

CULTIVATING CHARACTER: HOW THE HOME ENVIRONMENT NURTURES MORAL VALUES AMONG THE HIGHER SECONDARY STUDENTS

** Dr. Maxwell Benjamin Balraj*

* Associate Professor, Dept. of Education, Spicer Adventist University, Pune, India .

Abstract:

Today's young people are facing innumerable Value Problems. Does the Home Environment help to develop Moral Values among children? Hence, this study attempts to ascertain the influence of Organizational Climate (Home Environment) on the prevalence of Moral Values among the Higher Secondary students in Chennai city. The present study belongs to Normative Survey research. In this study, the Stratified Random Sampling Technique was followed, and the data were collected from 1446 students in 20 schools. The research focused on six components of moral values—Personal, Academic, Social, Aesthetic, Humanitarian, and Religious—and examined how these varied across different levels of school environments (classified as High, Moderate, and Low climate) The tools used in the study were a Situational test to measure Moral Values developed by the investigator. One Standardized Tools to measure Organizational Climate was Home Environment Inventory. The Statistical Techniques used in the study were Mean, Standard Deviation & t-test, for finding solutions to the problems. The major findings of the study are that the children have good Moral Values, irrespective of High, Moderate, and Low Home Environment.

Keywords: Moral values, Home environment climate, Academic achievement

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

Introduction:

The whole country is experiencing massive erosion values. Political and Economic Corruption, Scandals and Scams, Antisocial and Anti-national Activities, etc., are on the rise all over the country. The elders at home teach the developing baby behavior, dress codes, customs, aspirations, and so on. The minds of children develop in a major way through the process of non-formal education at home. The elders have a great responsibility towards the generation that is coming up. In the upbringing of our children, we have to give them an understanding of human values and a sense of control based on spirituality.

They should equip the children with certain factors such as: awareness of truth, a sense of responsibility, emotional maturity, communication skills, awareness of intellectual development, sense of judgment and observation, cultural awareness, development of

personality, religious & spiritual values, and leadership qualities. The mother and father are the first examples in social behavior that children see before them and learn to imitate. The parents should set their children on the right path right from their early years. They should not hesitate to correct them and even punish them when they take to wrong way. They can show their love for their children by doing everything necessary to make them follow the right path. It is only when parents show firmness in dealing with their children that they will develop along the right lines. Children should develop a healthy and strong body. He should develop the ability to think logically, to plan wisely, and to distinguish right from wrong, good from evil, beauty from ugliness, truth from falsehood, and godliness from ungodliness. Does a student of this generation know Moral Values and to develop the ability to make conscious moral decisions? Do Home

Environment help to develop Moral Values among the students? This study attempts to ascertain the influence of Organizational Climate on the prevalence of Moral Values among the Higher Secondary students in Chennai city. Today, young people need help and guidance in the development of their values and value system more than ever before.

Review of Literature:

The home environment plays a vital role in shaping a student's personality, academic success, and moral development. Researchers have long emphasized that the nature of the home climate—comprising parental attitudes, family interactions, emotional support, discipline styles, and socioeconomic factors—significantly influences both the moral orientation and academic performance of adolescents.

The home environment plays a pivotal role in shaping the personality, values, and academic performance of students. Numerous studies have explored the influence of family background, parental involvement, and home atmosphere on the moral and educational development of adolescents, especially those in higher secondary education.

Home Environment & Academic Achievement:

According to Epstein (2001), parental involvement and a positive home environment are strongly linked with students' academic success. A structured home environment that supports learning activities, such as reading, supervision of homework, and encouraging curiosity, often leads to better academic outcomes. Kellaghan et al. (1993) found that factors such as the availability of learning materials at home, the presence of a quiet study space, and parental expectations contribute significantly to academic achievement, especially during secondary education.

Desforges & Abouchaar (2003) emphasized that parental support in the early and middle years of schooling enhances students' attitudes toward education, leading to higher academic success.

The Influence of Home Environment on Moral, Emotional, Social, and Academic Development of Students

Berkowitz and Grych (1998) noted that the moral atmosphere at home—shaped by parental modeling, communication of ethical principles, and the quality of relationships—profoundly influences moral development in children and adolescents. Walker & Taylor (1991) demonstrated that children who perceive their parents as warm, supportive, and morally consistent tend to internalize moral norms more effectively and exhibit higher levels of moral reasoning. Narvaez (2005) argued that a nurturing home environment that fosters empathy, cooperation, and respect for others significantly contributes to moral maturity.

Studies like Wentzel (1993) show that students with strong moral values—such as responsibility, integrity, and perseverance—tend to be more focused and committed, leading to better academic performance. The development of moral values often correlates with traits like self-discipline and goal orientation, which are critical to academic success. Lapsley & Narvaez (2006) have asserted that moral character traits and academic behaviors are interdependent; students who are morally grounded are more likely to display academic integrity and resilience in learning.

