Adolescents moral and ethical development: whose responsibility is it? The case of preparatory schools of Hawassa University Technology Villages

Deribe Workineh

Hawassa University, Hawassa, Ethiopia

Citation: Deribe, W. (2021). Adolescents moral and ethical development: whose responsibility is it? The case of preparatory schools of Hawassa University Technology Villages, *Ethioinquiry Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences;* 1 (1), 20-45.

Publication history: Received revised version on 03/12/2021; Published online on 27 December 2021; Weblink: https://journals.hu.edu.et/hu-journals/index.php/erjssh/

Full length article Open access

ABSTRACT

This study focused on identifying the responsible agents in promoting moral and ethical behaviours among adolescent students. 490 respondents (339 students and 151 teachers) were randomly selected from six schools of preparatory grades (grade 11 and 12)and made to fill the questionnaire items. In addition, 36 discussants (six in each study site) participated in the Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Self-developed questionnaire items and leading questions for FGD were employed as data-gathering instruments. The data were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative data analysis procedures. Thus, descriptive analysis (percentage, mean and standard deviation) and inferential analysis (t-test and linear regression analysis) were conducted following the research questions posed. The response of the FGD was also narrated and integrated with the response of the quantitative data analysis. The analysis conducted using t-test revealed that students and teachers perceive the role of civic education and its contribution in promoting moral and ethical behaviour differently; both student and teacher respondents were not aware of the difference between civic education, and moral and ethical education; religious leaders/institutions, parents, internal/external factors(more of technological, political and personal factors)and teachers were found responsible in promoting students moral and ethical behaviours. The result from the quantitative analysis was also supported by the response of the focus group discussants' T-test. Accordingly, the analysis further showed that except for the dimension of internal/external factors, teacher and student respondents differ in their response regarding the role of religious leaders/institutions, parents, and teachers in promoting students' moral and ethical behaviour. Furthermore, the result of regression analysis depicted that parent-related factors are the most determinant in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students. Based on the findings, it is recommended that implementing a new moral and ethical curriculum that is free from political and religious interferences is an urgent issue. To realize this, the curriculum developers and writers have to be professionally-oriented

Keywords: Civic education, Ethics, Morality, Moral education, Ethical education

1. INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Morality and ethical values are important issues that can be considered when we are talking about the development of society. Morality is perceived as a system of rules that regulate the social interactions and social relationships of individuals within societies (Smetana, Campione-Barr & Daddis, 2004), and a body of standards or principles derived from a code of conduct from a particular philosophy, religion, or culture (*Stanford University, 2011).* Since people cannot be separated from their social context (these social contexts may refer to schooling, religion, politics, parental and peer influences), their morality is developed concerning the norms, values, and patterns of action in which they are part and parcel. In this regard, the key point is that members of any social community have a wide range of moral positions and may react to and construct a personal morality of their own concerning similar, shared 'external' social and cultural settings.

In a similar context, ethics is conceptualized as a set of concepts and principles that guide people in determining what behaviour helps or harms conscious people (*Paul, Richard, Elder & Linda, 2006*)*;* ethics includes phrases such as the science of the ideal human character or the science of moral duty*(Kidder & Rushworth, 2003); and thus it* tries to examine the reasoning behind people's moral life and critical analysis of concepts and principles connected to it. *(Reiss, 1999).* Thus, in a real-life situation, ethics is frequently used as a more consensual word than moral, which is less favoured.

Different authors argued that the implementation of moral education is important to promote students' moral development and ethical character. For instance, moral education which is supported by moral philosophy, moral psychology, and moral educational practices enhance the moral development and ethical character of students (Han, 2014); moral education is a means for moral and ethical development by promoting rationale pro-social skills and a means to cultivate meaningful or real human value (Carr, 2014); moral education is about an inner change, which is a spiritual matter and comes through the internalization of universal human values (Halstead, 2007). Therefore, the objective of moral and ethical education lies in the fact that it can develop shared feelings with others and makes one committed to his/her responsibilities and actions (Campbell, 2008).

Although what is mentioned above is about the values of moral and ethical education and its contribution to the moral and ethical development of adolescents, the question is "Who is responsible for teaching and promoting these moral and ethical behaviours that will shape young children and adolescents in a good manner?" Studies suggested that several stakeholders are responsible for the development of young children and adolescents' morality and ethical behaviours. For example, parents (Oladipo, 2009), schools, including teachers (Husu & Tirri, 2007; Baumi, 2009), peer groups, religious institutions, and culture (Norenzan, 2014) have responsibilities to discharge in this in this regard. Moreover, considering these contributing agents for promoting moral and ethical behaviour of children and adolescents, Smetena (1999) suggested that morality is a complicated reciprocal process that is manifested within a social setting through interaction while conserving self-identity. Similarly, Killen and Nucci (1995) argued that this type of social interaction, for example, within a peer group, parents/caregivers can positively influence moral development in young children and play an important role in their moral development.

In the Ethiopian context, the government introduced an Education and Training Policy (ETP, 1994). Referring to the policy document, Seyoum (1996) explained that the education and training policy envisages bringing up citizens endowed with human outlook, countrywide responsibilities, and democratic values that enable to develop the necessary productive, creative and appreciative capacity to participate fully in the development and utilization of resources and the environment at large. In line with this, a curriculum of civic education was designed by the Ethiopian Ministry of Education (MoE, 2005) and implemented in schools. However, in the document, the government uncovered that the civic education curriculum which was being implemented throughout the country was not properly executed due to different factors. Among these, according to the writer of this paper, one is that introducing or teaching civic education is considered as the only responsibility of schools and teachers and secondly emphasis was given to the civic part (which seems politically shaped and oriented) ignoring the moral and ethical aspect that contributes to the development of all-rounded personality of young children and adolescent students.

Statement of the Problem

In present Ethiopia, from the report of different forms of media and personal observations of the researcher, there is increased violence among different social groups (for example, between ethnic groups, religious groups, political groups, members of the school community, etc,.). Juvenile crime, embezzlement, irrationality, cruelty, numerous human rights violation, racism, displacement of people from their residential areas, confusion between democracy and anarchism, and other forms of immoral and unethical behaviours were observed here and there. All these and other human rights abuses in different forms within the country declare the presence of moral and ethical crises. Furthermore, the political instability and other socio-political factors resulted in adolescent students experiencing some immoral and unethical behaviours that affected the teaching-learning process and the wellbeing of society as a whole.

The major actors in these immoral and unethical behaviours are mostly young school children and adolescents. It is believed that humanity comes if there is rationality. However, as indicated above, a significant number of young children and adolescents are observed as being irrational, immoral, and unethical. Consequently, rational thinking, moral and ethical values are declining and deteriorating from time to time. These social crises are immoral and most have complex origins such as politics, poverty, and globalization. The problems observed ensure that society as a whole is facing a real problem in promoting morality and ethical values for young children and adolescents.

It is also assumed that civic education given in Ethiopian schools at all levels is not in a position to meet the demand of the government in developing the moral and ethical behaviour of school children. Moreover, it is observed that no one is going to take responsibility for the immoral and unethical conducts that occurred frequently; rather, those who practiced immoral and unethical behaviour attributed to the sources to different external factors. Therefore, to make a proper intervention against moral and ethical crises that the country has faced alarmingly and to promote the moral and ethical development of young children and adolescents, it seems crucial to introduce and teach moral and ethical education. But the question is "Who is responsible for teaching and promoting socially desirable moral and ethical behaviours for young children and adolescents?"

Based on the above explanations, the present study was aimed to give answers to the following research questions.

