On the Problem of "Moral Dilemma" and the Application of "Moral Dilemma Teaching Method" in Primary School Moral and Rule of Law Course——Taking "Tram Dilemma" as an Example

Zhuo Chen[1], Xinyu Tian[2]

1. Yangzhou University Business School, Jiangsu Yangzhou 225127
2. Shandong Normal University Department of Education, Shandong Jinan 250014

Abstract: Moral dilemma refers to a situation or a problem that involves two moral norms at the same time, and the two cannot be taken into account at the same time. The "tram dilemma" is the most basic form of the dilemma, which does not involve any additional conditions, and is a relatively good direct investigation and the variant of the problem. The authors adopt the literature method and questionnaire survey method to carry out the research from the perspective of "moral metaphor". In the teaching of moral and rule of law course, moral dilemma stories are generally used as the basic materials, and children are asked to discuss the moral issues in the stories and answer the questions raised around the stories, to judge the stage of moral cognitive development of children and guide and promote their further development. In the authors' opinion, to use the "moral dilemma teaching method" accurately, it is necessary to re-examine this moral issue and choose the appropriate perspective to apply it to children in primary school.

Keywords: moral dilemma, tram dilemma, moral metaphor, value judgement, primary school, moral and rule of law course

Introduction

The tram dilemma problem was first raised by the philosopher Philippa Foot in 1967 in her paper The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of the Double Effect[1], which led to a wide-ranging and heated debate. The idea is that a tram comes along with exactly five people on the track in front of it, and there is no time to run away unless someone pulls the trigger so that the tram goes to the spare track, but there is also a person on the spare track. Assuming you were standing next to the trigger and had only a few seconds to think about it, would you choose to pull it so that the tram would change track and save the five people by sacrificing one person's life?

1. The origin of the problem

Researchers have found that the moral judgements made by most subjects in tram dilemmas are value-laden and utilitarian, i.e., most people would normally choose to save five people at the expense of one; and a minority of deontologists believe that the life of one person is as important as the lives of five, and that people should not be used as a

means to an end under any circumstance, even if the sacrifice of one person can save five[2-5].

1.1 Western ethical perspectives

In the academic discussion, "Tram Dilemma" has been continuously varied and rewritten, developing and deriving many different versions, and more moral dilemmas have been set up. A series of moral dilemmas have been formed, including the "Elixir Dilemma", Flyover Dilemma, Hospital Dilemma, Botanist Dilemma, and so on. After fifty years of discussion in the West, many scholars have participated in the discussion, and analyzed the issue from the perspective of utilitarianism and other Western ethical theories, but no accepted conclusion has been reached so far.

The differences mainly lie in two schools of ethics. Ethics is the study of moral philosophy, with the purpose of human happiness, to explore the good and evil of people, and the justification of the act or not. From the point of view of whether or not the consequences of behavior are the standard of moral judgement, moral theories are distinguished into consequentialism and non-consequentialism. Utilitarianism is typical of consequentialism, which holds that an action is morally right or permissible if, and only if, it produces greater social welfare than other available alternatives. Non-consequentialism (generally known as "deontology") holds that an action is justified not in terms of the consequences it produces, but in terms of whether or not it complies with the limits of duty or obeys the dictates of the goodwill, and is exemplified by Kant's deontological ethics[6]. Although these two moral theories have different standpoints, they usually arrive at the same answers to basic moral judgements in daily life, but when faced with moral dilemmas, their differences come to the fore.

1.2 Universal moral grammar

Mark Hauser believes that there exists an innate and unconscious "Universal Moral Grammar" system in human beings, which enables people to analyze and make judgements quickly before reason or emotion comes into play, and this judgement system has been formed through millions of years of natural selection and evolution. Despite cultural differences, human moral judgement is influenced by the intrinsic "Universal Moral Grammar" system[7].

In order to bring the experimental situation closer to reality, David Navarrete et al. used virtual reality technology to create an immersive 3D simulation to observe how subjects make choices. The results of the experiment showed that 90% of the people would choose to sacrifice one person to save the other five, that is, the vast majority of people still chose a utilitarian outcome[8].

1.3 Western emotional influence study

However, when researchers add factors that can promote subjects' emotional involvement to the tram dilemma, such as enhancing the psychological distance between subjects and people in the situation[9], such as temporal distance[10], spatial distance[11], increasing victim identifiability[12], etc., the results were found: Subjects' choices changed accordingly and they were more reluctant to change the tram tracks.

Bleske Rechek, April et al. showed that people were less likely to sacrifice one person to save five others if the person on the turnoff was younger, more closely related, or a current partner[13].

