

Supplementary File 1: Coding instructions and initial codes assigned by each of the coders for the “foundational statements” generated as part of Survey 2¹.

Coding Instructions

“Listed below is a series of statements generated by students as part of a recent psychological study. Please examine each statement carefully, then

Put “C” (for “consequences”) next to a statement if, in your opinion, the author of the statement is making appeals to negative or positive consequences, bad or good effects, or adverse or desirable outcomes that concern either an individual or the society as a whole.

Put “O” (for “other”) next to a statement if, in your opinion, the author of the statement is not making appeals to negative or positive consequences, bad or good effects, or adverse or desirable outcomes that concern either an individual or the society as a whole.”

Statements (please write C or O next to each statement below).

1. “Because the definition of “wrong” should be consistent regardless of whether you’re alone [or] in a group setting [right-pointing arrow] Even if there are no consequences, one should be able to recognize the ‘wrongdoing’ on one’s own.”

Coder 1: O

Coder 2: O

2. “Moral norms are by definition moral. Breaking one is immoral, and even if it doesn’t hurt anyone, the action is a step towards hurting someone.”

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

3. “If you have subjectively assessed exceptions to norms and rules, then what is a norm is determined by the actor rather than by the majority for common good.”

Coder 1: C*

Coder 2: O

¹ * indicates a coding decision that was subsequently altered by a given coder in the direction of another coder following a discussion. [] indicates transcription of a symbol or our reconstruction of the indecipherable/missing text; { } indicates additional content due to verbal clarifications provided by the author of a statement. Coder 1 refers to the first author.

4. "Established moral norms are established for a reason. If these moral norms can be broken casually and it is not possible for it to hurt anyone, then maybe they aren't really established. If everyone is breaking moral law, the consequence is severe, so I guess people act as such in hopes that everyone else adheres to moral law."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: O*

5. "For example, the moral norm of stealing would be wrong because it usually wouldn't harm anyone but it would be unjustful to them (possibly). It would largely depend on the moral norm."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

6. "According to Kant, if this was universalized, established norm would be self-defeating."

Coder 1: O

Coder 2: O

7. "I'm not sure whether there will be a guarantee that nobody is harmed in each time a violation occurs. In case there is an instance where the violation enters the grey area, I chose this option."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

8. "I think it is inherently wrong to violate established moral norm, because if people were allowed to break norm as long as no one is harmed, then it would incite and encourage people to try violating the norm and assuming that no one will get hurt. The assumption is what I dislike."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

9. "Moral norms exist because they enforce social stability. If everyone sought to violate moral norms, then there would not be any order present in society. {This would affect everyone, including the person breaking the norm}"

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

10. "I don't necessarily agree completely with the statement, but felt it was the lesser of the evils, as the other 2 options were far more faulted."

Coder 1: O

Coder 2: O

11. "It is a slippery slope. People might think no one will be harmed but then they are. This all keeps order in society."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

12. "Moral norms generally are norms because society has agreed that something is right or wrong for a reason. Even if nobody is harmed there is usually rationale for the norm."

Coder 1: O

Coder 2: O

13. "It is wrong because you undermine the social value of the norm, even when no one is hurt. With lying for instance, even if no one is harmed, the trust that someone has in your hands is decreased."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

14. "Moral norms generally exist to maintain some sort of order{which ultimately benefits everyone}, so violating them for a reason as selfish as 'fun' represents a threat to the order for no real reason. Also, acts can be wrong even if they don't directly harm anyone else."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

15. "It is still wrong regardless. Even if no harm came out of it and other people not affiliated are not harmed, the action is still wrong."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

16. "Rule utilitarianism, for example: It maximizes utility on average to follow the "rules" based on utilitarian maxims."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: O*

17. "It is wrong either way, because those norms have been established to protect people and we should not bend the rules just because nobody got harmed [right-pointing arrow] may have just gotten lucky, but it does not make the act itself less wrong because of the favorable outcome."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

18. "Many moral norms are not only harmful by harming others."

Coder 1: O

Coder 2: O

19. "I agree with this view because [violating] norms even if no one is harmed starts a slippery slope."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

20. "I picked the first choice because I believe there are other potential negative consequences to violating an established moral norm besides just harming someone."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

21. "There are a set of norms people are expected to follow as fellow human beings. Even if it didn't hurt someone this time, it could harm someone the next time if you now think it's acceptable."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

22. "I think that it is always wrong to violate moral norms because it sets a bad example for others and for your future actions. Also, even though you may not be harming someone, you also are not improving their state of being."

Coder 1: C

Coder 2: C

23. "Because morals/values should not be situational— they should stick {to ensure stability}"

Coder 1: C*

Coder 2: O