after taking out his binoculars for a closer look.

Unspecified: George thinks the swimmer is waving an enthusiastic 'hello' and not for help.

Bad: George thinks the swimmer is waving an enthusiastic 'hello' and not for help, though he doesn't bother to take out his binoculars to double-check.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: George drives home, leaving the swimmer behind. It turns out the swimmer was just waving a friendly greeting and makes his way back to the shore just fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome: George drives home, leaving the swimmer behind. It turns out the swimmer was waving for help. Luckily, seconds later, he is picked up by another motorboat.

False belief/Bad outcome: George drives home, leaving the swimmer behind. It turns out the swimmer was waving for help. He drowns 15 minutes later.

Question: How morally blameworthy is George for driving home, leaving the swimmer behind?

(9) *Background:* Erica is driving to the market when she sees a runner by the side of the road. The runner is bent over and has one hand on his chest.

Belief/reason:

Good: Erica believes that the runner has just stopped to catch his breath and will continue his jog shortly; she slows down to make sure.

Unspecified: Erica believes that the runner has just stopped to catch his breath and will continue his jog shortly.

Bad: Erica believes that the runner has just stopped to catch his breath and will continue his jog shortly, but she doesn't slow down to make sure.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Erica drives on. Indeed, the runner has just paused to rest and soon continues. He jogs the rest of the way home. He is a bit out of breath but fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome:

Erica drives on. The runner is about to have an asthma attack. Luckily, he finds his inhaler in time, and returns home. He is a bit out of breath but fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Erica drives on. The runner is about to have an asthma attack. He doesn't find his inhaler in time. He collapses on the side of the road.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Erica for driving on, leaving the runner behind?

(10) *Background:* Gil is instructed by a doctor to give his elderly mother pills for her heart disease. The doctor says that she must not intake vitamin K within the same hour she takes the pills. One day his mother tries a new kind of fruit.

Belief/reason:

Good: The fruit looks like all the other fruits his mother eats, so he assumes it is safe to give her the pills.

Unspecified: Gil assumes it is safe to give her the pills.

Bad: The fruit doesn't look like any fruit he's seen before, but Gil assumes it is safe to give her the pills.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Gil gives her the pills. The fruit does not in fact contain any vitamin K. Gil's elderly mother goes to bed after taking the pills and wakes up the next morning just fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Gil gives her the pills. The fruit is actually high in vitamin K. Fortunately, a friend's visit delays Gil's elderly mother from taking the pills. She takes the pills much later and is fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Gil gives her the pills. The fruit is actually high in vitamin K. Gil's elderly mother takes the pills right away ends up in the hospital for heart distress.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Gil for giving his mother the pills right then?

(11) *Background:* Ben is house sitting for some friends one weekend. He is about to leave to run errands all afternoon after making himself lunch.

Belief/reason:

Good: Ben thinks the stove is off when he leaves, because all the indicator lights are off.

Unspecified: Ben thinks the stove is off when he leaves.

Bad: Ben thinks the stove is off when he leaves, though one of the indicator lights is still on.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Ben leaves the house. He finishes up all his errands and returns to the house that evening. The stove was indeed turned off. Ben prepares dinner while watching the news.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Ben leaves the house. He finishes up all his errands and returns to the house that evening. The stove was left on, but the cleaning lady turned it off.

False belief/Bad outcome: Ben leaves the house. He finishes up all his errands and returns to the house that evening. The stove was left on. There's smoke and fire everywhere.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Ben for leaving the house?

(12) *Background:* Ginny's classmate wants to borrow a bike to go mountain biking. Ginny's sister left her bike in the garage when she went off to college. The bike had been in and out of the shop for brake trouble.

Belief/reason:

Good: Ginny believes the bike is fully functional now, since the last time she talked to her sister, the brakes were working fine.

Unspecified: Ginny believes the bike is fully functional now.

Bad: Ginny believes the bike is fully functional now, though the last time she talked to her sister, the brakes were still giving her trouble.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Ginny lends her classmate the bike, which turns out to be fully fixed. Her classmate bikes up a mountain. It is a difficult ride, with lots of winding paths, but she is safe.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Ginny lends her classmate the bike, which turns out not to be fully fixed. Luckily, her classmate ends up borrowing another better mountain bike from someone else, and she is safe.

False belief/Bad outcome: Ginny lends her classmate the bike, which turns out not to be fully fixed. Her classmate crashes into a tree due to the defective brakes and loses her two front teeth.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Ginny for lending the bike?

(13) *Background:* Josephine and her little sister are in the bathroom doing makeovers by the sink. Josephine straightened her hair that morning using a straightening iron.

Belief/reason:

Good: Because the iron is unplugged, Josephine assumes that the iron hasn't been used since the morning and should be cool to touch.

Unspecified: Josephine assumes that the iron hasn't been used since the morning and should be cool to touch.

Bad: The iron is still plugged in, but Josephine assumes that the iron hasn't been used since the morning and should be cool to touch.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Josephine lets her sister continue to play by the sink. Indeed, Josephine was the last one to use the iron that morning. Her sister picks up the iron, which is not hot at all.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Josephine lets her sister continue to play by the sink. Actually, one of Josephine's sisters just used the iron, so the iron is still dangerously hot. Fortunately, her sister doesn't touch the iron, so she isn't burned.

False belief/Bad outcome: Josephine lets her sister continue to play by the sink. Actually, one of Josephine's sisters just used the iron, so the iron is still dangerously hot. Her sister picks up the iron and is badly burned.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Josephine for letting her sister play by the sink?

(14) *Background:* Rebecca works at a day care. For lunch, Rebecca plans to make meatloaf for all of the children. She opens a package of ground turkey from the fridge.