Hadit's Social Intuitionist Model (SIM) of Moral Judgement explains this as follows: the role of intuition and emotion in human decision-making[14] cannot be ignored, and moral emotions can directly enable moral judgements to occur[15]. Moral judgment is the result of rapid, automatic intuition (emotion), while moral reasoning is a post-mortem process of interpretation after moral judgment, which is calm and controlled. Currently, more and more researchers believe that moral judgement is the result of the synergistic action of emotional and cognitive processing, i.e., moral judgement is a process of both emotional and cognitive processing.[16][17]

Psychologists have also found that most people choose to switch tracks when faced with the first situation: the possibility of switching tracks and having the tram hit one person, or not switching and having the tram hit five people. But when faced with the second situation: throwing personally a passerby off a flyover and derailing the tram to save five people, or not doing anything and letting the tram hit five people, most people would choose not to do anything yet.

Showing that humans possess moral intuitions that operate like utilitarianism in the first situation and like moral deontologists in the second[18].

A bio-neurological team led by Yiyuan Tang and others replicated the classic experiments and showed that most people use general areas of the brain to operate in the first condition, but in the second condition, the emotional judgement part of the brain is used, according to the fMRI scans. Patients with brain injuries in which the emotional judgement part is compromised, when this experiment is conducted, in both the first condition, and the second condition, decide in a utilitarian manner to sacrifice one person in order to save five people [19][20].

This shows that the choice of the answer to the question is closely related to the moral emotional judgement.

1.4 Current status of general studies in China

The tram dilemma was introduced into our country some years ago, which likewise attracted the attention and research of domestic scholars. Most of these scholars also explore it as a difficult problem, only that the theories and methods used are basically copied or duplicated from the existing discourses in Western academic circles. Its solution is generally summarized in two ways:

(1) Utilitarianism, the sum of pleasure and pain, takes the net pleasure maximization scheme, the principle is "to provide the greatest benefit for the greatest number of people", so the conclusion is that by pulling the lever, sacrificing one person's life to save five people's lives. In practice, the majority of subjects responded that they were willing to pull the lever, and that such a choice of last resort was morally acceptable;

(2) Libertarianism, a basic principle: non-aggression. Trams should continue to travel on the established track, changing the track creates an infringement on the innocent, once you choose to run over an innocent person, you are responsible for it. From a libertarianism perspective, logically, liberalism is not flawed, but it is also cruel. Utilitarianism is compassionate, but people as a means to achieve the overall purpose, let a person shudder. "Tram Dilemma" involved in the legitimate rights and interests of life, life has a special nature, its value cannot be measured, cannot be compared. If an innocent third party can become a victim of emergency risk avoidance behavior, this may be used by people with ulterior motives to deliberately deprive others of their lives on the grounds that the value of their own lives is higher than the value of the lives of those who were sacrificed, so as to benefit from it. Furthermore, for human beings to exist and develop with dignity, the prerequisite is that the value of life is recognized by the State, and since the Constitution explicitly lists human dignity as an object of protection, it must also safeguard the life on which it is based [21].

1.5 Current status of special studies in China

However, not all scholars agree with the viewpoints of Western ethics. For example, Tingyang Zhao[22] refutes the tram dilemma from the root of "the tram dilemma is a dilemma", and argues that the tram dilemma is not an ethical issue because it erases the specificity of human beings, and therefore does not have any ethical significance, neither that it is not touching, nor does it conform to the criteria of a strict dilemma. Finally, he gives a four-step solution of "spiritual communication" and concludes that sacrificing one person to save five is the only relatively reasonable choice for the tram driver.

Another example is Deshun Li[23], who argues that real difficulties often arise from a certain kind of arbitrary desires and thoughts in our minds, and therefore reflecting on and transcending traditional value arbitrariness will lead to a new liberation of our minds. Therefore, he opposes Sandel's view of justice[24] and believes that the solution to this problem should be to abandon normative subjectivity and "moralism" and to create a hierarchical structure of multiple subjects and "communitarianism".

However, Dongping Han[25] refutes both views, arguing that Tingyang Zhao's argument that the tram dilemma is not an ethical dilemma is unfounded and contradictory, that the judgement that ethical dilemmas, in general, can be solved as long as they are not absolutely adhered to by the ethical norms is a misjudgment, and that the analysis of the root cause of the dilemma due to "philosophical pretension" is unconvincing. On the other hand, Deshun Li is wrong in his attribution: the view that there will not be an unsolvable tram dilemma if value arbitrariness is abandoned is incorrect, and even his

judgement of "value arbitrariness" is a personal subjective definition. In terms of problem-solving, Tingyang Zhao's solution is no longer the tram dilemma and lacks feasibility, while Deshun Li no longer solves the problem in favor of exploring the question of who should bear the responsibility of compensating the abandoned.

The fundamental answer to the tram dilemma in a narrow sense is still whether to choose "save one or save five", and this is actually the source of this "difficult" and "unanswerable" question, and also the fundamental starting point of the "utilitarianism" that Philippa Foot wants to explore.

