

Culture Values of Honor among Deaf Adolescents in Kenya

Lornah Irene Ayako (PhD)

Department of Counseling Psychology, Catholic University of Eastern Africa, Kenya¹

Ramsis Technical Training College, Kenya²

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90400441>

Received: 20 April 2025; Accepted: 24 April 2025; Published: 21 May 2025

ABSTRACT

This study examines the cultural values of honor, face, and dignity among Deaf adolescents in Kenya. A quantitative research design was utilized, employing a multistage sampling method to select 309 Deaf secondary school students. The study was grounded in the Cultural Frame Switching Theory. Data were gathered using an adapted version of the Honor, Face, and Dignity Scale for Deaf adolescents ($\alpha = .8$), with responses assessed on a Likert scale. A total of 285 questionnaires were analyzed. Descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to analyze the data. The findings revealed that Deaf adolescents endorse strong cultural values related to honor, face, and dignity. The highest mean scores are observed for honor-related behaviors such as "I should protect the reputation of women I am related to" (Mean = 4.15, SD = 0.781) and "If my friend's reputation is questioned, I should come to their defense" (Mean = 4.52, SD = 0.500). T-tests indicated significant gender differences in the endorsement of honor values ($p < 0.05$), with males showing a higher inclination to defend personal honor compared to females. ANOVA results revealed significant age differences in the endorsement of dignity-related values, particularly in self-respect and moral integrity ($F(2, 291) = 5.32$, $p < 0.05$). This study concludes that Deaf adolescents in Kenya place a high value on honor, face, and dignity, with notable gender and age differences in how these values are expressed. The research points out the importance of considering cultural values when addressing the social integration and emotional well-being of Deaf individuals.

Keywords: Culture, Deaf Adolescents, Honor, Face, Dignity

INTRODUCTION

The concept of honor plays an important role in shaping both individual and group identities, significantly influencing social behavior. In cultures that emphasize honor, individuals and families place great value on their reputation, often defending it through retaliation when insulted or threatened. These cultures typically arise in areas with weak law enforcement, where protecting one's reputation becomes crucial for personal security and social status (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). In these societies, honor defense is a key part of life, and people often respond to perceived insults or threats to their reputation (Cohen & Nisbett, 1994).

Honor cultures highly value traits such as loyalty, honesty, and trustworthiness. These values are deep - rooted in people's identities and affect how they respond to threats to their reputation (Cheng et al., 2013). In such environments, individuals often feel compelled to retaliate when their own honor or that of their family is threatened. The importance of honor can strengthen community bonds and set clear social expectations, but it can also result in negative outcomes, like increased violence and honor-related crimes (Hoffman et al., 2014). In honor-based societies, failing to defend one's honor can lead to a loss of social standing, which affects both the individual and their family (Bisharat, 1990).

Although honor plays a significant role in many cultures, not all cultures place equal emphasis on it. Some argue that honor is more important in collectivist societies, where group reputation affects individual behavior. For example, Uskul and Cross (2018) discuss how honor is tied to family reputation and social expectations in Turkish culture, where personal dignity and conflict management are essential. Additionally, unspoken honor

norms often guide social interactions, creating clear expectations for acceptable behavior (World Health Organization, 2009).

Honor values are not confined to cultures that clearly prioritize them. Novin, Oyserman, and Oyserman (2016) suggest that even in societies where honor is not openly emphasized, it can still influence social behavior. For example, in cultures that prioritize dignity over honor, losing one's honor can still have serious social consequences. Keni (2024) contrasts honor and dignity in cultures across North India and Germany, showing that while both concepts relate to reputation and respect, dignity is often seen as more personal and individual, while honor is connected to group identity.

In the framework of Deaf culture, where sign language and shared experiences are key to communication and community, values such as honor, face, and dignity take on particular significance. Ayako (2024) highlights how Kenyan Sign Language fosters a sense of community and effective communication among Deaf individuals. While much research on honor cultures has been conducted globally, there is limited exploration of how these values affect Deaf adolescents. Deaf adolescents face challenges such as communication barriers and social exclusion, which may influence their understanding and experience of honor in different ways from their hearing peers.