Objectives of the Study:

To find out the level of selected Components of Moral Values on different classification of Home Environment among the higher secondary students.

Hypotheses of the Study:

There will be no significant difference in the Mean Value for the components of Moral Value on different levels of Home Environment among Higher Secondary Students in Chennai city.

Methodology of the Study:

The present study belongs to Survey Research. The variables used in this study are: Moral Values, and

Home Environment.

a) Population of the Study

The total number of Higher Secondary students studying in Chennai city is the population of the study. There were 460 Higher Secondary Schools in Chennai City .

b) Size of the Sample

Based on the stratified Random Sampling Technique, the investigator selected 20 schools. The higher secondary students studying in 20 schools were 1446 students, out of which 810 are Male Students and 636 are female students.

c) Tools Used

For the present study, three Tools were used. They were i) Test for Moral Values among School Students (TMVSS) developed by the Investigator and standardized tool, namely Home Environment Inventory (HEI).

The investigator decided to have only three minimum and 6 maximum situational test items for each value. Thus, the revised draft of the Tool TMVSS consisted of 50 situational test items for 12 values under 6 sub-classifications, which had four alternatives in each item.

Table 1: List of Values expected for school students under different classifications

S.N o.	Values	No. items included	Total items
A	Personal Values	01-07	07
1	Simplicity	01-03	03
2	Self-discipline	04-07	04
B	Academic Values	08-15	08
3	Responsibility	08-12	05
4	Curiosity	13-15	03
C	Social Values	16-23	08
5	Service	16-19	04
6	Co-operation	20-23	04

D	Aesthetic Values	24-35	11
7	Honesty	24-29	06
8	Tolerance	30-34	05
E	Humanitarian Values	35-43	09
9	Brotherhood	35-39	05
10	Compassion	40-43	04
F	Religious Values	44-50	07
11	Faith in God	44-47	04
12	Forgiveness	48-50	03
Total		50	50

The above Table 1 shows that there are six components of Moral Values under this each component has two values. It also revealed the number of items included in the Questionnaire and its total items.

Table 2: Number of Items included under Different Situations

S. No.	Type of Situations	No. of items included	Scores
1	Family situation	07	07
2	Classroom situation	14	14
3	School situation	07	07
4	Social situation	22	22
	Total	50	50

From Table 2, it was noticed that out of 50 situational test items selected, there were 7 family situations, 14 classroom situations, 7 school situations, and 22 social situations.

Description of Home Environment Inventory (HEI)

The Home Environment Inventory (HEI) is a standardized tool to measure the psycho-social Climate of home as perceived by children. It provides a measure of the quality and the cognitive, emotional, and social support that has been available to the child within the

home. HEI has 100 items belonging to ten dimensions of Home Environment.

The ten dimensions are- (A) Control, (B) Protectiveness, (C) Punishment, (D) Conformity, (E) Social Isolation, (F) Reward, (G) Deprivation of Privileges, (H) Nurturance, (I) Rejection, and (J) Permissiveness. Each dimension has ten items belonging to it.

Statistical Measures Used in the Study

After scoring the filled-in TMVSS, SEI, and HEI Questionnaires, a master Table was prepared by plotting the scores. Different statistical measures were used in the study to find out solutions to the problems, which are briefly as below.

- (i) Descriptive Analysis- Mean and Standard Deviation were used to analyze.
- (ii) Inferential Analysis –t-test to analyze the significant difference and

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Analysis of the Moral Values and the Achievements of the students with different Home Environments in total

This section deals with the ‘t’ test analysis between the Mean Scores of the Moral values and the Achievement of the Students with respect to Home Environment such as High, Moderate, and Low Home Environments. The Scores of various components of Moral values, such as Personal Value, Academic Value, Social Value, Aesthetic Value, Humanitarian value, and Religious Value, were also analyzed with respect to the different classifications of the Home Environment

Table 3: ‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Personal Value among Students with respect to different classifications of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value
HHE	119	77.88	20.12	0.33**
MHE	919	77.24	20.38	
MHE	919	77.24	20.38	1.83**
LHE	408	75.07	19.66	
LHE	408	75.07	19.66	1.36**
HHE	119	77.88	20.12	

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is understood from Table 3 above that the ‘t’ values 0.33, 1.83, and 1.36 of Personal values among Students of different Home Environment are Not Significantly different at the 0.05 level. Since all the comparisons show non-significant differences, we can conclude that students from Low, Moderate, and High Home Environments do not differ significantly in terms of their Personal Values. This suggests that Home Environment (as categorized here) does not have a notable impact on the development of Personal Values in students.