1.6 Exploration of the number of people in the context of the tram dilemma in China

This study is not yet fully recognized at this stage, but it may be an entry point for balancing utilitarianism and liberalism, i.e., in the authors' view, with a large enough sample, there is a situational number of people that will make the vast majority of the people (more than 99%) choose to "save n and give up 1".

Weikun Liu[26], in his study of the "flyover dilemma" and similar derivative problems, argues that the crux of the issue lies in whether or not a member of society is in favor of forcibly sacrificing the lives of a few for the sake of the lives of the many and ignoring the opinions of the few. As a result, people tend to refuse to sacrifice the lives of the minority when the difference in numbers is small, while it becomes more difficult to choose when the difference is very large.

Mingjuan Liu[27] concludes from her experiment that the number of people in a tram dilemma situation has an effect on moral judgement and compassion, i.e., as n increases people will tend to choose more utilitarianly, but, this effect is not significant. However, she believes that this conclusion is related to the small sample size and lack of comparison, and further experimental research is needed.

1.7 A unique new solution to the tram dilemma

According to Qingping Liu, in any dilemma, especially in substantive dilemmas such as the tram case, only by breaking the rigid pattern of consequence theory and moral theory, can we find the right way of thinking to solve the dilemmas: keeping in mind the finiteness of human beings, especially the finiteness of realizing free will, following the actual human nature logic of pursuing good and avoiding evil, choosing the first and giving up the second, and sticking to the bottom line of justice of doing no harm and respecting human rights, consciously aware of the various kinds of human rights. To consciously realize the different good or bad consequences of alternative choices, and then to make self-determined choices based on free will and the courage to assume autonomous responsibility.

Moreover, he creatively put forward the solution of bystanders sacrificing themselves to stop the tram and the post-conduct moral understanding that the act of saving five people cannot be considered noble, which is very enlightening to us.

2. Moral metaphors and value judgement

2.1 Only a certain kind of metaphor exists

Metaphorization of concepts is an important issue in the current field of concepts' research. The so-called metaphor refers to a concept in the cognitive domain is systematically used in another cognitive domain for the expression of the concept, this expression in most cases is automated and unaware, and even in many cases, the metaphorical expression has become the original meaning of the word, and only through the metaphor, people can express these concepts, for example, "heavy & important" (perceptual category expressing the concept of value), "above & leader" (spatial category expressing the concept of right), "cold & indifference"(temperature perceptual category expressing the abstract socio-emotional concept).[29]

We found an interesting data in the "Global Philosophers Survey" released on 18th November. 63.4% of the philosophers chose to answer the "Tram Dilemma" by "turn" (keep 5 alive), 13.3% of philosophers chose "don't turn" (keep 1 alive); for the "Flyover Dilemma", 22% of philosophers chose "push" and 56% chose "don't push".[30]

Thus, we wondered whether there is such a possibility: there is some kind of moral metaphor that interferes with people's judgement on the "Tram Dilemma". Therefore, with the help of the "Questionnaire Star" platform, we put a single

questionnaire collected from the public. In order to avoid interference between the questions, each questionnaire is not answered by the same person in principle, but in the selection of the sample to try to achieve complete randomness (possible non-randomness is the phenomenon of weak correlation such as whether to use the Internet and watch the questionnaire message), and anonymity.

The authors' questions were set as follows:

Question 1: The Tram Dilemma: Will you change the direction of the tram when there are five people tied to the track ahead of the tram travelling and one person tied to the other track?

Question 2: A Tram Dilemma about people with close ties variant: five people are tied to the track in front of the tram travelling, and one of your family or friends (the other five are not) is tied to the other track, will you change the direction of the tram?

Question 3: The Flyover Dilemma: In the Tram Dilemma, if pushing down a fat person on a flyover could save five people on the railway tracks under the flyover, will you push him down?

Question 4: A Noble Variant of the Flyover Dilemma: In the Tram Dilemma, if **sacrificing** a fat person on a flyover could **save** five people on the railway tracks under the flyover, will you push him down?

Question 5: A Despicable Variant of the Flyover Dilemma: In the Tram Dilemma, if pushing down a fat person on the flyover (who will be **killed**) can **save** five people on the tracks under the flyover, will you push him down?