This study aims to explore how cultural values of honor impact the social integration and relationships of Deaf adolescents in Kenya. It examines how these adolescents navigate the complex dynamics of honor, dignity, and social expectations within the Deaf community, contributing to a deeper understanding of how these values shape their social behavior and identity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Understanding the cultural values of honor among Deaf adolescents in Kenya requires a close look at how different societies define and express values like honor, face, and dignity. These values influence how individuals behave, relate to others, and respond to social expectations—especially in communities where identity and recognition are shaped by both cultural norms and social challenges.

In many societies where honor is highly valued, there is a strong belief in protecting one's reputation. According to Uskul, Cross, Günsoy, and Gul (2018), honor cultures are built on expectations that individuals must defend their name or family's name, sometimes even through aggression, if it is threatened. Such behavior is often linked to identity and respect in the community. In these cultures, maintaining honor becomes a form of social survival, especially in areas where formal systems of justice or protection are weak. This pattern can also be observed among Deaf adolescents in Kenya who may feel the need to assert their identity more strongly due to the stigma and exclusion they face. In such environments, honor may not only be about family pride but also about showing strength in a society that often overlooks them.

Keller (2021) explains that in honor-based societies, particularly among men, any threat to personal or family honor can lead to aggressive responses. This is because being seen as weak or dishonored could result in social rejection. These patterns are often found in settings where social structures demand that individuals take justice into their own hands. These dynamics are relevant when considering how Deaf adolescents in Kenya respond to challenges to their identity or dignity within schools, families, or the broader community. In cases where Deaf youth feel misunderstood or bullied, they may respond defensively or isolate themselves to protect their sense of self-worth, showing how honor becomes a coping mechanism for dealing with exclusion and inequality.

Vignoles, Kirchner-Häusler, Uskul, Cross, Rodriguez-Bailón, et al. (2025) provide a broader view by comparing cultures of honor, face, and dignity across three regions: the Mediterranean, East Asia, and Western societies. Their study shows that in honor cultures, self-worth depends on external approval and maintaining reputation; in face cultures, social harmony and obligation are central; and in dignity cultures, people rely more on inner values and self-respect. In the Mediterranean region, honor values appeared stronger than in Latin European contexts, showing that even within similar regions, variations exist. This comparison suggests that Kenyan Deaf adolescents may also navigate a unique blend of these values based on cultural expectations and

community responses to disability. For instance, while honor may be crucial within their cultural or family circles, the need to “save face” and maintain social peace may emerge more in school settings or peer interactions.

Rayhan (2023), examining Japanese society, describes how honor (meiyo), face (kao), and dignity influence ethical behavior and education. In Japan, these values guide how individuals interact, with an emphasis on avoiding shame, showing respect, and maintaining social order. Education systems support these values, teaching not just academics but also moral conduct. This integrated approach offers a useful reference point for exploring how schools in Kenya, especially those serving Deaf learners, might influence the development of similar ethical values. Deaf learners in Kenya, when given the right environment, can also internalize values such as dignity and mutual respect. However, this requires that teachers and peers recognize the importance of affirming their identity, rather than focusing only on their hearing difference.

Wei, Zhang, Fu, and Wang (2023) draw distinctions between honor and face cultures using the dignity, honor, and face (DOF) framework. Honor cultures rely on both internal awareness and external evaluation to define self-worth, often leading to competition and defense of reputation. In contrast, face cultures emphasize external approval, modesty, and cooperation, often within stable social hierarchies. From an indigenous perspective, honor may involve defending family, gender roles, and moral values, sometimes through physical means, while face involves managing reputation through social achievements and status. These cultural insights highlight the importance of understanding how Deaf adolescents in Kenya may adopt or resist certain behaviors to preserve honor or avoid shame. In a context where disability is sometimes viewed negatively, many Deaf adolescents may work harder to prove themselves, not just academically, but also morally, seeking to uphold their family's honor or gain respect in their communities.

Theoretical Framework

This study draws on Cultural Frame Switching Theory (Hong et al., 2000), which explains how individuals shift their behaviors, cognitions, and values in response to different cultural contexts. For Deaf adolescents in Kenya, who navigate both the mainstream (hearing) culture and their own Deaf cultural identity, this theory provides a useful lens to understand how they may toggle between different value systems, such as communal honor in Deaf culture and individual dignity in the broader Kenyan society, depending on the situation, communication environment, and social expectations.

