ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Preparing Good Citizenship through Active Stakeholder Participation: Some Ethiopian Schools in Focus

Mulugeta Yayeh

Abstract

The preparation of informed, effective, and responsible citizens is a formidable task that requires the active participation and passionate commitment of many individuals and institutions. Hence, understanding and describing the participation of Civic and Ethical Education stakeholders, in Ethiopia, in the process of good citizenship was the purpose of this study. To achieve this purpose, a descriptive survey design, using both quantitative and qualitative methods was employed. Through different sampling techniques, 30 civic and ethical education teachers, 300 students, 100 non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, and 22 school leaders were selected from 10 schools found in two woredas of East Gojjam administrative zone. Questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were used to gather data pertinent to the study. Based on the data gathered and analyzed, the study revealed that stakeholders of citizenship education, in Ethiopia, did not satisfactorily discharge their responsibilities for good citizenship. Finally, some recommendations that could possibly mitigate the problem (e.g., awareness creation on the responsibility of good citizenship) are included.

Keywords: *Citizenship Education, Ethiopia, Good Citizen, In-school stakeholders, Out-school stakeholders, Traditional institutions*

Department of Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia

BACKGROUND

Nowadays, the issue of good citizenship has embraced a central position in the education system of many countries. Due to this, the principal mission of schooling has now become the preparation of good citizenship. In this regard, Citizenship education, focusing on the development of civic knowledge, skills, attitudes, and dispositions on students, has been universally recognized as vital in realizing this mission (Osler & Starkey, 2004; Cogan & Derricot, 2000; Davies, Gregory & Riley, 1999; Margaret, 1998). Besides, many scholars unanimously contend that the alpha and omega mission of any citizenship education is the preparation of good citizens (Cogan & Derricott, 2000; Margaret, 1998; Cotton, 1996).

However, issues of citizenship and good citizenship are still contested areas. Due to this, defining good citizenship and determining major qualities of a good citizen have remained problematic. Regardless of this, many scholars are trying to define good citizenship and to show major qualities that qualify a good citizen. For instance, a good citizen, according to Cotton (1996), is one who is well informed, mindful of the common good, committed to democratic values and principles, autonomous, respectful, and participant. Davies, Gregory, & Riley (1999, p. 44) on their part contend that good citizens are "individuals who have a high level of concern for the welfare of others, who conduct themselves in a strong moral and ethical manner, who are very conscious of their community obligations, and who participate in the community within which they live". Based on their investigation of teachers' views about good citizenship, these scholars further reported that behaviors of good citizens could be classified into the following three major categories. These are; (1) Social *concern*, concern for the welfare of others; moral and ethical behavior; tolerance of diversity within society, (2) *knowledge*, knowledge of government, current events, the world community, the ability to question ideas, and (3) *conservatism*, i.e. acceptance of those in a supervisory role; patriotism; and acceptance of assigned responsibilities (ibid, p. 7).

For Cogan & Derricott (2000), the following are qualities expected from citizens of the 21st century. These are; the ability to look at and approach problems as a member of a global society, the ability to work with others in a cooperative way and to take responsibility for one's roles/duties within society, the ability to understand, accept, appreciate and tolerate cultural differences, the capacity to think in a critical and systematic way, the willingness to resolve conflicts in a non-violent manner, the ability to be sensitive towards and to defend human rights, and the willingness and ability to participate in politics at local and international level.

From the preceding views of scholars, therefore, it is not difficult to understand the fact that to be a good citizen implies having too many qualities, duties, and responsibilities that are vital for the well-being of the individual citizen her/himself, to the society which she/he belongs to, and to the international community at large.

Coming to Ethiopia, the preparation of good citizenship has become, as of the 1990s, the central mission of the country's education system in general and that of Civic and Ethical Education in particular. This idea is explicitly manifested in major educational policy documents of the country (MOE, 2007; MOE, 2002; TGE, 1994). For instance, in different parts of the country's Education and Training Policy (hereafter ETP), one can find statements/

phrases that imply the need for good citizenship. For example, the following excerpt, taken from the objective

part of the policy, epitomizes this contention.

> Bring up citizens who respect human rights, stand for the well-being of people, as well as for equality, justice and peace, endowed with democratic culture and discipline; Bring up citizens who differentiate harmful practices from useful ones, who seek and stand for truth, appreciate aesthetics and show positive attitude towards the development and dissemination of science and technology in society (TGE, 1994, pp.7-8).