1. Is there a difference between students and teachers in perceiving the value of the existing civic education in building students' moral and ethical behaviour?
2. Is there an awareness difference between students and teachers in perceiving what moral and ethical education is?
3. Is there variation between students and teachers regarding the factors that lead students to practice immoral and unethical behaviour?
4. Based on the view of students and teachers, which stakeholders (parents, schools, or religious institutions/leaders) are the most contributors in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students?

Objectives of the Study

General Objective

The general objective of the present study was to identify the responsible bodies in promoting moral and ethical behaviour of young children and adolescents.

Specific Objectives

More specifically, the research was intended to:

1. Identify whether there is a difference or not between students and teachers in perceiving the value of the existing civic education in promoting students' moral and ethical behaviour?
2. Investigate whether there is an awareness gap or not among students and teachers on what moral and ethical education is.
3. Identify whether there is a variation or not among students and teachers regarding the factors that lead students to practice immoral and unethical behaviour.
4. Identify the most determinant stakeholders (e.g. parents, schools/teachers, or religious institutions/leaders) that are responsible for promoting moral and ethical behaviour among young children and adolescents.

Significance of the Study

Due to the growing rates of immoral and unethical behaviours that affect the wellbeing of society, it seems imperative to investigate the causes of these immoral and unethical behaviours and identify responsible bodies for promoting young children's and adolescents' moral and ethical behaviour. This is because a well-establishing moral and ethical behaviour in young children and adolescents through the implementation of moral and ethical education contributes to having good young citizens that contribute to building a nation. Thus, the findings of the present study are expected to close the gaps by benefiting,

- the school community (teachers, principals, and administrative workers) in acquiring knowledge on the necessity of integrating moral and ethical education in the curriculum at all levels of education.
- young children and adolescent students by recognizing what their rights and responsibilities are while learning in schools and living within the community that they belong to.

- The policymakers and curriculum developers by providing the information obtained from the study.
- parents, school teachers, and religious institutions in developing their awareness as they are responsible for promoting moral and ethical behaviour of young children and adolescent students.
- different governmental and non-governmental organizations that work on young children and adolescents in promoting moral and ethical behaviour of the young children and adolescents.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The setting of the study covered some preparatory schools from Sidama Regional State and Hawassa City Administration which are located within the technology villages of Hawassa University.

Research Design

A mixed research approach (quantitative and qualitative design) was employed in the present study. The data were gathered using a cross-sectional design survey design. From the quantitative aspect, self-developed questionnaire items were developed, administered, and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical procedures. For the qualitative data, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was conducted with the participants of the study.

Study Population

The population of the study encompassed the technology villages of Hawassa University located in Sidama Regional State, Ethiopia. Within the technology village, there are two clusters:

- Alata-Bansa cluster centres and Hawassa Zuria-Dalle cluster centres. Within these cluster centres, there were 4 preparatory schools (grades 11 and 12) that had 4115 students and 183 teachers.
- Hawassa city administration cluster consists of 2 preparatory schools. Within these schools, there were a total of 4965students and 239 teachers. Thus, the total populations for this study were 9080 students and 422 teachers.

From each preparatory school selected for this study, main and vice school principals, members of Parent-teacher Association (PTA) and leaders of the most common religious institutions (Ethiopian Orthodox church, Protestant church, and Islam) were the target population of the study.

Samples and Sampling Techniques

From each of the above-mentioned Sidama Regional State and Hawassa City Administration cluster centres, 6 preparatory schools were selected both randomly and purposely. Thus, Tabor preparatory and Addis Ketema preparatory schools from Hawassa City Administration, and Aleta Wondo and Dale preparatory schools from the other clusters were purposively selected. This was because of the presence of a large number of students and the information obtained that confirms that unethical and immoral behaviours are highly prevalent in the schools encompassed within these clusters. In addition, from the other preparatory schools which were relatively peaceful, 2 schools, namely Wondo Genet and Daye (Kewena Gata) preparatory schools were randomly selected. Based on the number of students obtained from the sampled schools, a representative sample of students

and teachers was selected using the statistical procedure developed by Israel (2009). Thus from a total of 9080 students, 339 students were randomly selected. Furthermore, 151 teachers (about 25 teachers from each school) were selected using a systematic random sampling procedure to participate in the study. This gave a total of 490 respondents who filled in the questionnaire items. Furthermore, for each selected preparatory school, a total of 36 discussants were purposely selected for Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Accordingly, 3 religious leaders, 1 PTA representative, 1 director, and 1 vice-director were selected from each preparatory school understudy.

Data Gathering Instruments

Questionnaire

As the study design was a descriptive survey, 68 self-developed questionnaire items with five-point Likert-type scales (5= strongly agree, 4= agree, 3= undecided, 2 = disagree and 1 = strongly disagree) and rating scale were administered for students and teachers. The instrument has seven sub-scales, namely perception of civic education, awareness of moral and ethical education, perception of the responsibility of teachers in developing moral and ethical behaviours, religion-related factors, teacher-related factors, parent-related factors, and internal/external factors. Before administering the final items of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted to validate the instrument. The analysis of pilot test data yielded a reliability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha = 0.86 with high internal consistency.

Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

A total of 21 leading questions (7 items for each group of participants) that facilitate group discussion regarding the nature of moral and ethical development of young children and adolescents were set and FGD was conducted with PTA members, school leaders, and representatives of religious institutions. The validity of the leading FGD questions (basically face validity and content validity) was checked in terms of the research questions/objectives by professionals from the fields (Psychology and civic education) and some questions were amended and modified based on the feedback and comments given.

Data Gathering Procedure

A total of 500 questionnaire items were distributed (346 for students and 154 for teachers). Out of these, 490 of them (339 students and 151 teachers) were correctly filled in and returned. This made the response rate 98%. The data were collected using assistants for each study centre. The FGD was conducted by the main and co-researchers at each study centre.

Data Management and Analysis

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative data analysis techniques were employed. Thus depending on the nature of the basic research questions, descriptive analysis such as mean score, percentage, and standard deviation was computed. Furthermore, like that of the research questions, inferential statistical analysis procedures such as t-test and regression analysis were employed. The data gathered through FGD were analyzed, narrated, and organized in a systematic form. Finally, the information obtained through qualitative analysis was integrated with results obtained through quantitative data.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Results

In conducting the inferential analysis, the assumptions for the parametric tests(for example, random sampling, independence observation, normal distribution, and homogeneity of variance for t-test) were checked and the assumptions were met. For the linear regression analysis, the assumptions were associated with linear regression (i.e. normality, multicollinearity, and homoscedasticity) were first checked and in all cases, these assumptions were met. Effect size (eta squared) was calculated when it becomes necessary.

Table 1: Summary of the Background Information of the Respondents

Variables	N	%
Participants Sex		
Male	315	64.4
Female	175	35.6
Total	**490**	**490**
Participants Occupation		
Students	339	69.0
Teachers	151	31.0
Total	**490**	**490**
Participants Field of Study		
Natural Science	254	51.5
Social Science	236	48.5
Total	**490**	**490**

Table 1 above summarizes the demographic characteristics of sample respondents selected from Hawassa University Industrial Villages. As the data depicts, out of the total number of 490 respondents, 315(64.4%) were males and 175(35.6%) were females. Occupation-wise, 339(69.0%) were students and 151(31.0%) were teachers. The research participants from the field of Natural Science were 254(51.5%) and from the field of Social Science were 236(48.5%). Thus, it is possible to conclude that the sample participants represent the target population in terms of sex, occupation, and field of study.