Belief/reason:

Good: Rebecca thinks that the ground turkey is still fresh, because it was purchased that week.

Unspecified: Rebecca thinks that the ground turkey is still fresh.

Bad: Rebecca thinks that the ground turkey is still fresh, though it's been in the fridge for ages.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Rebecca makes meatloaf out of the ground turkey and serves it to the children. The meat happens to be fresh, and the children eat the meatloaf before reading hour.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Rebecca makes meatloaf out of the ground turkey and serves it to the children. The meat is actually not fresh, but a fire alarm prevents the children from eating the meal.

False belief/Bad outcome: Rebecca makes meatloaf out of the ground turkey and serves it to the children. The meat is actually not fresh. The children eat the meatloaf, and many get extremely sick.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Rebecca for serving the turkey meatloaf to the children?

(15) *Background:* Jacob and his friend are rafting down the Colorado River. Jacob has been before, but it is his friend's first time. He asks Jacob whether it's okay to go for a swim.

Belief/reason:

Good: Having rafted down it many times before, Jacob believes the next segment of the river is quite tame and fine for swimming.

Unspecified: Jacob believes the next segment of the river is quite tame and fine for swimming.

Bad: Jacob hasn't rafted down it before, but he believes the next segment of the river is quite tame and fine for swimming.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Jacob encourages his friend to swim. The current is indeed slow and suitable for a leisurely swim. Jacob's friend swims safely down the river. He is able to enjoy the scenery along the way.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Jacob encourages his friend to swim. The current is actually very strong. By a stroke of luck, Jacob's friend is able to jump back on the boat. There, they continue to enjoy the scenery.

False belief/Bad outcome: Jacob encourages his friend to swim. The current is actually very strong. Jacob's friend gets thrown by the current, crashes into a wall of rocks. He splits his lip open and slices up his face.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Jacob for encouraging his friend to swim?

(16) *Background:* Andrew works at Logan Airport. He is at a central command station in charge of ensuring that multiple planes aren't using the same runway for take-off.

Belief/reason:

Good: The signals from the adjacent station have just come through, so Andrew assumes that runway 2B is clear.

Unspecified: Andrew assumes that runway 2B is clear.

Bad: The signals from the adjacent station haven't come through, but Andrew assumes that runway 2B is clear.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Andrew gives the go-ahead for the takeoff. The runway is clear, and the plane takes off as planned without incident.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Andrew gives the go-ahead for the takeoff. The runway is not clear, but the other plane has to turn around due to mechanical issues, so there is no crash.

False belief/Bad outcome: Andrew gives the go-ahead for the takeoff. The runway is not clear. Two planes collide at the junction. There are multiple passenger injuries.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Andrew for giving the go-ahead for the takeoff?

(17) *Background:* Tyler works for a company that builds railway tracks for trains. One day, Tyler's team must fasten the track rods with an extra spike at dangerous corners.

Belief/reason:

Good: Carefully checking the work logs of the night team, Tyler thinks that the first segment of the track is done.

Unspecified: Tyler thinks the first segment of the track is done.

Bad: Tyler forgets to check the work logs of the night team, but he thinks that the first segment of the track is done.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Tyler skips the first segment of the track, which had been completed by the night team already. When the railway track is opened for use, trains pass safely and without incident.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Tyler skips the first segment of the track, which actually hadn't been completed by the night team. It just so happens that city planners re-route around the first segment, so it is never used.

False belief/Bad outcome: Tyler skips the first segment of the track, which actually hadn't been completed by the night team. When the railway track is opened for use, a train derailed; passengers, including children, are badly hurt.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Tyler for skipping the first segment?

(18) *Background:* Stacey works at a rock-climbing shop. A customer comes in to rent a harness. Safe harnesses are kept in a green bin. Defective harnesses are kept in a red bin. Stacey grabs a harness for the customer.

Belief/reason:

Good: Stacey believes that the harness is completely safe, because she found it in the green bin.

Unspecified: Stacey believes that the harness is completely safe.

Bad: Stacey believes that the harness is completely safe, though she doesn't make sure it came from the green bin.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Stacey straps the customer in. After 5 minutes climbing, the customer falls from a height of 20 feet, and is caught safely by the harness.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Stacey straps the customer in. After 5 minutes climbing, the customer falls from a height of 2 feet. The harness fails, but she is unscathed.

False belief/Bad outcome: Stacey straps the customer in. After 5 minutes climbing, the customer falls from a height of 20 feet. The harness fails and she cracks six ribs.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Stacey for strapping the customer in with that harness?

(19) *Background:* Sarah built a huge play igloo out of snowballs yesterday. Her friend is over today, and she is totally intrigued by it.

Belief/reason:

Good: After leaning on it with all her weight, Sarah assumes that this one has strong walls and is safe to play in.

Unspecified: Sarah assumes that this igloo has strong walls and is safe to play in.

Bad: Though the igloo partially crumbles when she leans against it, Sarah assumes that it has strong walls and is safe to play in.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Sarah tells her friend to go inside the igloo. The igloo is sturdily built; the snowballs have frozen solid into strong walls. Sarah's friend jumps excitedly inside the igloo and has a great time pretending she's an Eskimo.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Sarah tells her friend to go inside the igloo. The snowballs in the igloo walls are not balanced. Sarah's friend jumps excitedly, and the snowballs crash. Luckily, they hit the ground, and not Sarah's friend, who still has a great time.

False belief/Bad outcome: Sarah tells her friend to go inside the igloo. The snowballs in the igloo walls are not balanced. Sarah's friend jumps excitedly. The snowballs crash hard on her head, causing a concussion.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Sarah for telling her friend to go inside the igloo?

(20) *Background:* Susan and a friend are having lunch on Saturday. They are making sandwiches with stuff from Susan's fridge. Susan's friend wants a ham sandwich.