Question 6: A crude variant of the Tram Dilemma: In a dangerous situation, if the death of one person would allow five people to live, would you do it? (all six are identical)

Question 7: A noble and crude variant of the Tram Dilemma: In a dangerous situation, if **sacrificing** one person could keep five people alive, would you do it? (all six are identical)

Question 8: A despicable and crude variation of the Tram Dilemma: In a dangerous situation, if **murdering** one person could keep five people alive, would you do it? (all six are identical)

The results are shown in the table below:

Performance \ Question	The Number of Questionnaires Issued	Recovery Questionnaire （Recovery Rate）	Valid Questionnaire （Effect Rate）	Yes （Percentage）	No （Percentage）	None （Percentage）
1	400	395 （98.75%）	395 （100%）	253 （64.1%）	137 （34.68%）	5 （1.27%）
2	400	397 （99.25%）	396 （99.75%）	5 （1.26%）	387 （97.73%）	4 （1.01%）
3	400	387 （96.75%）	387 （100%）	100 （25.84%）	281 （72.61%）	6 （1.55%）
4	400	399 （99.75%）	390 （97.94%）	169 （43.3%）	208 （53.3%）	13 （3.3%）
5	400	389 （97.25%）	387 （99.49%）	9 （2.33%）	362 （93.54%）	16 （4.13%）
6	400	395 （98.75%）	393 （99.49%）	142 （36.13%）	240 （61.1%）	11 （2.89%）
7	400	396 （99%）	382 （96.46%）	272 （71.20%）	104 （27.23%）	6 （1.57%）
8	400	400 （100%）	398 （99.5%）	7 （1.76%）	388 （97.49%）	1 （0.25%）

*In order to ensure that the data obtained are in line with the rules of exploring the issue of "moral dilemmas",

questionnaires with a response time of less than 60s (in practice, qualified questionnaires take less than 40s) are considered valid; in order to ensure that more questionnaires are recovered and more effective, the option of "unfilled" was set but not informed in advance (i.e., if you do not select it, you can submit it successfully by directly choosing "Next").

According to the results, it is easy to see that, first of all, the answers to "tram dilemma" are more in line with the philosophers' answers, and the number of "turn" choices significantly decreases to a very low level after the introduction of the concept of family and friends (a metaphor for closeness and the obligation to help), which is confirmed by Jenzer's study [31] too. The study also confirms that the higher the closeness, the more likely moral judgements are to be influenced by closeness and to act in defense of the close person.

Language affects logical judgements. We have made a crude simplification of the tram dilemma as a control group; after the introduction of the concept of "sacrifice" (a noble metaphor), the number of choices for "causing a person to die" nearly doubled, while the number of choices for "causing a person to die" decreased to less than 10 per cent of the control group after the introduction of the concept of "murder" (a despicable metaphor).

On reflection, although the survey tried to avoid interfering options, in fact, there was a problem of inconsistency of subjects to form an accurate control; at the same time, due to financial constraints ($0.1/copy, totaling $320), the sample size was insufficient to support the conclusions because the data is more meaningful when you have a large number of subjects; and the logic of the language still interfered with the judgement of the subjects.

However, according to the conditions of the statistical data, it can still be initially considered that the moral metaphor of "noble vs. despicable" did influence the answer to the "Tram Dilemma".

2.2 Moral metaphors from the perspective of value judgement

In this survey, there is an unexpected situation, that is, for the investigation of the "flyover dilemma", the proportion of subjects choosing to "push down" compared with the philosophers has increased significantly, so the authors compare these two questions.

The philosopher's version of the Flyover Dilemma: In the Tram Dilemma, if pushing down a **person** on a flyover could save five people on the railway tracks under the flyover, will you push him down?

The authors' version of the Flyover Dilemma: In the Tram Dilemma, if pushing down a **fat person** on a flyover could save five people on the railway tracks under the flyover, will you push him down?

The gap in this question arises simply because of the difference between a "person" and a "fat person", which the authors find has been explored by Minrui Zhong [32], and the identity of the "fat person" (called the "victim identifiability") influences people's judgement to make moral judgement choices.

The authors argue that this is a non-benign value judgement.

Value judgement that is the judgment about value, which refers to whether a particular subject or a particular object has value, what value, and how much value of the judgment. To put it more bluntly, it means that people tend to make judgements about various social phenomena and problems, whether they are good or bad and whether they should be or not. Since this kind of judgment is directly related to people's values, it is called value judgment.[33]

This is reflected in this survey as "fat people have lower value".

In fact, it seems that the words "noble" and "despicable" in 1 also have the moral metaphor of value judgment [34]. To sacrifice now means to give one's life for a just cause; to save means to rescue from distress or danger [35]; to murder means to design to kill [36]. The first two terms have a clear value judgement towards good and the third term has a clear value judgement towards bad.

Due to financial constraints, the authors are unable to launch another questionnaire survey, but according to daily observation, people generally have a negative attitude towards people with "physical defects", "obese", "ugly", and so on. However, it has been observed that people generally stereotype people with "physical defects", "obese", "ugly", etc. as having a slippery slope of personality meaning, and it is not difficult to explain why people subjectively tend to believe that such people are more inferior in value judgement, thus affecting the choice of moral metaphors for such questions.

The authors will explore this issue further.