From the above statements, therefore, one can understand that the current education and training policy of Ethiopia has recognized the role of citizenship education in preparing good citizenship and building a democratic system. Moreover, it is possible to construe that this policy document has given attention to the preparation of informed, participant, and democratic citizens who could meaningfully contribute their part in the democratization process and play a significant role in tackling various social problems of the country.

The second and third Education Sector Development Programs (hereafter ESDPII and ESDP III) of the ministry of education in Ethiopia are also important educational policy documents that explicitly made good citizenship the mission of the country's education system in general and Civic and Ethical Education in particular. In this connection, in the ESDPII[1] document the mission of the country's educational institutions was stated as follows.

> The overall mission of all educational institutions in the country is to **produce good citizens** who respect and defend the rights and responsibilities stated in the constitution … participate in the economic development of the society,…Therefore, the overall goal of producing good citizenship shall continue to receive greater importance in the coming years (MOE, 2002, p.19, the emphasis is mine).

To achieve these objectives, the following strategy (among others) was formulated.

> The education system will be revitalized so that it nurtures and produces responsible citizens who participate actively in and also knowledgeable about public affairs. To this end, the central mission of all educational institutions will be to provide citizenship education (MOE, 2002, p. 22, my emphasis).

From ESDP II, therefore, it is possible to understand that the major goal of education in Ethiopia, during those five years, was the preparation of good citizens. It is also possible to discern that during those years, Civic and Ethical Education was given a substantial place in realizing this central mission of schooling.

Good citizenship remained the central mission of the education system during the next five-year education plan of Ethiopia. This was clearly indicated in the ESDP III[2] document as follows.

> The education system has a societal responsibility to produce good and responsible citizens**,** who understand, respect and defend the constitution, democratic values, and human rights; develop attitudes for research and work and solve problems; develop a sense of citizenship to participate in and contribute to the development of the community and the country (MOE, 2005, p. 26, my emphasis).

The above ideas imply that preparation of good citizens, which is also the ultimate goal of Citizenship Education, has been given due consideration in the implementation period of the third ESDP.

Likewise, the Blue Print of Civic and Ethical Education, the policy document of Civic and Ethical Education in Ethiopia, was another important educational policy document vis-à-vis citizenship education. This national policy document, which was published by the Ministry of Education in June 2007, elucidates the multi-faceted issues of citizenship education in the country. One important issue that this policy document gives attention is the stakeholders of Civic and Ethical Education. In this regard, the policy document enumerates various stakeholders. These include; the family, local community, religious institutions, schools, civic and ethical education teachers, non-civic and ethical education teachers, students, principals, supervisors, members

of Parent-Teacher- Association (PTA), district education offices, various governmental institutions, the mass media, non-governmental organizations, international organizations, and others (MOE, 2007). The responsibilities of each stakeholder, pertaining to the preparation of good citizenship, are also clearly specified in this policy document (MoE, 2007).

To sum up, in contemporary Ethiopia civic and ethical education, with the aim of preparing good citizenship, has become one of the topical issues of the country's education system. It has also become a statutory subject/course to be taught in all educational institutions of the country. For this reason, the country has publicized various educational policy documents that emphasized the need for good citizenship. In these policy documents, the participation of major stakeholders has been recognized decisive in realizing the need for good citizenship. This study, therefore, sought to understand the participation of major stakeholders of Civic and Ethical Education, in Ethiopia, with regard to their responsibilities for good citizenship.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Though citizenship education has been increasingly recognized as valuable approach to preparing good citizens, who could do well in addressing the multi-faceted problems of their societies, many studies explored that nations' desire for good citizenship has still remained an agenda that is not satisfactorily realized (McCowan, 2009; Cogan & Derricot, 2000; Davies, Gregory & Riley, 1999). Further, some studies explored that many societies today are besieged with unprecedented

social problems such as endemic corruption, lack of moral qualities, negligence for the common good, political apathy, and the like (Sharma, 2006; Taneja, 1990; Osler & Starkey, 2004).

Though the factors that attribute to the problems mentioned above could be different and country-specific, studies conducted on the issue at hand reported that the involvement of stakeholders of Citizenship Education and the approach used to implement the subject were some of the prime factors. For instance, the UNESCO (2003) pointed out that the decline of the upholders of ethical traditions (e.g., the family, religious institutions, neighborhoods, and other close social groups) was an important factor that aggravated the ethical/moral crisis of the day. Supporting this, Parker (2014) asserted that most parents today have become far from discharging the responsibility of shaping their children in an ethical manner. The study conducted by Aggrawal (2004) and Gardner, Cairns &Lawton (2000) too implied that the attempt to implement Citizenship Education with much reliance on formal curriculum and school teachers was another factor for inadequate achievements in citizenship education.

