SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

A. Item analyses

Here we present an overview of our item-wise analyses. For each individual item the average score over participants was calculated and entered into the analysis.

Moral Decisions data

Table S1. Percent of utilitarian responding for each dilemma in Study1

	Conflict		No-conflict	
	Low load	High load	Low load	High load
Plane	84	63	90	76
Trolley	86	86	93	97
Hospital	80	78	88	93
Cave	93	68	84	88
Average	87	74	89	88

ANOVA results:
Load $F(1,6) = 3.769$, $p = .100$, $\eta p2 = .386$
Conflict $F(1,6) = 7.737$, $p = .032$ $\eta p2$, $= .563$
Interaction $F(1,6) = 1.923$, $p = .215$, $\eta p2 = .243$
Simple effect Load on Conflict: Load $F(1,6) = 4.628$, $p = .075$, $\eta p2 = .435$

Table S2. Percent of utilitarian responding for each dilemma in Study 2

	Conflict		No-conflict	
	Low load	High load	Low load	High load
Plane	58	67	80	87
Trolley	71	67	83	92
Hospital	57	82	91	100
Cave	58	74	85	83
Average	61	72	85	91

ANOVA results:
Load $F(1,6) = 6.715$, $p = .041$, $\eta p2 = .528$
Conflict $F(1,6) = 42.363$, $p = .001$, $\eta p2 = .876$
Interaction $F(1,6) = 0.746$, $p = .421$, $\eta p2 = .111$
Simple effect Load on Conflict: Load $F(1,6) = 5.969$, $p = .050$, $\eta p2 = .499$

Table S3. Percent of utilitarian responding for each dilemma in Study 3

	Conflict		No-conflict	
	Low load	High load	Low load	High load
Plane	70	71	84	80
Trolley	69	68	90	84
Hospital	77	72	83	86

Cave	66	74	83	88
Average	71	73	85	85

ANOVA results:

Load F(1,6) = 0.004, p = .950, ηp2 = .001

Conflict F(1,6) = 70.139, p < .001, ηp2 = .921

Interaction F(1,6) = 0.108, p = .754, ηp2 = .018

Simple effect Load on Conflict: Load F(1,6) = 0.078, p = .790, ηp2 = .013

Conflict Detection

Table S4. Average confidence ratings (SD) per item in Study 1

	Low load			High load		
	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict
Plane	3.43 (2.23)	4.97 (1.64)	5.52 (1.32)	4.79 (1.67)	5.17 (1.71)	5.66 (1.00)
Trolley	5.33 (1.00)	5.19 (1.57)	5.14 (1.76)	5.33 (1.03)	4.86 (1.57)	5.65 (1.53)
Hospital	5.80 (0.92)	4.95 (1.63)	5.53 (1.45)	4.56 (1.88)	5.19 (1.33)	5.24 (1.86)
Cave	4.75 (1.71)	4.68 (1.58)	5.52 (1.27)	5.31 (1.65)	4.89 (1.6)	5.34 (1.55)
Average	4.75 (1.77)	5.07 (1.41)	5.50 (1.29)	5.00 (1.63)	5.13 (1.49)	5.56 (1.47)

ANOVA results for deontological responders:

Load F(1,6) = 0.140, p = .772, ηp2 = .023

Conflict F(1,6) = 3.724, p = .102, ηp2 = .383

Interaction F(1,6) = 0.047, p = .835, ηp2 = .008

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:

Load F(1,6) = 0.306, p = .600, ηp2 = .048

Conflict F(1,6) = 30.824, p < .001, ηp2 = .837

Interaction F(1,6) = 0.024, p = .882, ηp2 = .004

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:

Load F(1,6) = 0.247, p = .637, ηp2 = .039

Conflict F(1,6) = 38.165, p = .001, ηp2 = .864

Interaction F(1,6) = 0.012, p = .915, ηp2 = .002

Table S5. Average confidence ratings (SD) per item in Study 2

	Low load			High load		
	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict
Plane	5.11 (1.82)	5.73 (1.04)	5.10 (1.40)	5.22 (1.56)	4.22 (1.73)	5.54 (1.42)
Trolley	4.36 (1.86)	4.63 (1.50)	5.45 (1.27)	4.64 (1.69)	4.59 (1.47)	5.32 (1.62)
Hospital	4.56 (1.65)	5.00 (1.28)	5.34 (1.73)	3.80 (2.17)	5.00 (1.15)	5.53 (1.17)
Cave	4.50 (1.69)	4.40 (1.80)	5.54 (1.34)	5.29 (2.36)	4.90 (1.29)	4.88 (1.59)

| Average | 4.66 (1.68) | 4.85 (1.61) | 5.43 (1.40) | 4.68 (1.94) | 4.74 (1.29) | 5.43 (1.34) |