Table 2: An independent sample t-test that compared student and teacher respondents regarding their perception of the value of the existing civic education

	Scale	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	*P*	eta squared
Perception		Students	339	3.87	.75	t(488)=8.03	.00	.002
		Teachers	151	3.13	1.00			

An independent sample t-test was performed to compare what students and teachers perceived regarding the values of the currently offered civic education in the preparatory schools. There was a statistically significant difference between what students and teachers perceived regarding the value of civic education in building students' moral and ethical behaviours. Hence, a high mean difference ($t(488)=8.03$, $p<.05$, 2-tailed) was found among students' perceived value (M=3.87, SD=.75) and teachers' perceived value (M=3.13, SD=1.00). The magnitude of the differences in the means was small (eta squared=0.002). According to the nature of the questions presented for this analysis, the high mean value of students signifies that students perceived the existing civic education that has less value in promoting their moral and ethical behaviour as compared to the responses from the teachers.

Furthermore, FGD was conducted with school principals and key teacher-informants (unit leaders and selected homeroom teachers) to provide their view on how they evaluate the role of civic education in shaping the behaviour of students. The response of the discussants was almost the same and summarized here below.

> *Civic education is given for years starting first cycle upper primary grades (grade 5). However, it was observed that from the side of students, the value of civic education in promoting moral and ethical behaviour of students was not well recognized. According to the discussants, what was always observed was, students developed the behaviour of claiming for their rights (even sometimes beyond their rights) both in the school and out of the school environments.*

Based on the descriptive analysis made on the individual items, the t-test conducted and the FGD conducted with school principals and some key teacher-informants who have extra responsibilities in schools, it was observed how the understanding of students and teachers vary regarding the contribution of civic education in shaping and promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students.

Students and Teachers Awareness on what Moral and Ethical Education is and how it can be developed

The overall mean difference between teachers and students regarding their awareness of what moral and ethical education is and how it can be developed was computed using an independent sample t-test and the result is summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3: An independent sample t-test that compares students and teachers regarding awareness of moral and ethical education

Scale	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	*P*	Effect size (eta squared)
Awareness	Students	339	3.57	.71	t(488)=1.43	.15	
	Teachers	151	3.47	.76			

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare student and teacher respondents' awareness regarding what moral and ethical education is and how it can be

developed. A statistically significant difference ($t(488)=1.43$, $p>.05$, 2-tailed) was not found when the students' responses (M=3.57, SD=.71) and teachers' responses (M=3.47, SD=.76) were compared with an awareness dimension.

To get what FGD discussants reflect regarding the awareness of moral education and how it can be developed, the second leading question was forwarded and the reflection of the discussants is summarized below.

> *Both teachers and students have no clear understanding. Almost all the discussants argued that civic education is more related to political education and moral education is inclined to religious education. The discussants added that civic education is perceived as political education because most of the time this subject is taught by those who have a political inclination to the ruling government. The discussants reported that since moral education is perceived as religious education cannot be implemented in the school environment. Furthermore, the FG discussants suggested that reward and punishment are effective means to facilitate moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students.*

From the quantitative and qualitative analysis, the result depicted that both student and teacher respondents have no clear understanding regarding what moral and ethical education is and how it can be developed. Both groups perceive civic education and moral education similarly. That is, the respondents assume civic education as political education and moral education as religious education.

Student and Teacher Respondents Perception Regarding the Responsibility of Teachers in Developing Moral and Ethical Behaviour

In all questionnaire items designed to investigate students' perception regarding the responsibility of teachers in developing moral and ethical behaviours, respondent students perceived (attributed) as teachers are responsible for promoting moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students (Mean=4.09). This implies that teachers are responsible for the immoral and unethical behaviours observed.

Similar to students' perception regarding the responsibility of teachers in developing moral and ethical behaviours, in all questionnaire items, teachers who responded to the questionnaire items perceived that they are responsible for promoting moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students (Mean=4.02). Then, the question is "Do the respondents accept as they are contributors for the observed immoral and unethical behaviour practiced by adolescent students?"

Table 4: An independent sample t-test that compares students and teachers to identify whether teachers are responsible or not in promoting moral and ethical behaviour.

Scale	Group	N	Mean	SD	t	*P*	(eta squared)
Perception of Teachers Responsibilities	Students	339	4.09	.75	t=(488)=.903	.36	
	Teachers	151	4.02	.72			

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the perception of students' responsibilities (M=4.09, SD=.75) and teachers (M=4.02, SD=.72). The result revealed that there was no significant difference in the perception of teachers' responsibilities in promoting moral and ethical behaviour ($t(488)=1.20, p>.05$, 2-tailed) was found.

Factors that Hinder the Development of Moral and Ethical Behaviour

Religion-related factors, parent-related factors, internal/external related factors (more of technological, political, and personal factors), and teacher-related factors were analyzed as factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviours using the appropriate statistical procedure.

Religion-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviours among adolescent students as perceived by student respondents

Most student respondents, 263 (77.58%), rated that religious institutions/religious leaders can play an important role in the development of moral and ethical behaviour; 281(82.88%) were of the view that religious institutions/religious leaders are responsible for teaching moral and ethical behaviour; 229 (67.55%) the moral and ethical behaviour that observed at present is the result of adolescents' religious belief that they have today. On the contrary, 255(75.22%) student respondents reported that religious institutions/leaders of their locality were not aware that teaching moral behaviour is their responsibility; 213 (62.83%) student respondents disagree with the view that says religious institutions/leaders have their program for teaching moral and ethical behaviour; 185 (54.57%) agree that religious leaders are not good models for developing moral and ethical behaviour; 223 (65.79%) there is no strong relationship between schools and religious institutions/leaders in developing the moral and ethical behaviour of students.

Religion-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by teacher respondents

The response of 114 (75.5%) teacher respondents rated that religious institutions/leaders can play an important role in the development of moral and ethical behaviour and 109 (72.18%) of the respondents agreed that teaching moral and ethical behaviour is the responsibility of all religions. This indicates that there is a similarity between student and teacher respondents on these two questions. On the other hand, what teachers responded regarding the awareness of religious institutions/leaders, teaching moral and ethical education was their duty 98 (64.90%); religious institutions/leaders design their program for teaching moral and ethical behaviours; this implies that 98 (64.90%) of religious leaders are good models for developing moral and ethical behaviours82(54.30%) showed a contradictory result with what students responded.

Teachers 84 (55.63%)positively valued the presence of a strong relationship between school and religious institutions; however, students evaluated the relationship between schools and religious institutions differ in their response in which 123 (65.78%) of the respondents disagreed with the statement. In contrary to students' responses, 84 (55.63%) of teacher respondents disagreed that the religious beliefs that students follow served as a base for their moral and ethical behaviour. It was also revealed that of the total respondents, 115 (76.19%) disagreed as religious leaders in the study sites are models for students to learn moral and ethical behaviours.

FGD was conducted with the discussants to identify how religion-related factors, parent-related factors, teacher/school-related factors, and internal/external related factors

affect the moral and ethical development of students. The discussants' response is summarized below.