Cultural frame switching refers to the ability of bicultural individuals to switch between various cultural perspectives depending on the contextual cues they encounter, such as social environments, symbols, or even linguistic features like accents. In the case of Deaf adolescents, their dual cultural identification often means that their responses and behaviors are shaped by the cultural context they are in, whether in a Deaf space, a mainstream school, or in interactions with hearing individuals. This flexibility allows them to adjust their thinking and actions according to the norms of the culture they are engaging with at the time.

Research supports the idea that cultural frame-switching is activated by external cues, such as accents or symbols, which influence how individuals interpret their environment and respond to social interactions. Studies by Hong et al. (2000) and Benet-Martínez et al. (2002) have shown that individuals can shift between collectivist and individualist mindsets depending on cultural cues. Dehghani et al. (2012) further demonstrated that accents, as markers of culture, can trigger these shifts in cognition and behavior. For Deaf adolescents in Kenya, this theory helps explain how they might experience differing value systems around honor and dignity in varying contexts, influencing their social identity, interactions, and emotional well-being.

This theoretical framework is particularly relevant as it considers the dual cultural worlds Deaf adolescents navigate, providing insight into how they reconcile their sense of honor with the expectations of the larger society they interact with.

Research Objectives

1. To assess the levels of culture of honor endorsed by Deaf adolescents in Kenya.

2. To examine the differences in the culture of honor between male and female Deaf adolescents in Kenya.
3. To analyze age-related differences in the culture of honor among Deaf adolescents in Kenya.

Hypotheses

1. **HA₁**: There will be a significant difference in the levels of endorsement of honor-related values between male and female Deaf adolescents in Kenya.
2. **HA₂**: There will be a significant difference in the levels of endorsement of honor-related values based on age among Deaf adolescents in Kenya.

METHODS

Research Design: This study employed a quantitative research design to investigate the cultural values of honor, face, and dignity among Deaf adolescents. The quantitative approach allowed for systematic data collection through surveys, enabling the analysis of patterns and differences in cultural values across demographic factors.

Area of Study: The study was conducted in the Central and Nyanza regions of Kenya, which were home to early schools for the Deaf and associations that supported Deaf culture. These regions provided a setting ideal for examining cultural values related to honor, face, and dignity among Deaf adolescents.

Target Population: The target population consisted of secondary school students who were Deaf or hard of hearing and used Kenyan Sign Language as their primary mode of communication. The selected students were enrolled in schools for the Deaf in the Central and Nyanza regions, ensuring they were embedded within communities that fostered Deaf culture.

Sampling Technique and Size: The researcher employed a multistage sampling technique. Initially, purposive sampling was used to select the Central and Nyanza regions, based on their prominence in serving the Deaf community. The total population of Deaf secondary school students from both regions was 1,546. Using Yamane's formula (1967), a sample size of 309 participants was determined. To ensure proportional representation, stratified sampling was then applied, leading to the selection of 102 participants from the Central region and 207 participants from the Nyanza region. This approach ensured that the sample accurately reflected the population distribution across the two regions. The final response rate consisted of 87 participants from the Central region and 207 participants from the Nyanza region.

Measures: The survey tool in this study measures cultural values of honor, face, and dignity, using a Likert-scale format to assess agreement with statements on these themes (Leung & Cohen 2011). It has three subscales: Honor (13 items) examines the importance of defending one's reputation and standing up for others; Face (4 items) focuses on avoiding public embarrassment and maintaining social harmony; and Dignity (8 items) assesses self-respect and moral integrity, independent of others' opinions. Higher scores indicate stronger support for these values.

Data Analysis: Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used in the analysis, utilizing SPSS version 25. Descriptive statistics, specifically means, were employed to assess the overall endorsement of honor-related cultural values. Inferential statistics, including independent samples t-tests and ANOVA, were conducted to examine differences in cultural values based on gender and age.