Similarly, local studies conducted on the implementation of Civic and Ethical Education[3] (CEE) in Ethiopia reported that the subject has been at a process of implementation without the meaningful support of individuals and institutions that were recognized to be potential stakeholders of good citizenship (Akalewold, 2005; Girma, 2006; MoE, 2007; Mulugeta, Animaw, Desalegn, Belay, 2011; Mulugeta, 2011). Due to this, the attempt to prepare good citizens who could play important roles in alleviating national and global problems seems less successful. Supporting this, some studies (e.g., Mulugeta et al., 2011; MoE, 2007) and popular discourse indicate that citizenship education in Ethiopia has not been preparing citizens who could actively participate in all developmental issues of the country.

The need for good citizenship can be realized if its impeding factors are properly investigated and mitigated. This study, therefore, attempts to investigate one of such factors, i.e., citizenship education stakeholders' involvement in the preparation of good citizens in Ethiopia. To be specific, the study sought to understand the participation of *traditional institutions* (families, communities, and religious institutions), *in-school actors* of civic and ethical education (teachers and school leaders), and *out-school stakeholders* (*woreda* education offices, governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, and the media), in the implementation process of civic and ethical education, and indeed in realizing the idea of good citizenship. Thus, the study attempts to look for answers to the following *research Questions*: To what extent are traditional institutions of citizenship successful in discharging their responsibilities of preparing good citizens? To what extent are *in-school* stakeholders successful in preparing good citizenship? To what extent are *out- school* stakeholders effective in building up good citizenship?

As far as the scope of the present study is concerned, it was geographically delimited to two *woredas* and ten schools found in East Gojjam Administrative Zone and to the investigation of only major stakeholders of citizenship education conceptually. The findings of this study would have been more dependable and

comprehensive if the scope of the study could have included more *woredas* and schools geographically, and many other stakeholders conceptually. As a result, conclusions and generalizations of the study need to be used cautiously.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this study, descriptive survey design**,** using both quantitative and qualitative methods was employed. Its data sources were students (grade 8, 10, and 12), teachers (both Civic and Ethical Education and non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers) and school leaders (principals, vice-principals, and supervisors).

To select the research participants, different sampling techniques were employed. In East Gojjam Administrative Zone, there were eighteen *woredas*. From these *woredas*, two of them (Debremarkos and Baso Liben) were selected based on purposive sampling technique. From the two *woredas,* five full cycle primary (1-8), three general secondary (9-10), and two preparatory secondary (11-12) schools were selected using similar sampling technique. Geographical convenience and staff size were criteria used to select the sample *woredas* and schools.

From the schools selected, all Civic and Ethical Education teachers and school leaders were selected using comprehensive sampling technique. This is because they were major stakeholders of Civic and Ethical Education at the grassroots level and most importantly their number was not as such large to be sampled through probability sampling. Students from the upper grades of each cycle (grades 8, 10, and 12) and non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, however, were selected using stratified sampling methods. The reason behind selecting students at the upper-grade levels of the second cycle primary, general secondary, and preparatory levels is due to the fact that students at these grade levels are more matured and experienced having better information on the issue under investigation than students of lower grades. As a result, a total of 300 students, 30 Civic and Ethical Education teachers, 100 non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, and 22 school leaders were selected as sample of this study.

In order to obtain data pertinent to the study, questionnaires and semi-structured interviews were employed. In this regard, three sets of *questionnaires* for teachers (Civic and Ethical Education teachers and non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers), students, and school leaders were developed. Both Likert type close-ended questions, ranging from 1(very low) to 5 (very high) and open-ended questions were employed. The close-ended items were developed by referring to the major duties and responsibilities of various stakeholders of good citizenship, as enumerated in the *Blue Print of Civic and Ethical Education* (MoE, 2007). In this regard, a total of sixty-four (for teachers and school leaders) and thirty-seven (for students) close-ended items, in the form of Likert scale, were developed and used. These items were developed so as to obtain data on the participation level of each of the stakeholders of good citizenship. Besides, three open-ended items that focused on the status and challenges of stakeholder participation were included. Moreover, two different, but related *semi-structured interviews* were developed and used. These instruments were developed to get in-depth data, from teachers and school leaders, concerning the status and problems of stakeholders' participation.