> *As to the FGD participants from the three religious institutions: Orthodox Tewahido, Protestant, and Islam religion strongly believe as moral and ethical education can shape students' personalities positively. However, one of the reasons for students to lack morality and ethical values is because these issues are not considered and not integrated into the school curriculum. These discussants also stressed that even though civic education is given in the schools of Ethiopia, rather than developing moral and ethical behaviours, it motivated students to claim strongly for their rights (even violently) without accomplishing their responsibilities. They explained the reason for this might be: 1) the contents of civic education are dominated by political issues rather than moral and ethical issues; 2) majority of the teachers that teach moral and ethical education are politically oriented; 3) there is no opportunity for religious institutions to come to school and teach desirable moral and ethical behaviours and there is no any content of morality and ethics in the curriculum of school subjects. Surprisingly, according to the discussants, the majority of the students who participated in immoral and unethical behaviour are the "so-called" religious students who visit churches/mosques at least every Sunday for Christians and Friday for Muslims, as one of the discussants said, "Praying in churches on Sunday and throwing stones from Monday to Friday".*

Parent-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by student respondents

On parent-related items, more than 50% of student respondents gave credit for the role of their parents in developing moral and ethical behaviours. Students also reported that the moral and ethical values that they have today are due to the role of parents. As the detailed responses on individual items showed, the total respondents, 240 (70.79%) believed that family can play an important role in developing moral and ethical behaviour; 259 (76.40%) argued that parents are their good models for developing moral and ethical behaviours; 256 (75.51%) reported that they learned being reasonable and rationale from their parents; 240 (70 80%) believed that they learned to be concerned for others because of parental influence. Furthermore, 246 (72.56%) of respondent students accept their parents as their first teachers to develop moral and ethical behaviour and also 194 (57.22%) of the respondents revealed that their parents have a strong link with the school that they are learning which contributed in developing moral and ethical behaviour.

From the above descriptive analysis, it was found that students give credit that parents are responsible for helping/teaching their children to develop moral and ethical behaviours. Furthermore, these respondents argued that the moral and ethical behaviours that they have today are based on what they got from their parents.

Parent-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by teacher respondents

Teacher-respondents rated positively two of the parent-related items as follows: These are, the family can play an important role in the development of moral and ethical behaviour (134(88.74%) and parents are the first teachers to develop moral and ethical

behaviour (78(51.66%). The results obtained from these questionnaire items agree with those obtained from the students. On the other hand, teachers expressed their disagreement (rated negatively) to the following questionnaire items: parents around their workplaces/schools are good models for the development of their children's moral and ethical behaviours 112 (74.17%); adolescent students in their school learn to be reasonable and rationale from their parents 100 (66.22%); students in their school learned to be concerned for others from their parents 88 (58.28%) and parents have a strong link with their school for developing moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students 90 (59.60%).

Thus, from the analysis, students are defending their parents with a notion of a self-serving bias, and these student respondents argued that their parents are doing what they can in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of school children. Further information was obtained from FGD discussants (school leaders, PTA members, and religious leaders). The response given by these discussants is summarized here below.

> *PTA members argued that parents send their children not to stay at home. They are not sure whether their children are attending classes properly or not. This is common almost in all public schools. The directors stated that even when students breach school rules and regulations and are instructed to bring their parents, they either bring any adult person from "anywhere" or totally leave the school. Therefore, the school administration is enforced to tolerate the immoral and unethical behaviours committed by school children and this is also the direction given by top officials. Religious leaders and members of PTA emphasized no line links schools, parents, and religious institutions to discuss the situation of students from the academic perspective and promotion of moral and ethical behaviours.*

Internal/external factors(more of technological, political, and personal factors)that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by student respondents

The following external and personal factors are rated as contributors to adolescents' immoral and unethical behaviours. These are the expansion of information and communication technology 208 (61.35%), sensing/feeling to be a 'modern' person 224 (66.07%), the existence of political change and instability 211(62.24%), emotional and sensitive nature of adolescent students 213 (62.83%), inability to be rational and reasonable 223 (65.78%), political pressure 209 (61.65%) and peer pressure 199 (58.70%).

Internal/external factors(more of technological, political, and personal factors)that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by teacher respondents

Similar to students' responses, in all internal/external factors related items, teacher respondents argued that external as well as internal factors hold the lion's share which is more than 50%. Specifically, the expansion of information communication technology (ICT) or social media such as Face book 119 (78.80%), the existing political changes and questions 122 (80.80%), the nature of adolescents of being easily emotional and sensitive 117 (77.48%) and external political pressures (133(88.08%)) accounted the highest proportion that contributed to adolescents' immoral and unethical behaviours.

The response of FGD conducted regarding the internal/external factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviours of adolescent students is summarized here below.

> *The expansion of social media, specifically Face book aggravated students' immoral and unethical behaviour. In addition, the existing political conditions in the last four years throughout Ethiopia and the regional politics in the study site contributed to the development of immoral and unethical behaviours in the school environment.*

Teacher-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by student respondents

Teacher-related factors that hinder the proper development of moral and ethical behaviours of adolescent students were rated based on 16 questionnaire items. Of the total 339 adolescent student respondents, 210 (61.94%) of them attributed to the moral and ethical crises of adolescent students in the society were due to teachers. As to the respondents, these crises were specifically because of the deterioration in the teaching profession 242 (71.38%), lack of teachers' morality and spirituality 181 (53.40%), unnecessary sake of benefits by teachers 186 (54.86%), teachers' need for gaining power and position rather than the integrity of the profession 199 (58.70%), attitudinal change of the society towards teaching profession 205 (60.47%), teachers addictive behaviour such as smoking, drinking, using stimulants and gambling 209 (61.65%), unethical immoral behaviour of teachers in the classroom 197 (58.11%) and lack of honesty and being genuine 178 (52.50%). Based on this result, it can be implied that student respondents made their teachers responsible for why they lack a sense of moral and ethical behaviours.

Moreover, respondent students rated teachers in terms of teacher-related moral and ethical behaviours that one teacher has to possess. Taking 50% of the respondents as a cut point, that is 170 students, students responded that the majority of the teachers cannot fulfill the moral and ethical values in terms of the following variables: a sense of guilt when they committed an error (191 (56.34%)), sense of scarification and being genuine for their profession 217 (64.01%), assisting while students are learning 187 (55.16%), lack of skill for conflict resolution 245 (72.27%) and lack of professional quality of teaching 171 (50.44%). Thus, based on the opinions and information of respondent students, these issues were found as deficiencies of teachers that hinder their support for the promotion of students' moral and ethical development. On the other hand, acting as a counsellor when students seek help 182 (53.68%), respect for others (217(64.01%)) and self-confidence 193 (56.93%) are the positive sides of teachers that promote moral and ethical behaviours of their students.

Teacher-related factors that hinder the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students as perceived by teacher respondents

Although students evaluated almost all teacher-related items negatively by attributing that teachers are responsible for the failure encountered in the development of students' moral and ethical behaviours, teacher respondents agree with some of the issues and disagree with others. For example, the following results go in line with what students responded: deterioration of the teaching profession minimized the role of teachers as a role model for developing moral and ethical thinking (129(85.43%)), lack of morality and

spirituality by teachers 124 (82.12%), change of social attitudes in response to the teaching profession 127 (84.10%), addictive behaviour of teachers such as smoking drinking liquor and gambling 90 (59 60%), acting as a counsellor in providing advice when students seek help 89 (58.94%), lack of respect towards others (105 (69.54%)), lack of self-confidence (111(73.51%)) and decline in teaching professional quality (122 (80.80%)). On the other hand, a contradictory result was found between what teachers and students attributed concerning teacher-related factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviours among adolescent students. Thus 116 (76.82%) of teacher respondents disagreed with the view that teachers are the main source of moral and ethical crises of adolescent students, 110 (72.84%) unnecessary sake of monitory benefits, 95 (62.91%) need to gain power and position rather than for the integrity of the profession, 127 (84.15%) involvement of teachers in immoral and unethical activities while teaching in the classroom situation, 128 (84.77%) of the teachers by themselves are not honest and genuine and do not tell the truth for their students, and 107 (70.86%) sense of guilt while committing an error.