Belief/reason:

Good: Susan thinks that the ham in the refrigerator is fresh and safe to eat, because it smells fine.

Unspecified: Susan thinks that the ham in the refrigerator is fresh and safe to eat.

Bad: Susan thinks that the ham in the refrigerator is fresh and safe to eat, though it smells a bit off.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Susan makes a ham sandwich for her friend. The ham in the refrigerator was purchased just a day ago. It's fresh and ready to be used in sandwiches. Her friend finds the sandwich delicious.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Susan makes a ham sandwich for her friend. The ham in the refrigerator was purchased a week ago and has since spoiled. Her friend puts it aside though without eating it when she hears about what's for dessert.

False belief/Bad outcome: Susan makes a ham sandwich for her friend. The ham in the refrigerator was purchased a week ago and has since spoiled. Her friend eats the sandwich and breaks out into painful hives all over her face.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Susan for serving the ham to her friend?

(21) *Background:* Matt is babysitting his cousin, who is 8 years old. They're about to watch a scary movie that is rated PG-13.

Belief/reason:

Good: Matt believes that the movie shouldn't be too scary for his cousin, since online reviews say it's fine for young children.

Unspecified: Matt believes that the movie shouldn't be too scary for his cousin.

Bad: Matt believes that the movie shouldn't be too scary for his cousin, though he's heard it's not suitable for young children.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Matt puts the movie in. The movie is perfectly appropriate for kids of his cousin's age. Both Matt and his cousin watch the whole thing. They're thoroughly entertained.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Matt puts the movie in. The movie is not at all appropriate and way too scary for kids of his cousin's age. However, Matt's cousin dozes off at the beginning and has a nice nap.

False belief/Bad outcome: Matt puts the movie in. The movie is not at all appropriate and way too scary for kids of his cousin's age. Matt's cousin has horrible nightmares for weeks.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Matt for showing the movie to his cousin?

(22) *Background:* Zach is an intern at a veterinarian's office. His friend comes to visit him and sees cookies shaped like dog bones laying out in the worker's lounge.

Belief/reason:

Good: Zach assumes that the cookies are for people, since they are out in the common area where people normally put food to share.

Unspecified: Zach assumes that the cookies are for people.

Bad: Zach assumes that the cookies are for people, though they are out in the common area where all kinds of dog supplies are kept.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Zach invites his friend to eat a bone-shaped cookie. These cookies were baked by one of the other interns for a birthday. His friend takes a bite of the cookie, which tastes fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Zach invites his friend to eat a bone-shaped cookie. These cookies are used to put dogs to sleep and should not be there. Fortunately, his friend passes on the cookie.

False belief/Bad outcome: Zach invites his friend to eat a bone-shaped cookie. These cookies are used to put dogs to sleep and should not be there. His friend eats several cookies and starts heaving violently.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Zach for inviting his friend to eat the cookies?

(23) *Background:* Zoe is on winter break. She is running a very old chair lift at a ski lodge. It's her first day at this particular lift. A young boy is waiting in line at the lift by himself.

Belief/reason:

Good: Zoe thinks that this particular lift is fine for children to ride unattended, because her manual says so.

Unspecified: Zoe thinks that this particular lift is fine for children to ride unattended.

Bad: Zoe thinks that this particular lift is fine for children to ride unattended, though there's a warning sign in her manual for this lift.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Zoe lets the boy through to the lift. The lift is indeed safe for children to ride unattended. The boy gets on the lift, which takes safely him all the way to the top.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Zoe lets the boy through to the lift. The lift is actually quite unsafe for children to ride unattended, as there's no safety bar. However, the boy holds on tightly and rides safely to the top.

False belief/Bad outcome: Zoe lets the boy through to the lift. The lift is actually quite unsafe for children to ride unattended, as there's no safety bar. The boy falls off near the top and is badly frightened.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Zoe for letting the child get on the chairlift?

(24) *Background:* Sam is an assistant at Safety Town, a class designed to help children know what to do in case of a fire. Today the children go into a fake house full of smoke. One of the kids on the roster is missing health forms.

Belief/reason:

Good: Sam believes the boy should be fine participating, because the boy is certain he doesn't have asthma.

Unspecified: Sam believes the boy should be fine participating.

Bad: Sam believes the boy should be fine participating, though the boy sounds uncertain when he says he doesn't have asthma.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Sam sends the boy into the Safety Town smoking house. The boy doesn't have any breathing problem. He comes out fine and has learned what to do in case of a fire.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Sam watches the boy go into the Safety Town smoking house. The boy actually does have asthma, which makes his lungs close up around smoke. Luckily, he has an inhaler, so he's fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Sam watches the boy go into the Safety Town smoking house. The boy has asthma, which makes his lungs close up around smoke. He starts wheezing and has a full-blown asthma attack.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Sam for having the boy participate at Safety Town?

(25) *Background:* Peter and a friend are traveling in Kenya where malarial mosquitoes are quite common. His friend sees a pond and wants to go wading. His friend begins to walk toward the pond.

Belief/reason:

Good: Peter assumes it is safe to wade in the pond, as he remembers the medical center told him malaria is very rare in this region.

Unspecified: Peter assumes it is safe to wade in the pond.

Bad: Peter assumes it is safe to wade in the pond, though he's forgotten everything he was told at the medical center about malaria.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Peter encourages his friend to wade in the pond. It turns out the pond is free of malarial mosquitoes. The water is unusually clean. His friend is able to cool off and relax.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Peter encourages his friend to wade in the pond. It turns out the pond is infested with malarial mosquitoes. Fortunately, his friend isn't bitten and is able to cool off and relax.