3. The application of "moral dilemma teaching method" in primary school moral and rule of law course

3.1 Kohlberg's "moral dilemma approach"

In Lawrence Kohlberg's moral dilemmas, the educator presents a higher stage or level of moral judgement in response to children's reasoning and judgement on moral dilemmas, in order to arouse children's cognitive conflict, so that children can improve their moral cognitive reasoning level in the conflict, and acquire and internalize moral knowledge.[37]

What Kohlberg was interested in was not really the children's answers to moral dilemmas, but the reasoning process behind their answers, which he documented. His research found that children's moral development follows a universal law, which is from self-interested behavior to principle-abiding behavior [38], and this process can be divided into three levels and six stages, which we will not repeat here.

3.2 Reasons for the application of the "moral dilemma teaching method".

In China's current moral education (including primary school moral and rule of law course), it has long term been a kind of indoctrination, through teaching the way to let students understand, what is a good character (such as "righteousness and courage", "help others to be happy"), what is a bad character (such as "cheating" and "stealing"), and simply regard a virtue as a quality in themselves. Against the background of educational reform, moral education programmers in China have become more interesting and practical, but in actual teaching, teachers still insist on the simple inculcation and explanation of "virtue".

Moral principles and other norms of social life are not only special rules for guiding behavior, but also ways of making judgement and decisions. They are not only prescriptive in nature, but should be a way of thinking to make moral judgement and a way of dealing with moral conflicts. The real situation of social life is more complex than any difficult mathematical problem. Simplicity and purity are merely the happiness of youth, but as we grow older and assume responsibilities, most time of our lives are filled with the tension of conflict and the difficulty of choice.[39]

The *Outline of Basic Education Curriculum Reform (for Trial Implementation)* suggests that we should create situations close to students' lives and let them experience the process of exploration, thinking and research. Compared with the "superior knowledge inculcation" in China's moral education, Kohlberg's "moral dilemmas" essentially provide a more realistic context, which is more conducive to students' learning, and these stories are beneficial not only in the fact that they portray a picture of life and help students to adapt to the real world, but also in the fact that they allow students to grow up in the process of thinking, and provide a preview for students to analyze and think about real life problems.

Jing Xiao and Zejiang Pan[40] analyzed the moral dilemma teaching method from the theoretical level and the practical level, they think that the moral dilemma teaching method takes the students as the main body, puts the students in the moral dilemma conflict, and lets the students improve their moral cognitive ability and role-recognition ability in solving the conflict, and ultimately improves the moral level. And it pays more attention to the development of students' main body and the practicability, so it is supposed to be more effective.

4. Suggestions for the use of "moral dilemma teaching method" in practical teaching

4.1 Defining the stages and making sufficient preparations

In the authors' opinion, the teaching of "moral dilemma teaching method" can be applied in practice needs complete steps, which at least need to include: Teachers carefully design and prepare the dilemma situation - Present the dilemma situation and let the students face the conflict - Students clearly indicate their own opinions about the conflict -Students clearly state their own solutions to the problem - Students discuss the problem - Teacher clarify values and students make moral judgements.

4.2 Ensuring the authenticity of the situation

Authentic situations are the "field" in which students' abilities and qualities grow.[41] The life of the "moral dilemma" lies in its authenticity, as people construct their own values based on what they have seen, heard and experienced in real life.

Personal experiences and real events that happen around them are the most effective in triggering cognitive conflicts among students.[42] Only by adopting real-life situations will students be able to answer questions as honestly as possible, without evading them by questioning them, and make considered judgements that will enable the teacher to grasp the true level of the students and to guide them when necessary.

The moral dilemma model can be used in conjunction with real social practice to avoid the situation of not being able to say what they mean;[43] it can also be carried out with the virtual reality technology used by David Navarrete, as mentioned in "I", so that students can have a real experience.

4.3 Considering Kohlberg's theory of developmental psychology carefully

Teachers' choice of moral dilemmas should not only be derived from students' lives, but should also follow the developmental laws of students' moral understanding, and should not be overly complex, resulting in students' half-understanding or one-sided understanding.[44] Primary school students are at the "pre-customary level" and "customary level", so teachers need to choose moral dilemmas according to Kohlberg's theory of stages of psychological development.

4.4 Clarifying the legal issues

The second variant of the authors' design for the tram dilemma actually has a legal problem.

There are legal provisions[45]: the natural person's right to life, the right to body, the right to health is infringed upon or in other critical situations, the organization or individual who has the legal obligation to help should provide timely help; such as parents have the obligation to help their children, husbands have the obligation to help their wives and so on. Therefore, even if the tram driver's choice to "turn" does not constitute the accusation of "murder", does not bear moral condemnation, and still abandons obligation to render salvage service.

The argument that it does not constitute murder stems from the discussion of "the legal theory on emergency to avoid an immediate danger" (may name emergency hedge), so let's discuss it briefly.

Article 21 of the Criminal Law of China provides: "In order to save the state, public interests, personal and property and other rights of oneself or others from the danger that is occurring, the act of emergency hedge, resulting in damage, shall not be held criminally liable."