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load F(1,6) = 0.026, p = .876, ηp2 = .004
Conflict F(1,6) = 8.629, p = .026, ηp2 = .590
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.131, p = .730, ηp2 = .021

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load F(1,6) = 0.375, p = .563, ηp2 = .059
Conflict F(1,6) = 21.336, p = .004, ηp2 = .781
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.203, p = .668, ηp2 = .033

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined
Load F(1,6) = 0.099, p = .764, ηp2 = .016
Conflict F(1,6) = 30.121, p = .002, ηp2 = .834
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.012, p = .918, ηp2 = .002

Table S6. Average conflict composite rating (SD) per item in Study 3

| | Low load | | | High load | | |
	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict
Plane	4.00 (1.62)	3.55 (1.83)	3.69 (1.57)	3.23 (1.95)	3.96 (2.14)	3.73 (1.62)
Trolley	3.14 (1.89)	3.67 (1.76)	4.15 (1.73)	4.30 (1.95)	4.29 (1.83)	4.60 (1.88)
Hospital	4.10 (1.54)	3.47 (1.79)	4.14 (1.64)	3.72 (1.66)	3.48 (1.81)	4.61 (1.98)
Cave	2.57 (1.38)	3.72 (2.13)	4.35 (1.86)	3.00 (1.44)	4.15 (2.13)	4.5 (1.80)
Average	3.16 (1.8)	3.50 (1.81)	4.09 (1.63)	3.47 (1.78)	3.82 (1.94)	4.4 (1.72)

*Note: all data was reversed scored (i.e., smaller values indicate higher experienced conflict). Conflict composite is the average of the difficulty and conflictedness rating.

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load F(1,6) = 0.763, p = .416, ηp2 = .113
Conflict F(1,6) = 5.604, p = .056, ηp2 = .483
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.143, p = .719, ηp2 = .023

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load F(1,6) = 14.825, p = .008, ηp2 = .712
Conflict F(1,6) = 4.473, p = .079, ηp2 = .427
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.289, p = .610, ηp2 = .046

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load F(1,6) = 7.066, p = .038, ηp2 = .541
Conflict F(1,6) = 8.273, p = .028, ηp2 = .580

Interaction F(1,6) = 0.100, p = .762, ηp2 = .016

Table S7. Pooled data across three studies for each item.

	Low load			High load		
	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict	Deontological conflict	Utilitarian conflict	No conflict
Plane	4.43 (1.91)	4.70 (1.79)	4.95 (1.59)	4.40 (1.89)	4.45 (1.94)	5.05 (1.58)
Trolley	4.11 (1.89)	4.67 (1.71)	4.93 (1.68)	4.67 (1.66)	4.63 (1.61)	5.21 (1.72)
Hospital	4.76 (1.57)	4.46 (1.75)	5.10 (1.68)	4.07 (1.82)	4.62 (1.62)	5.13 (1.74)
Cave	3.78 (1.87)	4.40 (1.79)	5.13 (1.61)	4.59 (2.03)	4.63 (1.75)	4.94 (1.67)
Average	4.14 (1.88)	4.54 (1.73)	5.05 (1.56)	4.37 (1.88)	4.59 (1.70)	5.14 (1.61)

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load F(1,6) = 0.390, p = .555, ηp2 = .061
Conflict F(1,6) = 133.498, p < .001, ηp2 = .957
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.095, p = .768, ηp2 = .016

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load F(1,6) = 0.303, p = .602, ηp2 = .048
Conflict F(1,6) = 160.381, p < .001, ηp2 = .964
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.043, p = .843, ηp2 = .007

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load F(1,6) = 0.527, p = .495, ηp2 = .081
Conflict F(1,6) = 177.038, p < .001, ηp2 = .967
Interaction F(1,6) = 0.000, p = .994, ηp2 = .000

B. Deontological only analyses

Here we present additional conflict detection analyses for the subgroup of participants who consistently gave deontological responses on the two conflict problems that they solved.