In order to check the *reliability and validity* of the questionnaires, pilot testing was made in two schools (one primary and one general and preparatory secondary school) in a nearby *woreda* that was not chosen as sample of the study. By so doing, the reliabilities of the three questionnaires, i.e. questionnaires for students, teachers, and school leaders were found to be 0.69, 0.74, and 0.71 Crombach Alpha respectively. The instruments' facial and content validities were also checked by a colleague. Then, based on feedbacks obtained, some measures were taken to make the instruments more reliable and valid. It was after this that the researcher precedes to the actual data gathering process. All of the questionnaires were administered by the researcher himself in a face-to-face approach. During data gathering, attempts were made to briefly orient the research participants, particularly students, on the purposes and procedures of filling in the questionnaires. In most cases, students filled in the questionnaires in their classrooms with the presence of the researcher. Due to this, all questionnaires distributed were returned back to the researcher.

As far as *data analysis* is concerned, both quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods were employed. Descriptive data analysis techniques, i.e., mean and standard deviation were employed in order to analyze the quantitative data. Besides, thematic data analysis, using direct quotation, description, and, narration techniques were employed so as to analyze the qualitative data. Finally, in this study unreserved efforts were made to strictly observe the major *ethical principles* of research. In this regard, the major duty of a researcher, i.e., the obligation to respect the rights, needs, values, and desires of participants during data gathering and analysis processes (Creswell, 2014; Seidman, 2006) were given due consideration.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This part of the article presents results of the study underneath three themes. The three themes emanate from the three research questions that are indicated earlier.

Participation of traditional institutions in good citizenship

As already stated, the first research question of this study was related to the participation of traditional institutions in the preparation of good citizenship. For this purpose, the four groups of respondents, i.e., students, CEE teachers, non-CEE teachers, and school leaders were asked to rate their level of participation using 14 Likert items. Their responses, therefore, are presented in Table 1 below:

Table-1: Participants' ratings on the Participation of Traditional Institutions

Stakeholder	**Students (n=300)**		**CEE Teachers (n=30)**		**Non-CEE Teachers (n=100)**		**School Leaders (n=22)**	
	M	SD	M	M	M	SD	M	SD
Parents	2.44	.39	1.96	1.98	2.2	.69	1.98	.48
Community	2.42	.50	2.2	2.09	2.44	.82	2.09	.52
Religious institutions	2.96	.91	2.4	2.32	2.92	.84	2.32	.73
Grand Mean	**2.6**	**0.6**	**2.18**	**2.13**	**2.52**	**0.78**	**2.13**	**0.57**

Table 1 depicts the grand means of students', Civic and Ethical Education teachers', non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers', and school leaders' ratings concerning the overall participation of traditional institutions vis-à-vis good citizenship. As it can be seen from the table, these respondents rated the participation of these institutions as 2.6, 2.18, 2.52, and 2.13 respectively. Stated in another way, neither of these institutions' participation had reached to the expected mean, i.e. 3.

The above quantitative data was also found to be consistent with the qualitative data obtained through interviews. For instance, one of the preparatory school principals appraised the involvement of traditional institutions in the process of good citizenship as follows.

> Though the role of these institutions [traditional institutions] in shaping the new generation is decisive, their participation, in practice, is too negligible. Nowadays, many parents are not willing to even to attend consultative meetings that we arrange at the end of each semester. The same is true for the local community. In short no one seems to bother with the fate of the young generation.

This research participant had also the following to add.

> Generally, there is much reliance on schools and their educators, particularly Civic and Ethical Education teachers, for the preparation of good citizenship. In other words, many other stakeholders are not discharging their responsibility partly due to their belief that such responsibilities are reserved only to schools and their teachers.

Both of the quantitative and qualitative data presented above; therefore, imply that the participation of traditional institutions in the process of good citizenship has been at its lowest level.

Participation of in-school stakeholders in preparing good citizenship

Understanding the participation of in-school stakeholders of good citizenship, i.e. teachers and school leaders, was another concern of this study. Hence, using 31 items, participants were asked to rate the level these stakeholders' participation. Research participants' responses are, therefore, presented in Tables 2 and 3 as follows.

Table-2: Participation of Teachers in Good Citizenship

Stakeholder	Students (n=300)		CEE Teachers (n=30)		Non-CEE Teachers (n=100)		School Leaders (n=22)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
CEE Teachers	2.4	.41	3.2	.79	2.8	0.9	2.9	.64
Non-CEE Teachers	2.17	.49	2.0	.75	2.52	.98	2.48	.74
Grand Mean	**2.28**	**.45**	**2.6**	**.77**	**2.66**	**.94**	**2.69**	**.69**

Table 2 shows the participation level of both CEE and non-CEE teachers in preparing good citizenship. As clearly shown on this table, the grand means of these stakeholders' participation were found to be 2.28, 2.6, 2.66, and 2.69. Put succinctly, their participation level was below the expected mean (3). This implies that these stakeholders have not been satisfactorily discharging their responsibility for good citizenship.