Further information was gathered using FGD from school leaders (directors and vice directors), PTA members, and religious leaders (Orthodox Tewahido, Protestant, and Islam). The information obtained from the discussants is summarized here below.

> *It is undeniable that teachers will play a significant role in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students. However, so far their role is neglected. They are either ignored or if they have a chance to be engaged they are directly or indirectly, pressurized to emphasize the existing political situation. Moreover, there is no awareness by teachers, by their students, and even by society as they are the sources of moral and ethical values for their students. School leaders also emphasized that the majority of the teachers have no interest in their teaching profession and have no morality and ethics to perform their teaching activity effectively.*

Summary of the responses of PTA members who participated in the FGD.

> *Most of the teachers of the present day have no morality, ethics, and social acceptance as that of teachers of previous years (for example, as teachers of 20 or 30 years before). A significant number of teachers cannot be a model of moral and ethical values for their students. This is because, according to our observation, said the discussants, some teachers have no professional integrity and personality. The teaching profession by its nature is socially-exposed. Thus, if one teacher performs a socially desirable behaviour in terms of morality, he/she will be accepted by his/her students. On the other hand, if he/she does the opposite (immoral and unethical behaviours) he/she will be exposed easily and accused by society and students as a whole. In this case, they cannot be models for promoting moral and ethical behaviours for their students.*

Summary of the responses of religious leaders who participated in the FGD

Teachers are considered as a means for promoting moral and ethical behaviour of children and adolescents next to parents. However, according to the religious leaders, instead of promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students, some teachers by themselves have a deficiency of morality and ethical behaviours. No communication is observed between teachers and schools on how to develop the moral and ethical behaviour of students (the observed communication is only focused on the teaching-learning process); at the same time, according to the discussants, teachers are reserved to form communication with parents and religious institutions on how to promote the moral and ethical behaviour of students. Since teachers, parents, schools and religious institutions have a significant role in the moral development of students; the religious leaders recommended that all these stakeholders have to work in cooperation for promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students and to make schools, teachers, and religious leaders active participants in building the already deteriorated moral and ethical behaviour of students and their teachers.

In addition to the descriptive statistics that compared student and teacher respondents based on individual questionnaire items, an independent sample t-test was used to compare for each subscale and the result is summarized here below.

Table 5:Summary of the independent sample t-test that compares religion-related factors, parent-related factors, internal-external factors (more of technological, political, and personal factors), and teacher-related factors along the dimensions of teacher and student respondents.

Scale	**Occupation**	**N**	**Mean**	**SD**	***t***	***p***	**eta squared**
Religion-related Factors	Student	339	3.82	.81	*t*(488)=2.11	.03	0.002
	Teacher	151	3.66	.72			
Parent-related Factors	Student	339	3.94	.97	*t*(488)= 6.54	.00	0.002
	Teacher	151	3.66	.84			
Internal-External Factors	Student	339	3.61	.88	t(488)=.616	.53	
	Teacher	151	3.57	.77			
Teacher-elated Factors	Teacher	339	3.38	.83	t(488)=2.21	.02	0.002
	Student	151	3.21	.79			

An independent sample t-test was conducted to determine if there were significant differences between students and teachers along the dimensions of religion-related factors, parent-related factors, internal-external factors, and teacher-related factors. Statistically significant differences were found between the students' and teachers' responses along the dimension of religion-related factors, parent-related factors, and teacher-related factors but

a statistically significant difference was not found in students' and teachers' responses along the dimension of internal/external factors. The results can be summarised as follows.

Religion-related factors: There was a significant difference in the response of students (M=3.82, SD=.81) and teachers (M=3.66, SD=.72; *t*(488)=2.11 *p*<.05 2-tailed). The magnitude of the difference with the means was small (eta squared=0.002).

Parent-related factors: Statistically significant difference was found in the response of students (M=3.94, SD=.97) and teachers (M=3.37, SD=.84; *t*(488)=6.54 *p*<.00 2-tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared=0.002).

Internal/external factors(more of technological, political, and personal factors): There was no statistically significant difference in the response of students (M=3.61, SD=.88) and teachers (M=3.57, SD=.77); *t*(488)=–.616, *p*>.53, 2-tailed).

Teacher-related factors: There was a statistically significant difference in the response of students (M=3.38, SD=.83) and teachers (M=3.21, SD=.79; *t*(488)=2.21 *p*<.002 2-tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means was small (eta squared=0.002).

The above t-test result depicted that religion-related factors, parent-related factors, and teacher-related factors showed a statistically significant difference between students and teachers. On the other hand, in comparison to these dimensions, statistically significant difference was not observed along the dimensions of internal/external factors (For example, adolescents' sensitive and emotional behaviours, technological issues, and political instabilities). The result implies that these internal/external factors are recognized similarly by both student and teacher respondents as contributing factors for the development of moral and ethical behaviour of students.

The most determinant factor that determines the promotion of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students.

Table 6**:** Summary of linear regression analysis for religion-related factors (RRF), parent-related factors (PRF), and teacher-related factors(TRF).

Model	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.	R	R^2	Adjusted	Std. error of the estimate
1 Regressior	8.26	4	2.06	10.41	.00b	.28a	.08	.07	.44
Residual	96.21	485	.19						
Total	104.47	489							

a. Predictors: (Constant), RRF, PRF, TRF

b. Dependent Variable: Occupation

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Standard error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.69	.12		13.54	.00
	RRF	.04	.03	.08	1.46	.14
	PRF	-.157	.02	-.31	-5.79	.00
	TRF	-.02	.03	-.04	-.83	.41

Linear regression analysis was then computed to test whether ***RRF, PRF, TRF*** dimensions, which were the independent variables, predict the overall moral and ethical behaviour of students. The results depicted in Table 6 showed that parent-related-factor was significant $F(4,489)=10.41$, $p<.05$), with a negative beta coefficient (*ß*= -.31), and yielding R=.28, R^2=.08 and adjusted R^2=.07. This result implies that the model which includes the RRF, PRF, and TRF explains 8% of the variance in the overall factors that challenge the promotion of moral and ethical behaviours.

The negative effect would signify that the lower the mean score for PRF are indicators of how parental support and follow-up are the better predictors of students' moral and ethical behavioural development. The RRF and TRF dimension were not significant; $F(4,489$, $p>.05)$ and the beta coefficient positive (*ß*=.08), suggesting that the higher the RRF the lower the predictive ability of the moral and ethical behaviour will be.

DISCUSSION

Perception of Civic Education in Building Moral and Ethical Behaviour

How students and teachers perceive the role of the existing civic education in building the moral and ethical values of students was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential analysis. The results depicted that there were contradictions between the student and teacher respondents. Thus, as the findings from the perspective of students perception showed, civic education that they are learning at a classroom level has a role in developing their moral and ethical behaviour For example, civic education contributed to being a person of good character, shaped moral and ethical behaviours in a good manner, enabled them to interact with others peacefully, helped them to develop a sense of sensitivity, develop patience and responsibility, contributed for being reasonable and rationale and helped them to develop political consciousness and democracy. This finding confirmed what was found in the previous studies, for example, civics provides individual responsibility (Merone, 2006), deals with rights and duties of politically organized people (Shah, 2002), contributes to searching the value and principle of democracy and civic competence (Barnson, 1998). Learning civic education is a means to effective participation in the democratic and development process (UNDP, 2004) and equip citizens with ethical and democratic and in the end to achieve the culture of political socialization (Akalewold,

2005; Kisby & Sloam, 2009). From there, we understand that what students perceive regarding the role of civic education matches with what early researchers have identified. On the contrary, even if teacher respondents agree on the general value and function of civic education in developing the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students, what teachers perceived in some questions contradicts the response of students. Therefore, they valued less than 50% positively for some questionnaire items are the opposite of student respondents.