Table S8. Average conflict detection data (SD) for consistent deontological responders and all others (inconsistent deontological and consistent utilitarian) in the three studies.

	Low load			High load		
	Consistent deontological conflict	Other conflict	No conflict	Consistent deontological conflict	Other conflict	No conflict
Study 1	n = 10	n = 101	n = 106	n = 13	n = 67	n = 77
Confidence	5.80 (1.14)	5.02 (1.57)	5.50 (1.29)	5.38 (1.26)	5.23 (1.48)	5.56 (1.47)
Study 2	n = 22	n = 62	n = 77	n = 10	n = 47	n = 54
Confidence	5.05 (1.76)	4.95 (1.52)	5.43 (1.4)	5.30 (1.77)	4.85 (1.59)	5.43 (1.34)
Study 3	n = 13	n = 70	n = 79	n = 11	n = 57	n = 65
Reversed conflict composite	3.94 (1.29)	3.56 (1.81)	4.09 (1.63)	3.80 (1.47)	3.85 (1.94)	4.4 (1.72)
Pooled	n = 45	n = 233	n = 262	n = 34	n = 171	n = 196
	4.89 (1.63)	4.56 (1.76)	5.05 (1.56)	4.85 (1.62)	4.67 (1.77)	5.14 (1.61)

ANOVA results Study 1:
Conflict $F_{(1,21)}$ = 0.945, p = .342, ηp2 = .043
Load $F_{(1,21)}$ = 0.717, p = .407, ηp2 = .033
Interaction $F_{(1,21)}$ = 0.043, p = .839, ηp2 = .002

ANOVA results Study 2:
Conflict $F_{(1,30)}$ = 0.315, p = .579, ηp2 = .010
Load $F_{(1,30)}$ = 0.170, p = .683, ηp2 = .006
Interaction $F_{(1,30)}$ = 0.044, p = .835, ηp2 = .001

ANOVA results Study 3 :
Conflict $F_{(1,22)}$ = 3.757, p = .066, ηp2 = .146
Load $F_{(1,22)}$ = 0.276, p = .605, ηp2 = .012
Interaction $F_{(1,22)}$ = 0.765, p = .391, ηp2 = .034

ANOVA results Pooled:
Conflict $F_{(1,77)}$ = 3.985, p = .049, ηp2 = .049
Load $F_{(1,77)}$ = 0.018, p = .893, ηp2 < .001
Interaction $F_{(1,77)}$ = 0.000, p = .999, ηp2 < .001

C. Unfiltered analyses

Here we present an overview of the subject-wise data and analyses without filtering for load recall (i.e., all participants are included).

Table S9. Mean unfiltered ratings, decision time, and reading time for conflict and no-conflict dilemmas as a function of the dilemma response decision obtained in Study 1. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

		Conflict		No Conflict	
		Deontological	Utilitarian	Utilitarian/Deont ological	Other
Low load	Sample size	30	130	136	18
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.38 (1.66)	4.86 (1.41)	5.36 (1.27)	4.67 (1.73)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	13.85 (9.23)	14.67 (9.21)	16.29 (11.37)	13.32 (8.64)
	Antilogged	11.14 (2.02)	12.9 (1.66)	13.77 (1.76)	11.3 (1.75)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	20.74 (16.02)	17.84 (7.57)	18.84 (10.7)	15.85 (10.29)
	Antilogged	15.16 (2.39)	16.38 (1.52)	16.79 (1.6)	13.15 (1.89)
High Load	Sample size	44	99	114	22
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.59 (1.67)	5.01 (1.48)	5.29 (1.47)	4.46 (1.83)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	15.22 (13.13)	14.95 (8.43)	14.62 (8.49)	15.49 (15.57)
	Antilogged	11.6 (2.06)	12.83 (1.78)	12.48 (1.81)	10.88 (2.33)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	15.54 (11.57)	16.14 (7.35)	17.3 (10.06)	11.15 (8.52)
	Antilogged	12.3 (1.99)	14.75 (1.53)	15.36 (1.61)	8.8 (1.98)

Unfiltered dilemma decisions
ANOVA results

Conflict $F(1,259) = 664.824$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .720$
Load $F(1,259) = 3.224$, $p = .074$, $\eta p2 = .012$
Interaction $F(1,259) = 7.608$, $p = .006$, $\eta p2 = .029$
Simple effect Load on Conflict: $F(1,259) = 7.976$, $p = .005$, $\eta p2 = .030$