False belief/Bad outcome: Peter encourages his friend to wade in the pond. It turns out the pond is infested with malarial mosquitoes. His friend is bitten and later contracts malaria.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Peter for encouraging his friend to wade in the pond?

(26) *Background:* Mike is hunting quail in the woods. There's a movement in the trees. Mike raises his gun, and gets ready to shoot.

Belief/reason:

Good: Mike's view of the trees and the moving shape is hazy and obscured. He thinks that the movement was caused by a quail.

Unspecified: Mike thinks that the movement was caused by a quail.

Bad: Mike's view of the trees and the moving shape is clear and unobstructed. He thinks that the movement was caused by a quail.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Mike shoots. The thing in the distance is quail. Mike walks over and retrieves the quail, which he hit.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Mike shoots. The thing in the distance is actually a man. Mike walks over and finds that, due to a stroke of luck, he missed, and the man is fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: Mike shoots. The thing in the distance is actually a man. Mike walks over and finds that the man covered in blood.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Mike for shooting into the distance?

(27) *Background:* Will is preparing spinach soup for his grandmother at her house. There had been incidents of E. coli contamination leading to a recall of all bagged spinach. Now, many markets have restocked it.

Belief/reason:

Good: Will finds some spinach in his grandmother's fridge purchased just that day. He believes it's safe to eat.

Unspecified: Will finds some spinach in his grandmother's fridge. He believes it's safe to eat.

Bad: Will finds some old-looking spinach in his grandmother's fridge. He believes it's safe to eat.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Will cooks his grandmother spinach soup. The spinach is uncontaminated, and his grandmother drinks up the soup for dinner.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Will cooks his grandmother spinach soup. But the spinach is contaminated. Luckily, Will trips and spills the soup, so nobody eats any of it.

False belief/Bad outcome: Will cooks his grandmother spinach soup. But the spinach is contaminated. His grandmother drinks up the soup and ends up quite sick.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Will for cooking his grandmother the spinach?

(28) *Background:* Susan and her teenage son are visiting a friend who just moved an hour north of the city. Susan's son parks the car on a steep hill on the side of a road.

Belief/reason:

Good: Susan assumes her son's parking job is safe. She's watching carefully as they pull in and checks the e-brakes.

Unspecified: Susan assumes her son's parking job is safe.

Bad: Susan assumes her son's parking job is safe. She's distracted as they pull in, though, as she is on the phone.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Susan and her son leave the car. The car is in no danger of rolling down the hill. When Susan and her son return an hour later, the car is exactly where they left it.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Susan and her son leave the car. The car is actually not safely parked at all. Fortunately, a large truck pulls in right behind and prevents the car from going anywhere.

False belief/Bad outcome: Susan and her son leave the car. The car is actually not safely parked at all. The car rolls down the hill and kills a 9-year-old girl walking her dog.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Susan for leaving the car the way it was parked?

(29) *Background:* Bill is house-sitting for some neighbors over Columbus Day weekend. He is stepping out the door, late for a lunch meeting with a friend, when the fire alarm goes off.

Belief/reason:

Good: Bill looked through all the notes that his neighbors left for him. As a result, he thinks that the alarm is faulty and goes off randomly.

Unspecified: Bill thinks that the alarm is faulty and goes off randomly.

Bad: Bill hasn't read all of the notes that his neighbors left for him. But he thinks that the alarm is faulty and goes off randomly.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Bill leaves the house to meet his friend. The alarm is old and defective and often goes off for no reason. While Bill is gone, the alarm shuts itself off and doesn't act up again all weekend.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Bill leaves the house to meet his friend. The alarm is actually perfectly functional. The alarm keeps sounding because a space heater has gotten dangerously hot. Luckily, there is a power outage, which shuts down the heater.

False belief/Bad outcome: Bill leaves the house to meet his friend. The alarm is actually perfectly functional. The alarm keeps sounding because a space heater has gotten dangerously hot. It sets the neighbors' puppy on fire.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Bill for leaving the house with the alarm on?

(30) *Background:* Kristin is in the lab alone late at night. She needs to move another student's laptop to make room on a desk she needs. There's room on a bench by the door, empty except for a mug.

Belief/reason:

Good: Kristin believes the mug is empty. She checks it twice as she walks by.

Unspecified: Kristin believes the mug is empty.

Bad: Kristin believes the mug is empty. She gives it a quick glance as she rushes past.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Kristin sets the laptop down on the bench. The next day, someone walks in the door and knocks over the mug. Luckily, it is indeed empty, so the laptop is unharmed.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Kristin sets the laptop down on the bench. The next day, someone walks in the door and knocks over the mug. It's full of tea, but luckily none of it spills on the laptop.

False belief/Bad outcome: Kristin sets the laptop down on the bench. The next day, someone walks in the door and knocks over the mug. It's full of tea, which soaks and kills the laptop.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Kristin for setting the laptop by the mug?

(31) *Background:* Ryan happens to be in DC for a business trip. He takes his nephew to the zoo. They are watching the dolphin show when Ryan's nephew complains about a stomachache.

Belief/reason:

Good: Ryan assumes the stomachache is from the fried dough and nothing serious, because his nephew ate quite a bit.

Unspecified: Ryan assumes the stomachache is from the fried dough and nothing serious.

Bad: Ryan assumes the stomachache is from the fried dough and nothing serious, though his nephew didn't really eat too much.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Ryan takes his nephew to see the monkeys next. His nephew's stomach is in fact hurting from too much fried dough. His nephew soon feels better, and they end up seeing all the exhibits at the zoo.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Ryan takes his nephew to see the monkeys next. His nephew's stomach is in fact hurting from a recent operation. Luckily, his nephew soon feels better, and they end up seeing all the exhibits at the zoo.

