

Oxford Utilitarianism Scale

1. If the only way to save another person's life during an emergency is to sacrifice one's own leg, then one is morally required to make this sacrifice.
2. It is morally right to harm an innocent person if harming them is a necessary means to helping several other innocent people.
3. From a moral point of view, we should feel obliged to give one of our kidneys to a person with kidney failure since we don't need two kidneys to survive, but really only one to be healthy.
4. If the only way to ensure the overall well-being and happiness of the people is through the use of political oppression for a short, limited period, then political oppression should be used.
5. From a moral perspective, people should care about the well-being of all human beings on the planet equally; they should not favor the well-being of people who are especially close to them either physically or emotionally.
6. It is permissible to torture an innocent person if this would be necessary to provide information to prevent a bomb going off that would kill hundreds of people.
7. It is just as wrong to fail to help someone as it is to actively harm them yourself.
8. Sometimes it is morally necessary for innocent people to die as collateral damage—if more people are saved overall.
9. It is morally wrong to keep money that one doesn't really need if one can donate it to causes that provide effective help to those who will benefit a great deal.

7-point Likert scale; 1 - Strongly Disagree, 7 - Strongly Agree

Mean scores on both subscales should be computed. Impartial Beneficence-items 1,3,5,7 and 9; Instrumental Harm-items 2,4,6 and 8.

Reference:

Kahane, G., Everett, J. A., Earp, B. D., Caviola, L., Faber, N. S., Crockett, M. J., & Savulescu, J. (2018). Beyond sacrificial harm: A two-dimensional model of utilitarian psychology. *Psychological Review*, 125(2), 131.