Ethical Considerations: Informed consent was obtained from all participants and their guardians where necessary. Participants were fully informed about the study's purpose and procedures and were assured of confidentiality. Voluntary participation was emphasized, with the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. These ethical guidelines ensured that the study adhered to the highest ethical standards while safeguarding the rights of the participants.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

The sample size consisted of 309 participants, with 285 questionnaires analyzed, representing a high response rate of 92.2%. This response rate is considered appropriate for the study, as it exceeds the recommended minimum threshold of 70% for survey-based research (Fowler, 2014). The age distribution reveals that the largest group of participants is in the 18–19 years range, comprising 142 individuals, or 49.8% of the valid responses. The next largest group is the 20–21 years category, with 84 participants, accounting for 29.5% of the sample. Those aged 22–23 years make up 15.1%, with 43 individuals, while the smallest group is those aged 24 years and above, at 5.6%, with 16 participants. In terms of gender, there are 134 male participants, representing 47.0% of the valid responses, and 151 female participants, making up 53.0%. This indicates a slight majority of females in the sample.

Levels of Culture of Honor

The study assessed the culture of honor among Deaf adolescents in Kenya using the Honor, Face, and Dignity Scale developed by Michele J. Gelfand and colleagues. The scale includes three subscales: Honor, Face, and Dignity. The results are detailed as follows: Table 1 presents Honor, Table 2 covers Face, and Table 3 displays Dignity.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of the Role of Reputation in Defending Personal Dignity

	Mean	Std. Deviation
I should avoid doing anything inappropriate so as not to embarrass myself.	4.31	.464
I should always know what is appropriate for a given situation and act accordingly.	4.47	.500
I should protect the reputation of women I am related to.	4.15	.781
I should be ready to defend my honor at any cost.	4.33	1.044
I should never criticize others in public, especially if they are older or more experienced.	2.28	1.035
I should never tolerate being disrespected.	3.90	.868
I should not do anything that would damage my family's reputation.	4.34	1.168
If I get insulted and do not respond, I will look weak.	3.42	1.221
If my friend's reputation is questioned, I should come to their defense.	4.52	.500
I should always think twice before speaking so as not to embarrass myself.	4.11	.629
I should always think about how my behavior will reflect on the reputation of my close ones.	4.31	.461
I should uphold and defend my family's reputation.	4.47	.500
I should avoid making others look incompetent.	4.17	.775
I believe that people worthy of respect are those who do their utmost to fulfill the expectations of their role.	3.93	.806

Participants reported varying levels of agreement with statements related to reputation and personal dignity, with the means and standard deviations providing insights into these perceptions. The statement “I should avoid doing anything inappropriate so as not to embarrass myself” yielded a mean of 4.31 (Std. Dev. = .464), indicating strong agreement with the importance of avoiding self-embarrassment. Similarly, “I should always know what is appropriate for a given situation and act accordingly” had a mean of 4.47 (Std. Dev. = .500), reflecting strong agreement with the necessity of situational awareness in behavior. Regarding family reputation, “I should protect the reputation of women I am related to” had a mean of 4.15 (Std. Dev. = .781), suggesting moderate agreement with the importance of defending family members' reputation, though the higher standard deviation points to some variability in responses. The statement “I should be ready to defend my honor at any cost” had a mean of 4.33 (Std. Dev. = 1.044), showing that most participants are inclined to defend their honor, although the relatively higher standard deviation indicates varied opinions on the extent to which this should be done. On the other hand, “I should never criticize others in public, especially if they are older or more experienced” received a low mean of 2.28 (Std. Dev. = 1.035), highlighting that participants generally do not perceive public criticism as a significant issue, even for older or more experienced individuals. The statement “I should never tolerate being disrespected” resulted in a mean of 3.90 (Std. Dev. = .868), suggesting moderate agreement with the idea of not tolerating disrespect, with somewhat consistent responses across participants. “I should not do anything that would damage my family’s reputation” received a mean of 4.34 (Std. Dev. = 1.168), indicating strong agreement but also considerable variability in how individuals perceive their responsibility toward family reputation. Participants agreed with the statement “If my friend’s reputation is questioned, I should come to their defense” (Mean = 4.52, Std. Dev. = .500), indicating strong support for defending friends’ reputations. For personal reflection, “I should always think twice before speaking so as not to embarrass myself” scored a mean of 4.11 (Std. Dev. = .629), suggesting that participants are cautious in their interactions to avoid self-embarrassment, with relatively low variability. Likewise, “I should always think about how my behavior will reflect on the reputation of my close ones” had a mean of 4.31 (Std. Dev. = .461), showing that participants are conscious of their actions' effects on their loved ones' reputations. The statement “I should uphold and defend my family’s reputation” received a mean of 4.47 (Std. Dev. = .500), reflecting strong agreement with defending family reputation. In contrast, “I should avoid making others look incompetent” (Mean = 4.17, Std. Dev. = .775) shows strong agreement, though there is slight variability in the responses, emphasizing the importance of not undermining others publicly. Lastly, “I believe that people worthy of respect are those who do their utmost to fulfill the expectations of their role” had a mean of 3.93 (Std. Dev. = .806), signaling moderate agreement with the idea that role fulfillment is key to earning respect, although opinions varied across participants.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of Maintaining Face in Social Interactions