The formation of Personal Values may be influenced more by individual personality traits, peer groups, cultural norms, or school environment, rather than the home environment level alone. Educators and parents might need to focus more on value education programs and peer influence rather than assuming home environment alone determines values.

Table 4: ‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Academic Value among Students with respect to different classifications of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value
HHE	119	68.84	24.31	1.00**
MHE	919	71.03	22.15	
MHE	919	71.03	22.15	0.04**
LHE	408	70.98	19.80	
LHE	408	70.98	19.80	0.98**
HHE	119	68.84	24.31	

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is found from Table 4 that the ‘t’ values 1.00, 0.04, and 0.98 are Not Significant at the 0.05 level. From this analysis, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in Academic Values among students from Low, Moderate, and High Home Environments. This indicates that, in this study, home environment level does not appear to influence students' academic values in a significant way.

Table 5: ‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Social Value among Students with respect to different classification of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value
HHE	119	69.50	24.43	0.88**
MHE	919	71.48	22.88	
MHE	919	71.48	22.88	0.66**
LHE	408	72.27	18.82	
LHE	408	72.27	18.82	1.31**
HHE	119	69.50	24.43	

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is revealed from Table 5 that the ‘t’ values 0.88, 0.66, and 1.31 of Social values among the Students of different Home Environments are Not Significantly different at the 0.05 level. While analyzing the Mean Scores, it is found that there is no significant difference

in Social Values among students from Low, Moderate, and High Home Environments. This indicates that, according to the data, the level of home environment does not significantly impact students' social values.

Table 6: ‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Aesthetic Value among Students with respect to different classifications of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value
HHE	119	68.56	23.83	1.47**
MHE	919	71.80	22.38	
MHE	919	71.80	22.38	0.44**
LHE	408	71.27	19.49	
LHE	408	71.27	19.49	1.27**
HHE	119	68.56	23.83	

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It can be observed from Table 6 that the ‘t’ values 1.47, 0.44, and 1.27 are Not Significant at the 0.05 level. It is revealed from the results that there is no significant difference in Aesthetic Values among students from different levels of Home Environment (High, Moderate, Low). This suggests that home environment, as categorized in this study, does not significantly influence students' aesthetic values.

Table 7: ‘t’ Values between the Mean Scores of Humanitarian Value among Students with respect to different classifications of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	‘t’ Value
HHE	119	70.61	24.38	0.12**
MHE	919	70.34	24.02	
MHE	919	70.34	24.02	2.14*
LHE	408	73.13	20.90	
LHE	408	73.13	20.90	1.11**
HHE	119	70.61	24.38	

*Significant at 0.05 Level

**Not Significant at 0.05 Level

It is observed from Table 7 that the 't' value 2.14 is Significant, whereas the values 0.12 and 1.11 is Not Significant at the 0.05 level. The results reveal that Humanitarian Values among the Students of Low Home Environment are Significantly Higher than the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment and Humanitarian Values Scores among the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment are similar. Students from Low Home Environments have significantly higher Humanitarian Values than students from Moderate Home Environments, while students from High and Moderate Home Environments show similar levels of humanitarian values. This indicates a partially significant effect of home environment on humanitarian values.

Table 8: 't' Values between the Mean Scores of Religious Value among Students with respect to different classifications of Home-Environment

Category	N	Mean	SD	't' Value
HHE	119	70.24	25.70	1.37**
MHE	919	73.67	25.71	
MHE	919	73.67	25.71	1.81**
LHE	408	76.13	21.53	
LHE	408	76.13	21.53	2.51*
HHE	119	70.24	25.70	

*Significant at 0.05 Level **Not Significant at 0.05 Level

The above Table 8 shows that the 't' values 2.51 is Significant, whereas the 't' values 1.37 and 1.81 are Not Significant at the 0.05 level. It is understood from the results that the Students from Low Home Environments have significantly higher Religious Values than students from High Home Environments, while students from Moderate and High Home Environments show no significant difference in religious values. This reflects a partially significant influence of the home environment on religious values.

Findings of the Study:

The findings of the study are:

Among the Students of Low, Moderate and High Home Environments the **Personal values** are similar.

Personal values among the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment are higher than all other components of Moral Values. Among the Low Home Environment Students, the Personal Values are better than Academic, Social, Aesthetic Values, Humanitarian and Religious values are similar to the Personal Values in Low School Climate.

Among the Students of Low, Moderate and High Home Environments the **Academic values** are similar.

Academic values among Students are lesser than Personal Values among High, Moderate and Low Home Environment. Among Moderate and Low Home Environment the Academic values are lesser than Religious values whereas all the other Moral Values are similar.

Among the students of Low, Moderate and High Home Environments the **Social values** are similar.

Social values are lesser than Personal values among High and Moderate Home Environments and among the Low Home Environment, the Social Values are lesser than the Personal and Religious values whereas all the other Moral Values are similar.