Awareness on What Moral and Ethical Education is and How It Can be Developed out of the School Environment

It was found that student respondents have no awareness regarding the difference between civic education and moral education. In addition, student respondents have no awareness about the social and governmental institutions' responsibilities in promoting moral and ethical behaviours. Similar to the responses of students, teacher respondents also have a problem of awareness regarding the difference between moral education and civic education. Because of this, both groups of respondents have no awareness that moral education enables them to develop shared feelings with others and makes them committed to one's responsibilities and actions. This view confirmed what was stated in Campbell (2008) concerning ethics which he remarked that it should always be fair, honest, transparent, and respectful of the rights and privacy of others in society (Frank et al., 2011).

A similar result was depicted when an independent sample t-test was computed. The finding revealed that respondent students and teachers have no statistically significant difference concerning their awareness of moral education and ethics. This might be, as the FGD report indicated, civic education is more associated with and perceived as political education, and moral education was recognized as a theological (religious) education.

Challenges and Difficulties in Promoting Moral and Ethical Behaviour of Adolescent Students

As it was discussed in the first chapter of this study, the moral and ethical values of adolescent students are deteriorating from time to time. This situation agrees with what is noted in Yaro (2013) which states that "gone are the days when morality and discipline used to be virtues. Today it is the exact opposite. We now live in a decadent society where morality and discipline are (thrown) overboard". Based on Yaro's explanation, the discussion held under the sub-heading of current challenges and difficulties in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students is the very important part of this study in identifying the responsible bodies that can play an important role in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students. Thus, here below the findings are discussed under different sub-headings following the previous research findings.

Religion-related factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students

Both student and teacher respondents argued that religious institutions and leaders are one of the major contributors to the development of moral and ethical behaviour of students, and teaching morality and ethical behaviour is the central responsibility of all religions. Similarly, the FGD result reported that religious institutions (both Christianity and Islam) have the power of shaping and modifying students' moral and ethical behaviour positively. Furthermore, FGD discussants argued that the current moral and ethical

problems of students are due to the lack of integrating some religious information related to morality and ethics into the school curriculum. Thus, what was found in the present study confirmed the findings of previous researchers. For instance, religious institutions contributed a lot for the moral development of the child even more than the other contributing factors (Smetana et al, 2004); declining moral standards are at least attributed to the rise of secularism and the decline of organized religion (Zukerman, 2008); Religion is a precondition for morality; that is, morality is impossible without belief in God (Pew Research Centre, 2007); religious affiliation is just one of the many ways people can satisfy a need to "belong" (Bloom, 2012); religion is not only particularly concerned with morality as an external correlate but also includes morality as one of its basic dimensions (Saroglou, 2011); Religion provides the unique basis for morality and without religion, there could be no morality (Gaukroger, 2012); religious services (regardless of religious domination) reliably report pro-social behaviour (Brooks, 2006); religiosity itself increases social desirability concerns (Gervias, 2014a); to establish morals, one's conscience needs to be educated with Godly concepts such as grace, faith, compassion, forgiveness and reliable association between intensity of religious participation or involvement and willingness to cooperate or contribute to a common pool (Sosis& Ruffle, 2003, Soler, 2012).

On the other hand, on the same scale (religion-related challenges in the development of moral and ethical behaviour) when individual items are compared in terms of students' and teachers' responses as well as when an independent sample t-test was computed on the whole scale among student and teacher respondents, statistically significant difference was observed. Does this lead to the question being a religious person leads a follower to be a moral and ethical person? From the FGD made with school leaders, members of PTA, and leaders of religious institutions, the response was "no". This is because, according to the response and observation of the discussants, almost all students in their locality are religious and they visit churches and mosques frequently to accomplish their religious commitment. However, they become other persons when they are out of these religious worshiping places. The explanation given by the discussants for such behaviour agrees with what was stated in the previous studies of Norenzayan (2014) that stated religion and morality are popular, complex, and intensely controversial and morality does not necessarily depend upon religion and religion is neither necessary nor sufficient for morality (Rachels & Rachels, 2011; Gaukrogar, 2012).

Parent-related factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students

Among the other factors, according to the results found from the analysis, the family can play an important role in the development of moral and ethical behaviour of students. This signifies that home is the first school for the development of socially desirable moral and ethical behaviours. Regarding this issue, all the respondents (students and teachers), as well as the FGD discussants, agreed that parents are responsible agents in promoting moral and ethical behaviours. This current finding was consistent with the previous findings that stated family interactions that facilitate Kohlbergianmoral reasoning stages are effective components like those interactions such as parental warmth, involvement, and support are related to moral reasoning development (Hart, 1988; Powers, 1988; Walker& Taylor 1991) and parents provide the most constant and visible models of behaviours associated with character development (Oladipo, 2009). Several research findings suggested that children take their parents as models. Thus, parenting has been almost universally

acknowledged as being an essential source for children's moral and ethical development (Lee & Bowen, 2006). This is because parenting techniques, styles, and levels of involvement have a significant effect on a child's morality and ethical behaviour (Alizadeh, Abu Talib, Abdullah & Mansor, 2011; Jeynes, 2003, 2005), their conscience develops based on the variation in parenting style (Kochanska & Aksan, 2004). Moreover, the household is the immediate environment to shape children's personalities. As such, parents' responses to children's transgressions and immoral actions may influence the child's moral development (Smetana, 1999).

On the other hand, although the respondents and the participants of this study, as a whole, agreed that parents are responsible for promoting children's moral and ethical behaviour. Variation was found between student and teacher respondents concerning what parents are doing currently concerning the moral and ethical integrity of school children. Children protect their parents as they are not causes and factors for the moral crises observed and they attributed to teachers as the causes of moral and ethical crises. On the contrary, teachers attributed to parents as the causes and factors of moral and ethical crises that are observed in the present day both in schools and out-of-school environments.

Internal/external factors(more of technological, political, and personal factors)that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students.

The data obtained from the respondents and FGD participants identified that external factors such as the expansion of media that propagate immoral and unethical messages, inferiority and superiority complexes, instabilities because of political polarization, ethnic violence, external political pressures, low social and psychological maturity of students prohibits students to rationalize and to be reasonable. Peer pressure was also found as the main internal/external factor that aggravates moral and ethical crises. Therefore, based on these findings, one can conclude that both external factors (socio-political) that come from society and the identified internal factors (personal factors) were the major factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviours among adolescent students. The finding obtained from the respondents and FGD participants confirmed what was explained in the previous studies of Alshare (2010), Fuchs (2017), Gahagan, Vaterlaus and Frost (2016), and Alshare, Alkhnaldeh and Eneizan (2019) that argued beside the positive effects, communicative technologies of social media have contributed a lot in developing immoral and unethical behaviours. Similarly, the present finding identified that age-related factors affect the moral and ethical development of adolescent students. This finding confirms what was found in Greene et al (2001), Moll et al (2001), Folger et al (2002), and Gaudin and Thotne (2001) that argued the role of emotion and sensitivity by adolescents in promoting the moral and ethical behaviours. Among external factors, peer pressure influences the development of the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students. This result confirmed the finding of Killen and Nucci (1995) that stated the type of interaction within a peer group can positively influence moral development. Furthermore, O'fallon and Butterfield (2005) identified clear evidence of peer influence on ethical behaviour.