False belief/Bad outcome: Ryan takes his nephew to see the monkeys next. His nephew's stomach is in fact hurting from a recent operation. He needs immediate medical attention. His condition worsens, and he starts seizing on the ground.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Ryan for taking his nephew to see the monkeys?

(32) *Background:* Kevin is at a bar one night when he sees his sister sitting at the next table. She is laughing and drinking and seems to be having a good time.

Belief/reason:

Good: Kevin's sister is incredibly responsible, so Kevin thinks that she will stay sober tonight.

Unspecified: Kevin thinks that his sister will stay sober tonight.

Bad: Kevin's sister is notoriously irresponsible, but Kevin thinks that she will stay sober tonight.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Kevin pays his bill and leaves the bar without stopping at his sister's table. His sister had only one drink and drives herself safely home afterwards. She goes right to bed.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Kevin pays his bill and leaves the bar without stopping at his sister's table. His sister actually had 5 drinks. Luckily, a friend takes her keys and gives her a ride home.

False belief/Bad outcome: Kevin pays his bill and leaves the bar without stopping at his sister's table. His sister actually had 5 drinks. On her drive home, she loses control and drives into the concrete median divide.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Kevin for not stopping to check in with his sister?

(33) *Background:* Mitch is at home on his day off, giving his 2-year-old son a bath. He fills the bath, while his son stands by the tub. The phone rings in the next room. Mitch tells his son to hang on while he gets the phone.

Belief/reason:

Good: Mitch's son always does what he's told. So, Mitch believes his son will wait for him for just a moment.

Unspecified: Mitch believes his son will wait for him for just a moment.

Bad: Mitch's son never does what he's told. But Mitch believes his son will wait for him for just a moment.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Mitch leaves the room for 2 minutes. When Mitch returns, his son is where he left him, outside the tub. He enjoys his bath.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Mitch leaves the room for 2 minutes. When Mitch returns, his son is in the tub, already enjoying his bath.

False belief/Bad outcome: Mitch leaves the room for 2 minutes. When Mitch returns, his son is in the tub, facedown in the water.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Mitch for leaving his son alone?

(34) *Background:* Haley and her assistant are studying primate cognition on an island off Puerto Rico. The monkeys there roam around freely. The assistant is in charge of handling the monkeys.

Belief/reason:

Good: Haley attended a one-week animal safety course; she assumes that the monkeys are free of diseases that may be dangerous to humans.

Unspecified: free of diseases that may be dangerous to humans.

Bad: Haley was out of town the day of the safety course, but she assumes that the monkeys are free of diseases that may be dangerous to humans.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: The monkeys carry diseases that can be transmitted to birds, but not humans. Haley tells her assistant not to bother with the secondary protective gear. Her assistant listens. She leaves the island totally healthy.

False belief/Neutral outcome: The monkeys actually do carry diseases deadly to humans. Haley tells her assistant not to bother with the secondary protective gear. Her assistant listens. Luckily, she's never bitten or scratched and leaves the island totally healthy.

False belief/Bad outcome: The monkeys actually do carry diseases deadly to humans. Haley tells her assistant not to bother with the secondary protective gear. Her assistant listens. She is bitten by a monkey, and contracts a fatal strain of Herpes.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Haley for telling her assistant to not bother with gear?

(35) *Background:* Brian is helping out his neighbor for the weekend. His neighbor is away, but her house is getting fumigated (with poisonous fumes) because of pests.

Belief/reason:

Good: His neighbors' aunt Sally lives in a flat upstairs. Since nobody answers when he knocks and calls, Brian thinks that Sally is at a friend's.

Unspecified: Brian thinks that Sally is at a friend's when he lets the fumigators in.

Bad: His neighbors' aunt Sally lives in a flat upstairs. Since it's quiet upstairs, when Brian lets the fumigators in, he thinks that Sally is at a friend's.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Brian tells the fumigators to start their job. They fill the house with poisonous gas. Sally is playing bridge at her friend's house. She returns on Monday to a pest-free and fume-free house.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Brian tells the fumigators to start their job. They fill the house with poisonous gas. Sally has actually dozed off in her room in the attic. But all the noise wakes her up, so she's able to leave the house in time.

False belief/Bad outcome: Brian tells the fumigators to start their job. They fill the house with poisonous gas. Sally has actually dozed off in her room in the attic. She suffers serious chemical poisoning, as the house and her lungs are filled with fumes.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Brian for telling the fumigators to start?

(36) *Background:* Eva is babysitting her baby niece Emily and 5-yr-old nephew. The older boy gets into trouble a lot. Baby Emily is happy as long as she gets her porridge, which Eva made that morning and left on the counter.

Belief/reason:

Good: Eva believes the porridge has been untouched, because her nephew has been out of the kitchen.

Unspecified: Eva believes the porridge has been untouched.

Bad: Eva believes the porridge has been untouched, though her nephew has been playing in the kitchen.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Eva feeds baby Emily the porridge, which contains milk, ground nuts, and oats. Her brother plays in the kitchen while she eats. Baby Emily finishes the porridge and takes a nap.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Eva feeds baby Emily the porridge, but it turns out that her brother has tampered with it. Luckily, all he did was to sprinkle extra salt and sugar in it. Baby Emily finishes the porridge and takes a nap.

False belief/Bad outcome: Eva feeds baby Emily the porridge, but it turns out that her brother has tampered with it. He sprinkled some salt and dishwashing detergent in it. Baby Emily starts gagging on the porridge.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Eva for feeding her niece the porridge?

(37) *Background:* In the early morning, Nicole and her cousin are playing with a bouncy ball in front of Nicole's house. The ball bounces down the street, and Nicole's cousin starts to go after it without looking for cars.