Some qualitative data obtained through interview also substantiate this finding. For instance, one of the primary school Civic and Ethical Education teachers reported the participation of non-CEE teachers as follows.

> Though there is a slight improvement, still many things remained unresolved. For instance, non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers' involvement in teaching the values of Civic and Ethical Education is insignificant.

A vice principal from one of the general secondary schools, on his part, forwarded the following ideas focusing on civic and ethical education teachers.

> Undoubtedly, most of the responsibilities for good citizenship are shouldered by civic and ethical education teachers. Through formal instructional processes and co-curricular activities, they are trying their best to foster citizenship values on their students.

Regardless of this, this participant had the following to say about the problems that he observed from civic and ethical education teachers.

> The problem, however, is that the instructional approaches they follow are not in line with those indicated in the blueprint of civic and ethical education. Besides, I do not dare to say that they are discharging many of their responsibilities stipulated in the same document.

Therefore, based on the above quantitative and qualitative data, it is possible to understand that teachers' participation in the process of building up good citizenship has not reached a satisfactory level.

Table-3: Participation of School Leaders in Good Citizenship

Stakeholder	CEE Teachers (n=30)		Non-CEE Teachers (n=100)		School Leaders (n=22)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
PTA members	1.46	.46	1.76	.85	1.96	.42
Principals	1.97	.66	2.34	.01	2.69	.88
Supervisors	1.52	.53	1.8	.72	2.30	.59
Grand Mean	**1.65**	**.55**	**1.96**	**.52**	**2.31**	**.63**

Table 3 indicates the ratings of Civic and Ethical Education teachers, non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, and school leaders concerning the participation of the three major bodies of school leadership. As it can be seen from the same table, the overall performance of school leaders, i.e., PTA members, principals, and supervisors, in the implementation process of Civic and Ethical Education (good citizenship) have been somewhat low. For instance, all of the roles of PTA members were rated below 2 (low).

Besides, the performance of principals was reported to be low. Their performance, particularly in the eyes of Civic and Ethical Education teachers, was rated only 1.97.

Finally, the means shown in Table 3 above indicate that supervisors' performance in the process of good citizenship has been lower than that of principals. Except in the ratings of school leaders (2.30), supervisors' performance was found to be below 2 (low). This is clearly indicated in the ratings of Civic and Ethical Education teachers (1.52) and non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers (1.8).

Qualitative data obtained through interviews also support the above finding. For instance, from the interviewees conducted with teachers, one Civic and Ethical Education teacher, working in a secondary school, reported the following about her supervisor.

> Most of the time, our supervisor is not concerned with instructional issues. For example, one of his responsibilities, the responsibility to provide professional support on issues such as modern teaching, assessment techniques, action research, and textbook evaluation is almost untouched. He devotes most of his time to perform different managerial activities.

The qualitative data obtained from other participants were also consistent with the above qualitative data. In many instances, supervisors were reported to be less successful in discharging their responsibility of supporting the teaching-learning process. Surprisingly, from the interviews conducted on the role of supervisors, it was learned that a general propensity to consider supervisors just as *post office workers* has prevailed among school practitioners. Put differently, instead of considering them as educational professionals, school practitioners, including principals, tend to consider

supervisors as individuals assigned to solicit exchange of information from *woreda* education offices to schools and vice versa.

Supervisors themselves had also a similar opinion vis-à-vis their participation in civic and ethical education. For instance, one supervisor who participated in the interview had the following to say.

> I personally do not have the courage to say that I was successful in discharging my responsibilities for good citizenship. Particularly, my involvement in mobilizing stakeholders and supporting the instructional process of Civic and Ethical Education is too minimal.

Therefore, what can be understood at this juncture is that school leaders' roles and responsibilities, with regard to the implementation process of civic and ethical education and the preparation of good citizenship, were not well-practiced.

Participation of out-school institutions in building up good citizenship

In order to answer the third research question, i.e. "to what extent are *out-school* stakeholders effective in building up good citizenship?" 19 items were presented to the research participants. Their responses for these items are presented in Table 4.