Teacher-related factors that challenged the development of moral and ethical behaviour among adolescent students

In almost all teacher-related scale items, student respondents attributed that teachers are responsible and claimed as a cause for the observed students' immoral and unethical behaviour. On the other hand, what teachers responded on similar scale items differs from that of students' responses. That is, students blame their teachers and make them

responsible for the immoral and unethical behaviour observed whereas teacher respondents deny what students viewed and claim as they are not causes or factors for the presence of students' immoral and unethical behaviour. Furthermore, teachers argued that they are not models of antisocial behaviour that lead their students to develop immoral and unethical behaviour.

Some previous findings support what was responded by students. For example, teachers do not always deeply understand children's attitudes and behaviours (Simona & Speranta, 2013); teachers are not prepared to communicate with parents (Dorfer, 2007); teachers lost their confidence in education reforms (Simona & Speranta, 2013); the focus on the manner of teachers can draw attention to teaching as a moral endeavor grounded in the relationship between student and teacher (Follana, 2000). Therefore, Follana claimed that for a quality relationship between a teacher and a student, a teacher must have a manner of expressive virtue. That is, teachers need to understand and respond to conflicts values, norms, and beliefs, pervading teaching conflicts differently. Furthermore, Bullough (2011) asserted that based upon a wide range of life experiences, patterns are apparent in how teachers respond to moral dilemmas, indicating differences in levels of moral and ethical sensitivity and understanding.

3.2 Conclusion

This study was conducted at a time when Ethiopia is at the political transformation period that created political instability in several places including the study sites. This political instability and other socio-political factors resulted in adolescent students experiencing some immoral and unethical behaviours that affected the teaching-learning process and the wellbeing of society as a whole. Based on the research findings, the following conclusions were made.

- The contradictory result was found between student and teacher respondents regarding the role of civic and ethical education in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students. Student respondents stated that what they have learned in civic education has a role in boosting up their morale and ethical behaviour. Whereas, teacher respondents argued that the majority of the students are characterized by immoral and unethical behaviours both in the school and outside the school environments and this is an indication that civic education that the students learned starting from the early grades, has not contributed to protecting students from practicing immoral and unethical behaviours. Furthermore, according to teacher respondents, it seems that learned civic education has no power of shaping or modifying the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students in a positive manner.

- Students and teachers have no clear understanding regarding the difference between civic education and moral education and also have no awareness that social and governmental institutions are responsible for promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students. This might be because, 1) civic education was more associated and perceived as political education whereas moral education was recognized as a religious (theological) education,2) the content of civic education gave more emphasis to the political aspect neglecting the moral and ethical aspects,

and 3) most of the teachers assigned to teach civic education had a political inclination to the ruling political party.

- Religious leaders/institutions were found as responsible stakeholders in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of students. However, religious leaders/institutions were not working as they are expected in promoting socially desirable moral and ethical behaviours of adolescent students.

- Parents were found as responsible agents regarding promoting students' moral and ethical behaviours. However, what was happening on the ground, among the respondents, in the study area was quite different. Thus, the respondent students did not accept that their parents are responsible for the moral and ethical crises observed both in schools and outside environments whereas teachers blame parents by stressing that they are responsible for the moral and ethical crises observed. This might be because parents are not performing to the level they were expected in shaping and modifying the behaviour of their children. For example, being a good model for pro-social behaviour, continuous follow-up of the day-to-day activities of their children, working with schools and teachers in promoting pro-social behaviours of morality and ethics.

- Statistically, a significant difference was not found between students and teachers regarding the factors that lead students to practice immoral and unethical behaviours along the dimension of internal-external(more of technological, political, and personal factors). However, these respondents differ along the dimensions of religion-related factors, parent-related factors, and teacher-related factors. The presence of this difference is expected because of attribution bias as well as a lack of clear understanding of the role of religious institutions, parents, and teachers in building moral and ethical behaviour.

- Parent-related factors are the most determinant factors in promoting the moral and ethical behaviour of adolescent students. This might be an indication that teachers as well as rules and regulations of the schools are less powerful in controlling immoral and unethical behaviour.

3.3 Recommendations

- Considering the currently observed moral and ethical crises among adolescent students, designing and implementing a new moral and ethical education curriculum has to be given priority.

    - In designing this new moral and ethical education curriculum the contents should be free from specific political issues and bias.

    - The curriculum developers should be professionally oriented. The researcher also believes that it is important to consult professionals from the fields of social sciences, humanities, education, and religious stakeholders.

- Besides their academic preparation, the curriculum developers have to have a clear awareness of the existing social environment (political, economic, religious, etc.) and the limitations of the existing civic education.

- The role of moral and ethical education in schools is to reinforce values gained at home. Each child from birth, under his environment, belongs to a significant group. Therefore, parents, peers, teachers, and school administrators, and religious institutions can play a major role in the formation of moral and ethical values of students starting from an early age. Therefore, these stakeholders have to be well-oriented by the concerned education officials on the concept and importance of moral and ethical education.

- Schools should be free from external influences such as political and religious since they were observed as causes of moral and ethical crises.

- It has to be clear that morality can stand independent of religion. Although religion needs morality to promote a better society just as morality may need religion to promote its principles. Religion and morality are support one another in the development of a balanced personality as well as the creation of a peaceful, just, and egalitarian society. Therefore, directions should be given for those who teach moral and ethical education on how to teach and on what to focus on while teaching. For example, a clear demarcation should be kept between religious education and moral and ethical education.

- Working with teachers and the teaching profession is dully very important. In different studies, it was reported that the teaching and teaching profession is deteriorating from time to time. For this, without doubt, teachers have their contribution. A teacher who lacks moral and ethical values and a teacher that is not a good model of moral and ethical behaviour can not be expected to promote desirable moral and ethical behaviours for students. Therefore, working on teachers' morality and ethical behaviour is urgent and needs a priority.

REFERENCES

Akalewold Eshete (2005a). "Civic & Ethical Education Curriculum Policy: Recent Government's Interest & Subsequent Development."*IER.Flambeau*, Volume 13, Number 35.

Alizadeh, S. et al. (2011)."Relationship between Parenting Style and Children's Behaviour Problems."*Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 195–201.

Alshare, F. (2010)."The Effect of Advertising on Consumer Behaviour for Cans Food Industries."*European journal of social Sciences*, 16(3), 340-349.

Alshare, F., Alkhawaldeh, A. M., &Eneizan, B. M. (2019)."Social Media Website's Impact on Moral and Social Behaviour of the Students of University."*International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 169–182.

Bauml, M. (2009). "Examining the Unexpected Sophistication of Pre-service Teachers' Beliefs about the Relational Dimensions of Teaching."*Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(6), 902-908.

Bloom P. (2012). "Religion, Morality and Evolution." *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 179–199.

Branson, S.M (1998). *The Role of Civic Education*. New York: Web@civic.

Brooks, A.C. (2006). *Who Really Cares: The Surprising Truth about Compassionate Conservatism.* New York: Basic Books.

Bullough, R. V. (2011). "Ethical and Moral Matters in Teaching and Teacher Education."*Teaching and Teacher Education,* 27, 21-28.

Campbell, E. (2008). "Teaching Ethically as a Moral Condition of Professionalism."In D. Narváez and L. Nucci (Eds.).*The International Handbook of Moral and Character Education*. New York: Routledge.