From this, we can see that there are several key points at the beginning of the emergency hedge, first, it needs to safeguard "the interests protected by law"; second, it needs to "encounter danger"; third, it needs to be "impossible to take other measures to avoid". And its behavior is in this last resort to damage other smaller interests, to protect the larger interests from the danger of damage; its judgement needs to observe the details of the act, to analyze the whole process of the act, although some legitimate rights and interests have been damaged, but it does not have any social harm, and does not constitute any crime.

Obviously, the emergency hedge requires to measure the legal interests saved rather than the infringed legal interests. However, Chinese law stipulates that everyone is equal before the law, embodying the fairness and justice, a certain person in order to five lives and deprive others of their lives is unfair, life cannot be hedged.

If the damage caused is exactly the same as the damage avoided, from the point of view of the interests of society as a whole, this kind of risk-avoidance behavior does not make the society reduce its losses, and thus has no significance; if the damage caused is greater than that avoided, then it is a socially detrimental behavior, which is not permissible.[46]

In the "Tram Dilemma", "save 1 or 5" by "turn" is contrary to the essence of emergency hedge.

As such, at least the act of "pushing down the fat person" constitutes an offence, and its legal implications need to be clarified.

4.5 Combining discussion and guidance

Affected by age and psychological maturity, the thinking of primary school students tends to have a certain one-sidedness. Real-life phenomena are complex and multi-faceted, there are few simple binary relationships, and contradictory things can even co-exist. In the moral dilemma situation, teachers should encourage students to make diversified choices and explain their reasons, teachers need to comment and analyze students' answers from a social point of view at the time of review, in the values of certain guidance, can let students make a relatively reasonable, legal choices, and cultivate students' sense of social responsibility.

Moral dilemmas are questions without standard answers, which means that teachers cannot determine a fixed answer for the question.[47] Therefore, the authors believe that it is inappropriate to force students to assimilate, and that students can be allowed and even encouraged to retain their own views if they are not obviously wrong (such as hit 6) and do not seriously conflict with the rules of the society, so as to form their own moral viewpoints that really belong to them.

Wenhong Shen [48] thinks that in essence freedom is the freedom of choice, and that freedom is the basis for the cultivation of the ability to make moral choices.

Freedom in ethics and morality means that the moral subject decides independently and autonomously to take certain actions and create certain behaviors among various objective possibilities in accordance with his or her will. Our previous closed, didactic and slogan-based moral education easily neglected the freedom of students, with others making choices on their behalf, without considering their wishes, so that they do not have to take responsibility (they have lost the basis of their freedom of choice to take responsibility), thus maybe becoming "hypocrites" or people lacking of social responsibility, who only talk about moral words but do not do moral deeds.

4.6 Leading students to understand the consequences of taking responsibility.

From the point of view of Qingping Liu in "I", the authors believe that we can put forward new solutions such as "jumping off the flyover by oneself" to be brave and self-sacrificing, but it should be noted that this requires students to take responsibility -- here it is the loss of their own lives, in the "push down the fat person" behavior is a crime, etc., students can adhere to their own moral views, but must guide students to clearly take responsibility for the consequences of even "Is jumping off the flyover ethical for parents? " This is also a kind of moral education.

4.7 Recognizing the inadequacy of the theory

In Kohlberg's view, moral dilemmas can be resolved in cognitive reasoning. In practice, however, it is not possible for people to make action choices based on moral knowledge alone. This is because there is a clear gap between cognitive reasoning and moral decision. Decisions are considered (or practically reasoned) desires that are the cause of practice.[49] At the same time, the limitations of Kohlberg's moral developmental psychology are mainly manifested in the following two aspects: firstly, it does not solve the problem of knowing and doing in moral education, and the theory only stays in the study of moral judgement development and ignores the study of moral behavior; secondly, the theory is limited to the rational level and ignores the irrational level (the factors of motivation and moral emotions and other affective level); in fact, the study of the spatio-temporal characteristics of tram dilemma ERP shows that affective factors are involved in the process of individuals making moral dilemma judgements.[50]

Only by recognizing its shortcomings can we take the best and remove the worst and apply it to the practice of moral and rule of law course education in primary schools.

The authors' main suggestions are as above, but there are still many excellent paradigms of moral dilemma practice (e.g., the "other" model[51]) that we should further study, learn, practice, reflect on and explore.

Since the "moral dilemma" represented by the "Tram Dilemma" was raised, many scholars have put forward their own views and opinions, and the authors have only commented on some of them and put forward the perspective of "moral metaphors based on value judgement" in order to make the "moral dilemma approach" more effective and to prove the thinking angle of answering this question, and has also argued and put forward relevant opinions on the application of

"moral dilemma teaching method" in primary school moral and rule of law course. However, there are still many mistakes and problems in the authors' paper, which will continue to be explored and researched.