Table-4: Respondents' Ratings on the Participation of out-school institutions

Stakeholder	**CEE Teachers (n=30)**		**Non-CEE Teachers (n=100)**		**School Leaders (n=22)**	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Woreda education offices	1.9	.58	2.29	.55	2.05	.69
Various governmental institutions	2.06	.49	2.10	.36	2.5	.72
NGOs	1.3	.48	1.35	.48	1.58	.51
Mass media	2.16	.71	2.30	.61	2.44	.90
Grand Mean	**1.85**	**.56**	**2.01**	**.5**	**2.14**	**.70**

As clearly shown in Table 4, Civic and Ethical Education teachers, non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, and school leaders rated the participation of *woreda* education offices, in relation to citizenship education, as 1.9, 2.29, and 2.05 respectively. This implies that their performance was unsatisfactory. Like other stakeholders of Civic and Ethical Education, governmental organizations were also found to be less successful in discharging their responsibility in the process of implementing Civic and Ethical Education. The means for Civic and Ethical Education teachers (2.06), non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers (2.10), and school leaders (2.5) shown in Table 4 suggest that their participation has been low.

Table 4 also shows that NGO involvement in the implementation process of Civic and Ethical Education has been at its lowest level. All of the activities of the NGOs

regarding citizenship education were rated below 2 (low) implying very low performance. Finally, as table 4 depicts, respondents rated the involvement of mass media, in relation to citizenship education, as 2.16., 2.30, and, 2.44 respectively. From this data, it is possible to understand that, according to the ratings of these research participants, the role of media institutions in building up good citizenship has been low.

Some qualitative data also complemented the above quantitative findings. For instance, one of the primary school Civic and Ethical Education teachers had reported the following concerning the support of governmental institutions in the implementation of civic and ethical education.

> Let me tell you some cases. Once I had given my students a project work that required them visiting a nearby police station. Accordingly, my students went there. However, the response they got was never expected. One of the students was bitten by a policeman.

This research participant further explained the problems as follows:

> Again at another time, I asked my students to visit a trial at a first instance court. Nevertheless, the workers from the court ridiculed at the students and told them that observing a trial, for them, was a worthless thing. The students returned to class with great disappointment and one of them seriously asked me why they were learning Civic and Ethical Education. You know, the response of some governmental institutions is making students be skeptical on the importance of Civic and Ethical Education.

Thus, based on the quantitative and qualitative data presented above, it is possible to comprehend that organizations outside the school institutions did not satisfactorily discharge many of their responsibilities in relation to citizenship education.

DISCUSSION

Many scholars contend that traditional institutions (the family, community, and religious institutions) have irreplaceable responsibilities in the process of preparing good citizenship. For instance, they believe that the family is the first important institution in imparting major societal and citizenship values (Pestalozzi, cited in Sharma, 2006; Tozer, Violsa & Senese, 1998; Taneja, 1990). Similarly, the community is considered to be an important source of knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for good citizenship (Tozer, Violsa & Senese, 1998). Nevertheless, as findings of the present study confirmed, the overall participation of these institutions, in Ethiopian schools, was below what was expected. From this finding, therefore, it is not difficult to generalize that the views of many scholars (e.g., Parker, 2014; Sharma, 2006; Taneja, 1990; Tozer, Violsa & Senese, 1998) and organizations (e.g., UNESCO, 2003; MOE, 2007) on the role of traditional institutions in preparing good citizens has not been adequately materialized in Ethiopian schools.

Needless to say; Civic and Ethical Education teachers are one of the major actors of citizenship education. They play decisive roles in realizing the idea of good citizenship. However, as findings of the present study indicated, these major actors of citizenship education had not satisfactorily discharged their responsibility of good citizenship. Besides, the participation of non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers in building up good citizenship was found to be under the expected mean. This finding is consistent with the findings of Mulugeta et al (2011) and Mulugeta (2010). Therefore, from these findings it is possible to understand that the suggestions of many citizenship scholars (e.g., Taneja, 1990; Kerr, 1999; Parker, 2014) and the rhetoric of the Ethiopian government (MoE, 2007) concerning the role of teachers, both CEE and non-CEE teachers, in relation to good citizenship were not satisfactorily implemented in the schools under consideration.