The **Aesthetic values** are similar irrespective of the Home Environment.

Aesthetic values are lesser than Personal values among High and Moderate Home Environments and among the Low Home Environment the Aesthetic Values are lesser than the Personal and Religious values whereas all the others the Moral Values are similar.

Humanitarian values among the Students of Low Home Environment are Significantly Higher than the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment and Humanitarian Values Scores among the students of High and Moderate Home Environment are similar.

Students among the High and Moderate Home Environment, the Humanitarian Values are lesser than the Personal Values. Among the Moderate and Low Home Environment, the Humanitarian Values are lesser than Religious Values whereas all the other Moral Values are similar irrespective of the Home Environment of students.

Religious values among the Students of Low Home Environment are Significantly Higher than the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment and Religious Values Scores among the Students of High and Moderate Home Environment are found to be similar.

Students among the High and Moderate Home Environment the Religious Values are lesser than the Personal Values and among the Moderate and Low Home Environment the Religious Values are higher than the Academic and Humanitarian Values. Among the Low Home Environment, the Religious Values are higher than the Academic, Social, Aesthetic and Humanitarian Values whereas all the other Moral Values are similar.

Discussion:

The Personal Values are higher than other components of Moral Values in High, Moderate Low Home Environments, which may be due to good parental canalizing discipline, obedience, sense of responsibility, and providing good opportunities to frame and follow rules and regulations to achieve or set goals.

In Low Home Environment, the Religious value is High. This may be due to the regular attendance and participation in worship that cultivates faith in God, abstinence from wrongdoing, forgiveness and acceptance of family members, and a sincere and straightforward approach. A similar finding was found in the study of Zamen. G.S.(1982).

Educational Implication :

A positive attitude may be inculcated from childhood through parents and other members of the family, and teachers. In Home, where morality is learnt, and can be controlled and directed, learning to control Impulses, Moral Rules and Principles, is a valuable guide to apply the principles in new situations. Educators and parents should consider value education programs and peer group influences alongside home environment factors to effectively nurture moral development.

Conclusion :

The home environment is found to be a powerful factor determining the factors of the moral values of the students. Parents play a great role in molding the child's character. The skills, attitude, and emotions that make or mar the future of the child are built during these crucial years. In the Low Home Environment, the Moral Values are good among the children.

There can be a shift from good to excellent. When the parents are educated through seminars on family development and counselling, which include universal and ethical values like Compassion, Courage, Honesty, Tolerance, and Truthfulness, that will help in developing balanced individuals and in creating a human society. The parents must train their children to be masters in controlling the senses but not becoming slaves to the senses. A positive attitude needs to be inculcated from childhood through parents and other members of the family, and teachers.

Parents must guide their children to have a ceiling on desires, so that they develop their desires according to their capacities. Parents must train their children to overcome great enemies, such as ego, Anger, Jealousy, Hatred, Selfishness, Unhealthy Compassion, Lust, Greed, and Pride. The parents must guide their children to follow the example of an optimist. More emphasis must be placed on developing values among students; only then can children contribute to keeping the world and nations at peace.

References:

1. Berkowitz, M. W., & Grych, J. H. (1998). *Fostering goodness: Teaching parents to facilitate children's moral development*. *Journal of Moral Education*, 27(3), 371–391.
2. Desforjes, C., & Abouchaar, A. (2003). *The impact of parental involvement, parental support, and family education on pupil achievement and adjustment: A literature review (Research Report RR433)*. Department for Education and Skills.
3. Epstein, J. L. (2001). *School, family, and community partnerships: Preparing educators and improving schools*. Westview Press.
4. Kellaghan, T., Sloane, K., Alvarez, B., & Bloom, B. S. (1993). *The home environment and school learning: Promoting parental involvement in the education of children*. Jossey-Bass.
5. Lapsley, D. K., & Narvaez, D. (2006). *Character education*. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (6th ed., Vol. 4, pp. 248–296). Wiley.
6. Narvaez, D. (2005). *The neo-Kohlbergian tradition and beyond: Schemas, expertise and character*. In D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power (Eds.), *Character psychology and character education* (pp. 119–138). University of Notre Dame Press.
7. Walker, L. J., & Taylor, J. H. (1991). *Family interactions and the development of moral reasoning*. *Child Development*, 62(2), 264–283.
8. Wentzel, K. R. (1993). *Does being good make the grade? Social behavior and academic competence in middle school*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(2), 357–364.

Cite This Article:

Dr. Balraj M.B. (2025). *Cultivating Character: How the Home Environment Nurtures Moral Values Among the Higher Secondary Students*. In **Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal**: Vol. XIV (Number III, pp. 29–36). **Doi:** <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17192993>