With the development of brain science, the progress of value clarification theory and the advent of artificial intelligence autopilot problem[52], "moral dilemma" will be further expanded and occupy a more important position in philosophy, ethics and sociology. The authors would like to conclude with a sentence from Ms. Fang's article[53]: In the history of human existence, morality is an indispensable existence, and it is a winning strategy to maintain the harmonious survival of the human beings. The purpose of moral education is, to a certain extent, to teach people how to live in harmony. For man must not only ensure his own survival, but also not endanger the survival of others.

Conflicts of interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

[1] Foot P. The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of the Double Effect [J]. Oxford Reviews. 1967; 5(1): 5-15.

[2] Young L, Cushman F, Adolphs R, et al. Does Emotion Mediate the Relationship Between an Actions Moral Status and its Intentional Status? Neuropsychological Evidence [J]. Journal of Cognition and Culture. 2006; 6(1-2): 291-304.

[3] Greene J D, Sommerville R B, Nystrom, L E, et al. An fMRI Investigation of Emotional Engagement in Moral Judgment [J]. Science. 2001; 293 (5537): 2105.

[4] Petrinovieh L, O'Neill P, Jorgensen M. An Empirical Study of Moral Intuitions: Toward an Evolutionary Ethics [J]. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1993; 64: 467-478.

[5] Jeremy Bianchin. Introduction to the Principles of Morality and Legislation [M]. Translated by Shi Yinhong. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2000.

[6] Jacques P. Thiroux. Ethics: Theory and Practice (11th Edition) [M]. Prentice Hall. 2011.

[7] Marc D H. Moral Minds: How Nature Designed Our Universal Sense of Right and Wrong [M]. New York: Ecco/HarperCollins, 2006.

[8] Navarrete C D, McDonald M M, Mot M L, et al. Virtual Morality: Emotion and Action in a Simulated Three-Dimensional "Trolley Problem" [J]. Emotion. 2012; 12 (2): 364 - 370.

[9] Eyal T, Liberman N, Trope Y. Judging Near and Distant Virtue and Vice [J]. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology. 2008; 44(4): 1204 - 1209.

[10] Trope Y. Construal Levels and Psychological Distance: Effects on Representation, Prediction, Evaluation, and Behavior[J]. Journal of Consumer Psychology. 2007; 17: 83 -95.

[11] Kan Zhongyu. The effect of psychological distance on moral judgement[D]. Chongqing: Southwest University, 2010.

[12] Zhong Minrui. The effect of victim identifiability on moral judgement[D]. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University, 2011.

[13] Bleske- Rechek A, Lyndsay A N, Jonathan P B, et al. Evolution and the Trolley Problem: People Save Five Over One Unless the One Is Young, Genetically Related, Or a Romantic Partner [J]. The Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology. 2010; 4(3): 115-127.

[14] Anderson S W, Beehara A, Damasio H, et al. Impairment of Social and Moral Behavior Related to Early Damage in Human Prefrontal Cortex[D]. Nature Neuroscience. 1999; 2: 1032 - 1037.

[15] Shweder R A, Haidt J. The Future of Moral Psychology: Truth, Intuition, and the Pluralist Way [J]. PsychologicalScience. 1993; 4: 360 - 365.

[16] Xie Xiyao, Luo Yuejia. Emotional factors in moral judgement-an exploration from the perspective of cognitive neuroscience[J]. Advances in Psychological Science. 2009; (7):1250- 1256.

[17] Chaiken S, Trope Y. Dual Process Models in Social Psychology [M]. New York: Guilford Press, 1999.

[18] Miao Fangyan. An Ethical Study of "Cognitive-Intuitive" Moral Judgement[D]. Southeast University, 2019.

[19] Li Jian, Wang Yan, Tang Yiyuan. Spatio-temporal analysis of ERP on moral dilemma[J]. Chinese Journal of Biomedical Engineering. 2011; 30(02): 220-224.

[20] Wang Yan. Cognitive Behavioral and ERP Research on Moral Dilemma Decision Trade-off[D]. Dalian University of Technology, 2013.

[21] Zhuo Hua. Reflections triggered by the "Tram Problem"[J]. Legal Expo. 2018; (12): 166.

[22] Zhao Tingyang. The moral bifurcation of trams[J]. Philosophical Research. 2015; (05): 96-102+129.

[23] Li Deshun. The end of value solipsism--Sandel's theory of justice from the "tram problem"[J]. Philosophy Research. 2017; (02): 3-10+128.

[24] Sandel, Zhang Hanzhou, Wan Siyan, Liu Liangjian. From "Comparative Dialogue" to "Collaborative Dialogue"-Response and Comments on Professor Chen Lai and Other Professors[J]. Journal of East China Normal University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition). 2016; 48(03): 171-173+184.