Unfiltered conflict detection analyses
ANOVA results

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load $F(1,70) = 0.513$, $p = .476$, $\eta p2 = .007$
Conflict $F(1,70) = 14.887$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .175$
Interaction $F(1,70) = 0.003$, $p = .960$, $\eta p2 = .000$

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load $F(1,216) = 0.000$, $p = .988$, $\eta p2 = .000$
Conflict $F(1,216) = 17.975$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .077$
Interaction $F(1,216) = 0.115$, $p = .735$, $\eta p2 = .001$

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load F(1,248) = 0.153, p = .696, ηp2 = .068
Conflict F(1,248) = 14.921, p < .001, ηp2 = .057
Interaction F(1,248) = 0.016, p = .901, ηp2 = .000

Table S10. Mean unfiltered ratings, decision time, and reading time for conflict and no-conflict dilemmas as a function of the dilemma response decision obtained in Study 2. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

		Conflict		No Conflict	
		Deontological	Utilitarian	Utilitarian/Deontological	Other
Low load	Sample size	50	71	87	25
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.51 (1.68)	4.8 (1.65)	5.35 (1.39)	4.2 (1.92)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	14.73 (8.03)	16.2 (11.15)	15.15 (10.19)	15.64 (11.77)
	Antilogged	13.16 (1.94)	14.03 (1.86)	13.48 (1.79)	11.2 (2.43)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	17.58 (11.83)	18.93 (11.96)	20.95 (12.99)	20.64 (27.12)
	Antilogged	14.55 (1.88)	16.11 (1.77)	18.07 (1.72)	12.45 (2.63)
High Load	Sample size	41	72	89	20
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.74 (1.63)	4.55 (1.44)	5.26 (1.27)	4.19 (1.11)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	16.3 (11.47)	13.59 (8.74)	15.38 (8.51)	12.73 (8.28)
	Antilogged	11.24 (1.92)	12.47 (1.71)	12.72 (1.75)	9.84 (1.88)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	19.33 (17.37)	17.9 (7.07)	19.51 (15.88)	15.73 (12.68)
	Antilogged	14.65 (2.09)	16.32 (1.6)	16.21 (1.78)	12.11 (2.12)

Unfiltered dilemma decisions
ANOVA results

Conflict F(1,187) = 208.048, p < .001, ηp2 = .527
Load F(1,187) = 0.024, p = .876, ηp2 = .000
Interaction F(1,187) = 3.406, p = .067, ηp2 = .018
Simple effect Load on Conflict: F(1,187) = 0.899, p = .344, ηp2 = .005

Unfiltered conflict detection analyses
ANOVA results

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load F(1,86) = 0.061, p = .806, ηp2 = .001
Conflict F(1,86) = 28.624, p < .001, ηp2 = .250
Interaction F(1,86) = 0.284, p = .595, ηp2 = .003

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load F(1,129) = 1.140, p = .288, ηp2 = .009
Conflict F(1,129) = 32.714, p < .001, ηp2 = .202
Interaction F(1,129) = 0.099, p = .735, ηp2 = .001

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load F(1, 174) = 0.469, p = .494, ηp2 = .105
Conflict F(1,174) = 31.104, p < .001, ηp2 = .152
Interaction F(1,174) = 0.345, p = .558, ηp2 = .002

Table S11. Mean unfiltered ratings, decision time, and reading time for conflict and no-conflict dilemmas as a function of the dilemma response decision obtained in Study 3. Standard deviations are shown in parentheses.

		Conflict		No Conflict	
		Deontological	Utilitarian	Utilitarian/Deontological	Other
Low load	Sample size	43	82	93	26
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.67 (1.89)	4.21 (1.86)	3.67 (1.72)	4.17 (1.97)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	4.9 (1.74)	4.62 (1.78)	3.97 (1.71)	4.31 (1.75)
	Antilogged	17.75 (12.07)	16.56 (11.56)	15.63 (7.52)	19.62 (25.47)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	13.99 (2.08)	13.78 (1.86)	13.81 (1.69)	12.87 (2.45)
	Antilogged	15.25 (12.98)	15.51 (8.36)	15.52 (9.49)	11.16 (5.51)
High Load	Sample size	42	83	94	27
Confidence	1-7 scale	4.75 (1.7)	4.49 (1.92)	3.82 (1.78)	3.7 (1.88)
Reading time (s)	Raw latencies	4.92 (1.69)	4.51 (1.84)	3.97 (1.74)	4.04 (1.92)
	Antilogged	21.27 (11.56)	19.76 (10.61)	19.64 (10.05)	17.8 (14.92)
Decision time (s)	Raw latencies	11.72 (2.07)	13.53 (1.71)	13.25 (1.76)	9.73 (1.76)
	Antilogged	16.43 (7.19)	17.28 (9.71)	17.59 (8.18)	14.95 (8.77)