As explained by many scholars, and stipulated by various educational documents of the ministry of education in Ethiopia, school leaders have a number of responsibilities vis-à-vis the implementation of citizenship education and the realization of the idea of good citizenship (Osler & Starkey, 2004; Taneja, 1990; MoE, 2007). However, findings of the present study uncovered that the participation of school leaders (PTA members, principals, and supervisors) was below what was expected. The findings also indicate that school leaders had not been adequately discharging many of their responsibilities for good citizenship. These findings are found to be consistent with some previous studies (Mulugeta, 2015; Mulugeta et al, 2011; MoE, 2007; Taneja, 1990). For instance, Mulugeta (2015) who investigated the effectiveness of primary school principals in managing the implementation process of civic and ethical education curriculum has reported that "the curriculum of civic and ethical education in [the] primary schools studied has been in the process of 'implementation' without sufficient and meaningful support and active involvement of principals" (p. 24). Similarly, Mulugeta et al (2011) have reported that principals were not successful in discharging their responsibilities in relation to the civic and ethical education program that was launched in all schools of the Amhara national regional state.

Many citizenship educators unanimously contend that schools are not the only institutions responsible for citizenship education. For them, many institutions such as civil society organizations, non-governmental organizations, the media, political parties, governmental institutions, and the private sector play important roles in the process of building up good citizenship (Parker, 2014; McCowan, 2009; Yishaq, 2007; UNDP, 2004). In the Ethiopian context too various institutions, outside schools, are given similar responsibilities. For instance, *woreda* education offices are given a number of responsibilities in the implementation process of CEE (MoE, 2007). Different governmental institutions (e.g., courts, museums, and cultural offices) are also recognized to be important in enriching students' citizenship knowledge and skills (MoE, 2007). An independent, neutral, pluralist, professional, and socially responsible media also plays a significant role in realizing the mission of citizenship education (UNDP, 2004). Likewise, NGOs, due to their innovative and flexible practices and proximity to the grassroots level, play vital roles in the implementation process of citizenship education

(McCowan, 2009; UNDP, 2004; Yishaq, 2007).

It seems due to this verity that all these institutions are recognized as important stakeholder of Civic and Ethical Education in Ethiopia (M0E, 2007). However, as findings of the present study confirmed, the involvements of all these out-school stakeholders in the preparation of good citizenship were not satisfactory. This finding is found to be consistent with other studies that were conducted in different contexts. For instance, the findings of McCowan (2009) and Yishaq (2007) revealed that due to different reasons, NGOs did not meaningfully support the implementation process of citizenship education.

Though an in-depth study might possibly uncover the reasons behind the poor performance of these institutions, however, at this stage it is possible to infer that McCowan's (2009, p. 33) belief, i.e. "governments' skeptical attitude" towards' NGOs and civil society organizations has been important in the Ethiopian context. In this regard, the proclamation that the Ethiopian government issued, following the 2005 election results, seems significantly limited the participation of civil society organizations and NGOs in the country. Under that proclamation, these two institutions were prohibited to participate especially in areas related to politics and democratic participation. The reason behind, as it was stated by the government, was that these institutions' tendency to inculcate various liberal and neo-liberal agenda that contradict the ideology of the ruling party, i.e. *revolutionary democracy* on the Ethiopian people. Through this proclamation, the government not only limited the participation of these organizations, but it also began to strictly monitor their day to day activities, including their budget allocation and utilization. Due to this reason, in Ethiopia, the involvement of civil society organizations and NGOs vis-à-vis citizenship education has almost ceased to exist. As McCown (2009) has vividly explained, if someone observes any NGO and civil society organization participating in the education sector, he/she will soon notice that their participation is limited only in areas related to funding of the sector.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the present study, the following conclusions are drawn. First, the participation of traditional institutions, i.e., the family, community, and religious institutions in building up good citizens was at its lowest level. In other words, to the contrary of the views of many scholars and organizations, traditional institutions' involvement in preparing good citizens was found to be low. Second, the participation of in-school stakeholders of citizenship education, i.e. teachers (both CEE teachers and non-CEE teachers) and school leaders (PTA members, principals, and supervisors) in building up good citizenship was inadequate and unsatisfactory. Finally, the participation of out-of-school institutions, (*woreda* education offices, various governmental institutions, NGOs, and the media), in building up good citizenship was found to be at its infant stage. Overall, the participation of stakeholders in preparing good citizenship, in Ethiopia, was found to be low, inadequate, and unsatisfactory. These findings imply that these stakeholders have not been satisfactorily discharging their responsibility for the preparation of good citizenship.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study suggest that a concerted work that aimed at clarifying the what, why, and how of civic and ethical education and good citizenship need to be given a due attention. In this regard, it seems advisable to re-consider the following issues.

First, all concerned bodies, particularly *woreda* education offices, and schools need to exert unreserved efforts to create awareness on the responsibility of good citizenship. These institutions need to establish a strong partnership with major stakeholders of good citizenship. In this regard, they need to conduct recurrent discussions with traditional institutions. Besides, through different innovative approaches, they need to establish strong links with various community-based organizations.