[25] Han Dongping. Is the "Tram Problem" not difficult? --Discussion with Zhao Tingyang and Li Deshun[J]. Contemporary Chinese Values Research. 2020; 5(03): 5-14.

[26] Liu Weikun. Moral Dilemma Discussion - From the Perspective of Utilitarianism[J]. Western Journal. 2015; (08): 78-80.

[27] Liu Mingjuan, Liao Fenglin. Tram conundrum: The effect of situational numbers on moral judgement and compassion[J]. Journal of Capital Normal University (Natural Science Edition). 2013; 34(02): 82-88.

[28] Liu Qingping. A New Solution to the Tram Problem: Free Will and Autonomous Responsibility in a Dilemma[J]. Journal of Zhejiang University (Humanities and Sociology Edition). 2020; 50(03): 198-208.

[29] Cai Guangyao. Spatial Metaphors of Moral Concepts and Their Effects on Moral Judgement[D]. Ludong University, 2019.

[30] Justin Weinberg. What Philosophers Believe: Results from the 2020 Phil Papers Survey[EB/OL].https://dailynous.com/2021/11/01/what-philosophers-believe-results-from-the-2020-philpapers-survey/ [2024-5-12]

[31] Zhan Ze. Moral judgement in interpersonal relationships: the influence of intimacy [D]. Beijing Forestry University, 2019.

[32] Zhong Minrui. The effect of victim identifiability on moral judgement[D]. Guangxi Normal University, 2011.

[33] Shu Guoying. On the scientific problem of jurisprudence[J/OL]. Politics and Law Forum. 2022; (01): 1-14[2021-12-28].

[34] Baidubaike. Xisheng (English: sacrifice) [EB/OL]. https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E7%89%BA%E7%89%B2/4839?fr=aladdin [2024-5-12]

[35] Baidubaike. Zhengjiu (English: save) [EB/OL]. https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E6%8B%AF%E6%95%91/9526406?fr=aladdin [2024-5-12]

[36] Baidubaike. Mouhai (English: murder) [EB/OL]. https://baike.baidu.com/item/%E8%B0%8B%E5%AE%B3/240265?fr=aladdin [2024-5-12]

[37] Lawrence Kohlberg, Corson. Psychological perspectives on moral education[J]. Foreign Educational Materials. 1985; (05): 49-56+48.

[38] Pan Kaiwen. The Three Stages of Moral Conscience: What the Tram Problem Experiment Tells Us[J]. World Expo. 2020; (20): 62-65.

[39] Liu Yuan. Kohlberg's moral dilemma storytelling method and its inspiration for moral education in secondary schools in China[D]. Shanghai Normal University, 2008.

[40] Xiao Jing, Pan Zejiang. On the use of "moral dilemma" in moral education[J]. Journal of Central South University for Nationalities (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition). 2005; (S1): 330-332.

[41] Hu Guoxian. Discussion on the application strategy of "moral dilemma method" in the teaching of morality and rule of law class[J]. Teacher. 2021; (18): 45-46.

[42] Wang Kanying. The use of dilemma situation in teaching morality and rule of law[J]. Primary school teaching reference. 2021; (33): 70-71.

[43] Song Ting. Research and Analysis on the Moral Level of Adolescents--Based on the Choice of Moral Dilemma[J]. Modern Communication. 2020; (02): 128-129.

[44] Liu Wei. "The use of moral dilemma method in the teaching of morality and rule of law class[J]. Teaching Monthly Primary School Edition (Comprehensive). 2018; (12): 16-18.

[45] National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China. Civil Code of the People's Republic of China [M]. Article 105, 2020

[46] Gao Ge. On the emergency avoidance in China's criminal law [J]. Legal Studies. 1985; (03): 42- 48.

[47] Huang Huiling. How to Cultivate Students' Moral Judgement in Teaching Moral Dilemmas[J]. Primary School Teaching Reference. 2021; (33): 72-73.

[48] Shen Wenhong. Research on the moral self-development of primary school students[D]. Suzhou University, 2008.

[49] Aristotle. Nicomachean ethics[M]. Liao Shenbai, Translation. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2012.

[50] Shi Xiaoran, Yang Luyan. The use of Kohlberg's moral dilemma in education[J]. Dai Zong Journal of Tai'an Institute of Education. 2011; 15(04): 60-61.

[51] Sun Yuan. The "other" demonstration in moral dilemma education[J]. Chinese Journal of Education. 2018; (04): 86-92.

[52] Wan Dan, Zhan Hao. Philosophical analysis of responsibility subject and moral dilemma of self-driving cars[J]. Social Science Front. 2021; (11): 24-32.

[53] Fang Leilei. The Mission of Moral Education: Transcending the Dependent Existence of Human Beings[J]. Chinese Journal of Education. 2017; (06): 89-96.