	Mean	Std. Deviation
I should be extremely careful not to embarrass others, especially if they are of a higher rank.	2.28	1.035
If someone made me lose face, I would avoid this person in the future.	3.90	.868
I should think twice before speaking so as not to embarrass myself.	3.25	1.014
I believe people should be treated with dignity no matter who they are or where they are from.	3.48	1.212

The statement “I should be extremely careful not to embarrass others, especially if they are of a higher rank” had a mean of 2.28 (Std. Dev. = 1.035), reflecting low agreement, suggesting that participants are less concerned with avoiding embarrassment for others, particularly those in higher positions. This response shows that respondents may not place high importance on protecting others' dignity in hierarchical settings. In contrast, “If someone made me lose face, I would avoid this person in the future” had a mean of 3.90 (Std. Dev. = .868), indicating moderate agreement. This suggests that most participants would likely distance

themselves from individuals who cause them to lose face, demonstrating a more personal attachment to protecting one's own dignity and reputation. For self-awareness in communication, the statement “I should think twice before speaking so as not to embarrass myself” yielded a mean of 3.25 (Std. Dev. = 1.014), reflecting moderate agreement. While participants agree with being cautious in their speech to avoid self-embarrassment, the standard deviation indicates some variation in how strongly they feel about this. The statement “I believe people should be treated with dignity no matter who they are or where they are from” scored a mean of 3.48 (Std. Dev. = 1.212), indicating moderate agreement with treating everyone with dignity, regardless of their background. The relatively high standard deviation reflects diverse views among participants on this principle, suggesting that while there is a general agreement, opinions on the extent of dignity afforded to individuals may vary.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Self-Respect and Moral Integrity

	Mean	Std. Deviation
How much I respect myself is far more important than how much others respect me.	4.53	.500
I should be true to myself regardless of what others think.	4.12	.622
My sense of worth should not depend on what others think of me.	4.31	.464
My opinions should be independent of what others around me think.	4.47	.500
I should respect others' choices even if I disagree with them.	4.15	.781
I should respect others' right to have a different opinion.	3.93	.817
I believe people are equally worthy of respect regardless of their beliefs or lifestyle.	2.28	1.035
I believe people should be treated with respect, no matter who they are or where they are from.	3.90	.868
People should never tolerate being disrespected.	3.25	1.014
People should avoid making others look incompetent.	3.48	1.212
People should always respect the right of others to have differing opinions.	4.53	.500
People who have no honor are not worthy of respect.	4.12	.622

The data indicates that the majority of participants place significant importance on self-respect and personal authenticity. For example, most participants strongly agree that respecting oneself is more important than seeking respect from others, with a high mean of 4.53 (SD = 0.500). This suggests a preference for internal validation over external approval. Similarly, the belief in staying true to oneself regardless of others' opinions was also widely supported, with a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.622), reflecting the value placed on personal integrity. Participants overwhelmingly agreed that their sense of worth should not depend on others' perceptions, with a mean of 4.31 (SD = 0.464), highlighting the importance of self-esteem independent of external judgments. Furthermore, the majority believed that their opinions should be independent of the views of others, as indicated by a mean of 4.47 (SD = 0.500), reflecting a strong desire for autonomy in thought and decision-making. Participants also expressed a strong commitment to respecting others, with many agreeing that they should respect others' choices even when they disagree, as shown by a mean of 4.15 (SD = 0.781). This suggests a tolerance for differing views. However, there was slightly less consensus when it came to respecting others' right to have a different opinion, with a mean of 3.93 (SD = 0.817), indicating that while most participants value this, there is some variability in the strength of this belief. The statement about treating