Belief/reason:

Good: Because they live on a dead end street, Nicole assumes there aren't any cars coming down the street just then.

Unspecified: Nicole assumes there aren't any cars coming down the street just then.

Bad: Though there are cars at all times of the day on her street, Nicole assumes there aren't any cars coming down the street just then.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Nicole waves to her cousin to get the ball. The street is totally empty; there isn't a single car to be seen. Her cousin runs out to the street to reclaim the ball.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Nicole waves to her cousin to get the ball. But a car is just speeding down the street. Her cousin runs out to the street to reclaim the ball and narrowly avoids getting hit.

False belief/Bad outcome: Nicole waves to her cousin to get the ball. But a car is just speeding down the street. Her cousin runs out to the street to reclaim the ball and gets hit by the car.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Nicole for waving to her cousin to get the ball?

(38) *Background:* Maggie is a new employee at a small sky diving company. Her first customer arrives and needs to be fitted. A new batch of parachutes has been opened recently.

Belief/reason:

Good: Maggie thinks that the new batch has been through quality control, because the policy is that every parachute is tested as soon as it arrives.

Unspecified: Maggie thinks that the new batch has been through quality control.

Bad: Maggie thinks that the new batch has been through quality control, because all of the old ones in the shop have been through.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Maggie gives her customer a parachute from the new batch, which has indeed been through quality control. So the parachute is safe for use. The customer enjoys a safe landing.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Maggie gives her customer a parachute from the new batch, which has actually not been through quality control. Luckily, this parachute is perfectly fine and is safe for use. The customer enjoys a safe landing.

False belief/Bad outcome: Maggie gives her customer a parachute from the new batch, which has actually not been through quality control. This parachute would not have passed and is dangerous to use. The customer crashes and breaks both wrists.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Maggie for giving her customer that parachute?

(39) *Background:* Chloe works at the pound. Several new dogs have just come in. A lady comes in, interested in taking one of the new dogs home with her.

Belief/reason:

Good: Chloe believes that the dogs have been through their health inspection, because she just went through the records.

Unspecified: Chloe believes that the dogs have been through their health inspection.

Bad: Chloe believes that the dogs have been through their health inspection, even though she hasn't gone through the records recently.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Chloe hands the lady one of the new dogs, all of which passed health inspection. The lady adores the dog and takes him home.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Chloe hands the lady one of the new dogs, which aren't due for inspection until next week. Luckily, the dog is perfectly healthy. The lady adores the dog and takes him home.

False belief/Bad outcome: Chloe hands the lady one of the new dogs, which aren't due for inspection until next week. The dog is very sick and dies a month later, devastating the lady.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Chloe for giving the lady the new dog?

(40) *Background:* Charles is at a fraternity party where people are drinking lots of beer. He is having fun when he notices a friend slumped with his eyes closed.

Belief/reason:

Good: His friend is lying on one of the beds upstairs. Charles assumes that his friend is taking a nap.

Unspecified: Charles assumes that his friend is taking a nap.

Bad: His friend is lying on the floor outside the bathroom. Charles assumes that his friend is taking a nap.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Charles doesn't try to wake his friend, who is just exhausted and is taking a quick nap. He wakes up fifteen minutes later and rejoins the party.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Charles doesn't try to wake his friend, who was drinking heavily to take his mind off his exams. He blacked out temporarily, but someone else notices and helps him up.

False belief/Bad outcome: Charles doesn't try to wake his friend, who was drinking heavily to take his mind off his exams. He blacked out, and ends up choking on his own vomit.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Charles for not trying to wake his friend?

(41) *Background:* Joshua finds an abandoned tree house in the woods. He takes a buddy there to show him his great discovery.

Belief/reason:

Good: Because he's spent hours inside already looking all around, Joshua thinks that the tree house is sturdy and safe.

Unspecified: Joshua thinks that the tree house is sturdy and safe.

Bad: Even though has never been inside, Joshua thinks that the tree house is sturdy and safe.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Joshua invites his buddy to climb into the tree house, which was built with thick heavy wood. The tree house is strong and can support the weight of at least 4 children.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Joshua invites his buddy to climb into the tree house, which was in fact built very poorly. Luckily, Joshua's buddy is small and light enough that the house doesn't collapse.

False belief/Bad outcome: Joshua invites his buddy to climb into the tree house, which was in fact built very poorly. The house collapses as he climbs in, and his legs are badly damaged, permanently.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Joshua for inviting his buddy to climb in?

(42) *Background:* Janelle is on spring break in Hawaii with her boyfriend. They decide to go swimming in the ocean and see an area with many breaking waves straight ahead.

Belief/reason:

Good: Looking up a current map in her beach guide, Janelle believes that the breaking waves indicate a sandbar and that it would be an enjoyable place to swim.

Unspecified: Janelle believes that the breaking waves indicate a sandbar and that it would be an enjoyable place to swim.

Bad: Janelle left her beach guide at the hotel, but she believes that the breaking waves indicate a sandbar and that it would be an enjoyable place to swim.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: The breaking waves are indeed caused by a sandbar, which makes for calm shallow water, great for swimming. Janelle waves her boyfriend off to go swimming. He does, and the swim turns out to be amazing.

False belief/Neutral outcome: The breaking waves are actually caused by dangerous currents, which result in a large undertow. Janelle waves her boyfriend off to go swimming. However, he decides to go parasailing instead, which turns out to be amazing.

False belief/Bad outcome: The breaking waves are actually caused by dangerous currents, which result in a large undertow. Janelle waves her boyfriend off to go swimming. He does, and he nearly drowns.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Janelle for waving her boyfriend to go swimming?

(43) *Background:* Steven is at a Mexican restaurant for a late lunch, so there's only one other table occupied. The man at that table starts to cough continuously.