Carr, D. (2014). "Metaphysics and Methods in Moral Enquiry and Education: Some Old Philosophical Wine for New Theoretical Bottles."*Journal of Moral Education*, 43(4), 500-515.

ETP (1994).*Education & Training Policy*.Addis Ababa; EMPDA.

Fallona, C. (2000). "Manner in Teaching: A Study in Observing and Interpreting Teachers' Moral Virtues."*Teaching and Teacher Education,* 16, 681-695.

Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., & Van De Boss, K. (2002).*Moral Affect and Work Motives*: "I'm Mad as Hell and…" Unpublished Manuscript.

Frank, H., Campanella, L., Dondi, F., Mehlich, J., Leitner, E., Rossi, G. & Bringmann, G. (2011). *Ethics, chemistry, and education for sustainability.* Angewandte Chemie Inter national Edition, 50(37), 84828490. doi: 10.1002/anie.201007599

Fuchs, C. (2017). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction.*Sage.

Gahagan, K., Vaterlaus, J. M., & Frost, L. R. (2016). "College Student Cyber Bullying on Social Networking Sites: Conceptualization, Prevalence and Perceived Bystander Responsibility."*Computers in Human Behaviour*, 55, 1097-1105.

Gaukroger, S. (2012). *Objectivity: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gaudine, A. & Thorne, L. (2001)."Emotion and Ethical Decision-making in Organizations."*Journal of Business Ethics,* 31, 175-187.

Greene, J. et al. (2001). "An fMRI Investigation of Emotional Engagement in Moral Judgment."*Science*, 293(5537), 2105-2108.

Gervais, W. M. (2014a). *Everything is Permitted? People Intuitively Judge Immorality as Representative of Atheists*. PLoS ONE, 9(4), 10.1371/journal.pone.0092302 [PMC free article] [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]

Halstead, J. M. (2007). "Islamic Values: A Distinctive Framework for Moral Education."*Journal of Moral Education,* 36 (3), 283-296.

Han, H. (2014). "Analysing Theoretical Frameworks of Moral Education through Lakatos's Philosophy of Science."*Journal of Moral Education*, 43(1), 32-53.

Henrich, Joseph, Steven J. Heine, and AraNorenzayan. 2010. The weirdest people in the world? *The Behavioural and brain sciences.*33(2-3),61-83.

Hart, D. (1988). "A Longitudinal Study of Adolescents' Socialization and Identification as Predictors of Adult Moral Judgment Development."*Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 34: 245-260.

Husu, J., &Tirri, K. (2007). Developing Whole School Pedagogical Values a Case of Going through the Ethos of Good Schooling". *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(4), 390-401.

Jeynes, W. H. (2003). "A Meta-Analysis: The Effects of Parental Involvement on Minority Children's Academic Achievement."*Education and Urban Society*, 35(2), 202–218.

Jeynes, W. H. (2005). "A Meta-Analysis of the Relation of Parental Involvement to Urban Elementary School Student Academic Achievement."*Urban Education*, 40(3), 237–269.

Kidder, R. (2003). How Good People Make Tough Choices: Resolving the Dilemmas of Ethical Living. New York: Harper Collins.

Killen M, Nucci, L. P. (1995). "Morality, Autonomy, and Social Conflict."In M. Killen, D. Hart (Eds.).*Morality in Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kisby.B, and Sloam, J. (2009)."Citizenship, Democracy, and Education in the UK: Towards a common Framework for Citizenship Lessons in the Four Home Nations."*Parliamentary Affairs 65* (1) 68-89.

Kochanska, G., &Aksan, N. (2004). "Conscience in Childhood: Past, Present, and Future."*Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 50(3), 299–310.

Lee, J.S. and Bowen, N.K. (2006) Parent Involvement, Cultural Capital, and the Achievement Gap among Elementary School Children.*American Educational Research Journal*, 43, 193-218. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312043002193

Meron T. (2006). *Civic Education & Students of Higher Learning: A Case Study*. Proceedings of the fourth national conference in private higher education in Ethiopia. Addis Ababa: St. Mary's University College.

MoE (2006).*A Discussion Paper on Civic & Ethical Education for Teachers, Principals & Supervisors* (Amharic Document) Addis Ababa, EMPDA.

Moll, J., Eslinger, P. J., Oliveira-Souza, R. (2001). "Front Polar and Anterior Temporal Cortex Activation in a Moral Judgment Task-preliminary Functional MRI Results in Normal Subjects."*Arquivos de neuro-psiquiatria*, 59(3B), 657-664.

Norenzayan, A. &Shariff, A.F. (2008).The origin and evolution of religious prosociality.*Science* 322: 58-62.

Norenzayan, A. (2014). "Does Religion Make People Moral?"*Behaviour*, 151.365-384.

O'Fallon, M.J. and. Butterfield, K.D.(2005). "A Review of the Empirical Ethical Decision-Making Literature: 1996-2003." *Journal of Business Ethics*, 59, 375-413.

Oladipo, S.E. (2009). "Moral Education of the Child: Whose Responsibility?"*Journal of Social Psychology,* 20(2) 149-156.

Paul, R.and Elder, L. (2006).The Miniature Guide to Understanding the Foundations of Ethical Reasoning. United States: Foundation for Critical Thinking Free Press.

Pew Research Centre (2007). *Pew Research Global Attitudes Project*. Retrieved fromhttp://www.pewglobal.org/2007/10/04/chapter-3-views-of-religion-morality/and. New York: Routledge.

Powers, S. I. (1988). "Moral Judgment Development within TheFamily."*Journal of Moral Education*, 17: 209-219.

Rachels, J. and Rachels, S.(Eds.). (2011). *The Elements of Moral Philosophy* (7th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reiss, M. J. (1999)."Teaching Ethics in Science."*Studies in Science Education*, 34(1), 115-140.doi: 10.1080/03057269908560151.

Rushworth.K. (2003). How Good People Make Tough Choices: Resolving the Dilemmas of Ethical Living. New York: Harper Collins.

Saroglou V. (2011). "Believing, Bonding, Behaving and Belonging: The Big Four Religious Dimensions and Cultural Variation." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42, 1320–1340.

Seyoum T. (1996). "Attempts in Educational Reform in Ethiopia: A Top-down or a Bottom-up Reform."*The Ethiopian journal of Higher Education*,16, 1-37.

SimonaValea and SperantaFarca (2013).Teacher's responsibility in moral and affective education of children, *Procedia- Social and Behavioural Science*. 76, 863-867.

Smetana, J, G (1999). "The Role of Parents in Moral Development: A Social Domain Analysis."*Journal of Moral Education.*28(3), 312-320.

Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., &Daddis, C. (2004). "Longitudinal Development of Family Decision Making: Defining Healthy Behavioural Autonomy for Middle-class African- American Adolescents."*Child Development*, 75, 1418-1434

Soler, M. (2012). "Costly Signaling, Ritual and Cooperation: Evidence from Candomblé, An Afro-Brazilian Religion."*Evol. Hum. Behav*. 33, 346-356.

Sosis, R. & Ruffle, B.J. (2003). "Religious Ritual and Cooperation: Testing for a Relationship on Israeli Religious and Secular Kibbutzim." *Curr.Anthropol*. 44, 713-722.

Stanford University (2011)."The Definition of Morality".Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.Stanford University. Retrieved on 22 March, 2014.

Walker, L.J, Taylor, J.H (1991). "Family Interactions and the Development of Moral Reasoning."*Child Development,* 62, 264-283.

Yaro, J., A. (2013). The story of the northern Ghana.Rural development in northern Ghana.

Zuckerman P. (2008). *Society without God*. New York,: NYU Press.