Unfiltered dilemma decisions
ANOVA results

Conflict F(1,198) = 262.244, p < .001, ηp2 = .615
Load F(1,198) = 1.243, p = .265, ηp2 = .002
Interaction F(1,198) = 0.322, p = .570, ηp2 = .000
Simple effect Load on Conflict: F(1,198) = 1.103, p = .294, ηp2 = .002

Unfiltered conflict detection analyses
ANOVA results (Conflict composite index)

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load F(1,81) = 0.000, p = .983, ηp2 = .000
Conflict F(1,81) = 15.703, p < .001, ηp2 = .162
Interaction F(1,81) = 0.014, p = .905, ηp2 = .000

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load F(1,151) = 0.060, p = .807, ηp2 = .000
Conflict F(1,151) = 27.063, p < .001, ηp2 = .152
Interaction F(1,151) = 0.030, p = .863, ηp2 = .000

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load $F_{(1,185)} = 0.174$, $p = .677$, $\eta p2 = .070$
Conflict $F_{(1,185)} = 29.204$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .136$
Interaction $F_{(1,185)} = 0.040$, $p = .842$, $\eta p2 = .000$

Unfiltered conflict detection analyses
ANOVA results Pooled

ANOVA results for deontological responders:
Load $F_{(1,241)} = 0.255$, $p = .614$, $\eta p2 = .001$
Conflict $F_{(1,241)} = 56.933$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .191$
Interaction $F_{(1,241)} = 0.038$, $p = .845$, $\eta p2 = .000$

ANOVA results for utilitarian responders:
Load $F_{(1,500)} = 1.083$, $p = .298$, $\eta p2 = .002$
Conflict $F_{(1,500)} = 75.515$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .131$
Interaction $F_{(1,500)} = 0.001$, $p = .972$, $\eta p2 = .000$

ANOVA results for deontological/utilitarian combined:
Load $F_{(1,611)} = 0.000$, $p = .983$, $\eta p2 = .000$
Conflict $F_{(1,611)} = 15.703$, $p < .001$, $\eta p2 = .162$
Interaction $F_{(1,611)} = 0.000$, $p = .905$, $\eta p2 = .000$

D. Bayesian analyses

Overview JASP output for Bayesian ANOVAs on pooled data.

Deontological responders

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF $_M$	BF $_{10}$	% error
Null model (incl. subject)	0.200	5.279e -66	2.111e -65	1.000	
Conflict	0.200	0.844	21.626	1.599e +65	1.602
load	0.200	6.859e -67	2.743e -66	0.130	1.513
Conflict+ load	0.200	0.136	0.632	2.584e +64	2.031
Conflict+ load + Conflict ∗ load	0.200	0.020	0.080	3.735e +63	5.897

Note. All models include subject.

Utilitarian responders

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF $_M$	BF $_{10}$	% error
Null model (incl. subject)	0.200	2.635e -4	0.001	1.000	
Conflict	0.200	0.911	41.004	3457.408	1.086
load	0.200	2.273e -5	9.091e -5	0.086	0.905
Conflict+ load	0.200	0.080	0.347	302.703	1.988
Conflict+ load + Conflict ∗ load	0.200	0.009	0.036	33.484	2.463

Note. All models include subject.

Combined

Models	P(M)	P(M|data)	BF $_M$	BF $_{10}$	% error
Null model (incl. subject)	0.200	4.352e -4	0.002	1.000	
Conflict	0.200	0.884	30.574	2031.947	1.716
load	0.200	4.672e -5	1.869e -4	0.107	4.102
Conflict+ load	0.200	0.088	0.387	202.934	1.423
Conflict+ load + Conflict ∗ load	0.200	0.027	0.111	61.800	49.469

Note. All models include subject.