Belief/reason:

Good: Steven has been keeping an eye on the customer; he assumes that the customer just has a bad cough.

Unspecified: Steven assumes that the customer just has a bad cough.

Bad: Steven's mind is wandering, but he assumes that the customer just has a bad cough.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Steven turns back to his own meal. The customer is recovering from a cold. He drinks some water to end his coughing fit.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Steven turns back to his own meal. The customer is actually choking on a piece of meat. A waiter walks by and saves him with the Heimlich maneuver.

False belief/Bad outcome: Steven turns back to his own meal. The customer is actually choking on a piece of meat. Unable to clear his windpipe in time, he chokes to death.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Steven for turning back to his own meal?

(44) *Background:* Bob is reading the newspaper on his porch. His neighbor's new babysitter is on her phone in the yard, while the child she's looking after is playing in the street. A car drives up.

Belief/reason:

Good: From a good conversation with her the other day, Bob thinks the new babysitter is responsible enough to keep a close eye on the kid.

Unspecified: Bob thinks that this babysitter is responsible enough to keep a close eye on the kid.

Bad: Though he's never talked to her, Bob he thinks that the new babysitter is responsible enough to keep a close eye on the kid.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Bob goes back to reading the paper. The babysitter has an eye on her child. She rushes out to the street and picks up the child before the car comes.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Bob goes back to reading the paper. The babysitter is very distracted. Fortunately, the child runs back to house before the car comes.

False belief/Bad outcome: Bob goes back to reading the paper. The babysitter is very distracted. The car comes down the street. The child is hit and killed.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Bob for going back to reading the paper?

(45) *Background:* John just started work at an amusement park. His job is to operate one of the rides. One of the heavier customers finds the seatbelts uncomfortable, so he leaves them unfastened.

Belief/reason:

Good: After talking to his friend who's operated this ride hundreds of times, John believes that the seatbelts aren't necessary for it.

Unspecified: John believes that the seatbelts aren't necessary for this ride.

Bad: John has no experience with this ride, but he believes that the seatbelts aren't necessary for it.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: John lets the customer ride without the seatbelts. The ride is quite tame, so wearing them really is unnecessary. The customer enjoys the ride just like everyone else.

False belief/Neutral outcome: John lets the customer ride without the seatbelts. The ride is actually

quite dangerous without the seatbelts. By chance, though, the ride is operating at half speed, so the customer enjoys the ride just like everyone else.

False belief/Bad outcome: John lets the customer ride without the seatbelts. The ride is actually quite dangerous without the seatbelts. The customer gets tossed to the side of the ride and suffers massive head trauma.

Question: How morally blameworthy is John for letting the customer ride without seatbelts?

(46) *Background:* Mary is at the airport. She sees an elderly man with a cane clumsily running down the terminal. The floor in the terminal has just been mopped, and there is a 'Caution' sign.

Belief/reason:

Good: Mary assumes the man has seen the sign, since he's facing that direction.

Unspecified: Mary assumes the man has seen the sign.

Bad: Mary assumes the man has seen the sign, though he's not facing that direction.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Mary does not shout for the elderly man to slow down. The man sees the sign and slows down to a shuffle. He walks safely across the terminal.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Mary does not shout for the elderly man to slow down. The man doesn't see the sign, but he slows down once someone else shouts at him. He walks safely across the terminal.

False belief/Bad outcome: Mary does not shout for the elderly man to slow down. The man doesn't see the sign. He slips on the wet floor and falls hard, shattering his hip.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Mary for not warning the man to slow down?

(47) *Background:* Jessica is skiing in Colorado. She sees a group of teenagers about to ski down a slope that feeds into a perilous part of the mountain.

Belief/reason:

Good: Jessica thinks that the teenagers must be expert skiers, based on their skills and gear.

Unspecified: Jessica thinks that the teenagers must be expert skiers.

Bad: Jessica thinks that the teenagers must be expert skiers, based on their apparent confidence.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Jessica skis past the teenagers without saying anything. The teenagers are practically professional skiers and make their way down the mountain just fine.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Jessica skis past the teenagers without saying anything. The teenagers are only novice skiers. They'd kill themselves going down the slope, but they're stopped by ski patrol.

False belief/Bad outcome: Jessica skis past the teenagers without saying anything. The teenagers are only novice skiers, and one of them ends up in a fatal crash on the mountain.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Jessica for skiing past without saying anything?

(48) *Background:* Vince is a new computer technician at a store. A customer comes to the store to get her laptop checked out. The laptop gets very hot after only 10 minutes of work.

Belief/reason:

Good: Vince makes sure to check with all the other techs. He believes the laptop is fine and that it is normal for all laptops to heat up during use.

Unspecified: Vince believes the laptop is fine and that it is normal for all laptops to heat up during use.

Bad: Vince doesn't bother checking with the other techs. He believes the laptop is fine and that it is normal for all laptops to heat up during use.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Vince returns the laptop to the customer. The laptop is in fact within the normal range in terms of heating up with use; it's totally safe to use on one's lap. The customer goes home and uses her laptop all day without any problems.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Vince returns the laptop to the customer. The laptop is malfunctioning and heats up more than normal; it's dangerous to use, especially on one's lap. The customer goes home, and her laptop catches on fire. Luckily it is on her desk.

False belief/Bad outcome: Vince returns the laptop to the customer. The laptop is malfunctioning and heats up more than normal; it's dangerous to use, especially on one's lap. The customer goes home, and her laptop catches on fire. She suffers painful burns on her thighs.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Vince for returning the laptop to the customer?

(49) *Background:* It's a cloudy day but not raining. Pam's roommate is going out to a business lunch with a pile of important legal documents. Running out the door, she asks Pam who is at her computer whether she should take an umbrella. Pam assumes the weather will hold up, though weather.com forecasts showers.