Second, concerned bodies, particularly *woreda* education offices and schools, need to conduct ongoing discussions with school practitioners. The discussion needs to accentuate on the multi-faceted issues of citizenship education and good citizenship. Most importantly, the duties and responsibilities of Civic and Ethical Education teachers, non-Civic and Ethical Education teachers, and school leaders on the issue under consideration need to be emphasized.

Third, the tendency to consider schools and their educators as the only institutions responsible for good citizenship needs to be considered as a serious and urgent educational problem. This is because, as expounded by many scholars, the preparation of good citizenship can be successful if and only if its major actors, including those outside the school, are fully involved in the process. Therefore, all concerned bodies (e.g. policy makers, educational managers at all levels) need to devise different innovative approaches that aimed at improving the participation of out-school stakeholders for good citizenship.

As a final word, since the presence/absence of good citizens is a decisive factor for the destiny of our societies, the preparation of good citizenship need to embrace a central position in all educational endeavors, at all levels. Investing much money, time, and energy on the present generation need to be considered as paving the way for the prevalence of prosperous, just, and peaceful societies in the future. Hence, much work should be done on this educational issue.

REFERENCES

Akalewold Eshete. (2005). Civics and ethics education curriculum policy: Recent government's interest and subsequent development. *IER Flambeau***,** *13* (2), 39-56.

Cogan, J. J. & Derricott, R. (2000). *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education.* London: Kogan Page Limited.

Cotton, K. (1996). *Education for citizenship.* Portland: Northwest regional education laboratory.

Creswell, J.W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods.* Los Angeles: SAGE publications.

Davies, I. Gregory, I. & Riley, S.C. (1999). *Good citizenship and educational provision.* London: Falmer Press.

Gardner, R. Cairns, J. & Lawton, D. (2000). *Education for values: Moral, ethics, and citizenship in contemporary teaching.* London: Kogan Page Limited.

Girma Alemayehu. (2006). *The implementation of grade 8 civic and ethical Education: The case of Addis Ababa city administration.* Unpublished MA Thesis, AAU.

Kerr, D. (1999). *Citizenship education: An international comparison*. Retrieved on 4 November 2010 from http://www.inca. org.uk/ pdf/ citizenship-no- intro.pdf.

Margaret, S. B. (1998). *The role of civic education.* Washington DC: Centre for Education.

McCown, T. (2009). *Rethinking citizenship education: A curriculum for participatory democracy*. London: Continuum.

MoE – Ministry of Education. (2002). *The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia education sector development program II: Program action plan*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

MoE – Ministry of Education. (2005). *The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia education sector development program III: Program action plan*. Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.

MoE – Ministry of Education. (2007). *Blueprint of civic and ethical education.* Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

Mulugeta Yayeh, Animaw Tadesse, Desalegn Bizuneh & Belay Tsega. (2011). Evaluative research on the effectiveness of civic and ethical education program: With particular reference to schools in East Gojjam administrative zone. *Journal of Educational Research, 1* (1), 27-56.

Mulugeta Yayeh. (2011). Fostering societal values through appropriate strategies: The case of some selected schools in East Gojjam administrative zone. *Journal of Teacher Education, 2* (1), 31-61.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2004). *Study on the advances in civic education in education ystems: Good practices in industrialized countries.* International Bureau of Education: UNESCO.

Parker, W. C. (2014). Citizenship education in the United States: Regime type, foundational issues, and classroom practice. In Nucci, L. P., Narvaez, D. & Krettenauer, T. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Moral and Character Education* (2nd ed). New York: Routledge.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Sharma, Y. K. (2006). *Sociological philosophy of education*. New Delhi: Kanishka publishers.

Taneja, V. R. (1990). *Educational thought and practice*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.

TGE –Transitional Government of Ethiopia. (1994). *Education and training policy*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA.

Tozer, S. E, Violas, P. C. & Senese, G. (1998). *School and society: Historical and contemporary perspectives* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw Hill.

UNDP. (2004). *Civic education: Practical guidance note*. Retrieved on October 17, 2010, from http:// www.undp.org/oslocentre/docs04/ civic%20educatio.pdf.

UNESCO. (2003). *Report of the working group on the teaching of ethics*. Paris: COMEST.

Yishaq Degefu .(2007). *The role of non - governmental organizations in promoting civic and ethical education in Ethiopia*. Unpublished MA thesis: Addis Ababa University.