Belief/reason:

Good: Pam assumes the weather will hold up, though weather.com forecasts showers.

Unspecified: Pam assumes the weather will hold up.

Bad: Pam assumes the weather will hold up, because weather.com forecasts sun.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Pam says no umbrella. Pam's roommate listens to her. The day turns out to be a glorious one. The sky clears up in the afternoon.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Pam says no umbrella. Pam's roommate listens to her. It actually starts pouring, but fortunately not until Pam's roommate arrives at her lunch, inside.

False belief/Bad outcome: Pam says no umbrella. Pam's roommate listens to her. It actually starts pouring, soaking Pam's roommate and all of her important papers.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Pam for telling her friend not to bring an umbrella?

(50) *Background:* Winnie's uncle is gone for a two-week vacation. Since Winnie lives right next to her uncle, he has asked her to take care of his beloved kittens and cat during the time.

Belief/reason:

Good: From her own experience with raising kittens, Winnie thinks that the kittens eat the same food as the cat.

Unspecified: Winnie thinks that the kittens eat the same food as the cat.

Bad: Without reading the instructions from her uncle, Winnie thinks that the kittens eat the same food as the cat.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Winnie feeds the kittens the same food as the cat, though they should be eating their own food with more nutrients. Luckily, two weeks' time is too short to matter. Winnie's uncle is delighted to see them when he returns.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Winnie feeds the kittens the same food as the cat, though they should be eating their own food with more nutrients. Luckily, two weeks' time is too short to matter. Winnie's uncle is delighted to see them when he returns.

False belief/Bad outcome: Winnie feeds the kittens the same food as the cat, though they should be eating their own food with more nutrients. In two weeks' time, the kittens are dangerously malnourished. Winnie's uncle is devastated.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Winnie for feeding the kittens the cat food?

(51) *Background:* Stephen's friend dropped his phone in the wash. The circuit is shorted, and it isn't working.

Belief/reason:

Good: This happened to one of Stephen's other friends. He believes that baking it in the oven would do the trick.

Unspecified: Stephen believes that baking it in the oven would do the trick.

Bad: Though this hasn't happened to Stephen before, he believes that baking it in the oven would do the trick.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Stephen tells his friend to bake his phone. This works, the water is baked out, and the phone is fully restored, to Stephen's friend's relief.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Stephen tells his friend to bake his phone. This not only won't work but is quite dangerous. Luckily, Stephen's oven is not working, so he doesn't do it.

False belief/Bad outcome: Stephen tells his friend to bake his phone. This not only won't work but is quite dangerous. Stephen does this, and the phone explodes in the oven, emitting chemical fumes.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Stephen for advising his friend to bake his phone?

(52) *Background:* Jason and his freshman year roommate share a bedroom. One morning, Jason's roommate's alarm goes off extra early, at 7am. Jason's roommate stays in bed, while the alarm continues to sound.

Belief/reason:

Good: Jason assumes his roommate hears the alarm, because his roommate groans loudly and turns over.

Unspecified: Jason assumes his roommate hears the alarm.

Bad: Jason assumes his roommate hears the alarm, though his roommate doesn't stir.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Jason gets up and turns off his roommate's alarm. His roommate did indeed hear the alarm and rolls out of bed 5 minutes later, in time for a big exam.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Jason gets up and turns off his roommate's alarm. His roommate did not hear the alarm. He randomly wakes up 5 minutes later, though, just in time for a big exam.

False belief/Bad outcome: Jason gets up and turns off his roommate's alarm. His roommate did not hear the alarm and wakes up three hours later to discover he slept through a big exam.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Jason for turning off his roommate's alarm clock?

(53) *Background:* Albert and his brother are walking home from hockey practice when they pass by a lake that has frozen over.

Belief/reason:

Good: The ice looks quite thick everywhere, so Albert thinks it's sufficiently frozen over to support a person's weight.

Unspecified: Albert thinks it's sufficiently frozen over to support a person's weight.

Bad: Though the ice looks quite thin at points, Albert thinks it's sufficiently frozen over to support a person's weight.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: Albert suggests that they race across. The lake is plenty frozen. Albert's brother puts on his skates first, and he beats Albert to the other side.

False belief/Neutral outcome: Albert suggests that they race across. The lake is not nearly frozen enough. Albert's brother puts on his skates first but steps right through the lake at the shallow end, so he gets off.

False belief/Bad outcome: Albert suggests that they race across. The lake is not nearly frozen enough. Albert's brother puts on his skates first. He starts sprinting across but falls through the ice into the freezing cold water.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Albert for suggesting that they race across?

(54) *Background:* Ken is on his way to swim practice and realizes that he needs a timer. He borrows his friend's brand new watch.

Belief/reason:

Good: Ken believes the watch is waterproof and suitable for swim practice, since there's a waterproof symbol on the back of the watch.

Unspecified: Ken believes the watch is waterproof and suitable for swim practice.

Bad: Ken believes the watch is waterproof and suitable for swim practice, though there's no waterproof symbol anywhere on the watch.

Action/outcome:

True belief/Neutral outcome: It turns out the watch is waterproof. Ken's friend even wears it in the shower. Ken places the watch at the end of the pool. It functions just fine even when splashed with water.

False belief/Neutral outcome: It turns out the watch is not waterproof. Ken's friend always keeps it dry. Ken places the watch at the end of the pool. Fortunately, it stays dry the whole time and functions fine.

False belief/Bad outcome: It turns out the watch is not waterproof. Ken's friend always keeps it dry. Ken places the watch at the end of the pool. Unfortunately, it gets splashed and stops working.

Question: How morally blameworthy is Ken for placing the watch at the end of the pool?