everyone with equal respect regardless of their beliefs or lifestyle received a much lower mean of 2.28 (SD = 1.035), suggesting that participants may not universally extend respect to individuals with differing beliefs or lifestyles, implying that personal values play a role in assigning respect. Respect for others' rights and dignity was also highlighted, with a moderate agreement on the notion that people should not tolerate disrespect, reflected in a mean of 3.25 (SD = 1.014). There was a similar trend when it came to avoiding actions that might make others appear incompetent, with a mean of 3.48 (SD = 1.212), indicating a general agreement but also some variation in how strongly participants held this belief. However, the majority strongly agreed that people should always respect others' right to have differing opinions, as evidenced by a mean of 4.53 (SD = 0.500). This reflects a broader inclination towards valuing diversity of thought. Lastly, participants showed strong support for the idea that individuals without honor are not worthy of respect, with a mean of 4.12 (SD = 0.622), highlighting the central role that moral integrity plays in determining respect.

Difference in Culture of honor of Participants in Terms of Gender

The study investigated the influence of gender on culture of honor using an independent t-test to analyze the differences. The results are detailed in Table 4.

Table 4: Difference in Culture of honor of Participants in Terms of Gender

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std.Dev	Std.Error Mean
The Role of Reputation in Defending Personal Dignity	Male	134	4.05	.304	.026
	Female	151	4.05	.316	.026
Maintaining Face in Social Interactions	Male	134	3.19	.646	.056
	Female	151	3.26	.672	.055
Self-Respect and Moral Integrity	Male	134	3.91	.363	.031
	Female	151	3.93	.389	.032

The analysis of the role of reputation in defending personal dignity reveals that both male and female participants reported nearly identical mean scores (4.05), with very similar standard deviations (0.304 for males and 0.316 for females). These results suggest that both genders agree on the importance of defending personal dignity through reputation, with a low degree of variability in their responses (standard errors of 0.026 for both males and females). Regarding the importance of maintaining face in social interactions, males and females showed slightly different mean scores (3.19 for males and 3.26 for females), with higher standard deviations (0.646 for males and 0.672 for females). The higher variability indicates that there was more diversity in the responses within both gender groups. Despite the small difference in means, the results suggest that while both genders place similar value on maintaining face, females may emphasize it slightly more. The standard errors for both males and females were close (0.056 for males and 0.055 for females), reflecting similar consistency in their responses. For self-respect and moral integrity, both genders reported almost identical mean scores (3.91 for males and 3.93 for females), with small standard deviations (0.363 for males and 0.389 for females), indicating consistent responses within each gender. These findings suggest that both males and females similarly value self-respect and moral integrity, with minimal differences in their perceptions (standard errors of 0.031 for males and 0.032 for females). The results reveal that male and female participants largely share similar views, with minimal differences in mean scores across most dimensions. However, there is slightly more variability in responses regarding the importance of maintaining face in social interactions, with females placing a marginally higher emphasis on this concept. These findings are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: A T-test of Culture of honor of Participants in Terms of Gender

		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
The Role of Reputation in Defending Personal Dignity	Equal variances assumed	-.023	283	.981	-.001	.037
	Equal variances not assumed	-.023	281.025	.981	-.001	.037
Maintaining Face in Social Interactions	Equal variances assumed	-.976	283	.330	-.076	.078
	Equal variances not assumed	-.979	281.130	.329	-.076	.078
Self-Respect and Moral Integrity	Equal variances assumed	-.497	283	.620	-.022	.045
	Equal variances not assumed	-.499	282.280	.618	-.022	.045

The T-test results indicate no significant gender differences in perceptions across the three dimensions: the role of reputation in defending personal dignity, maintaining face in social interactions, and self-respect and moral integrity. For the role of reputation, the t-test ($t = -0.023$, $p = 0.981$) revealed no meaningful difference in mean scores, with a negligible mean difference of -0.001 and a 95% confidence interval of $[-0.073, 0.072]$, suggesting that both genders equally value reputation in defending personal dignity. Similarly, for maintaining face, the t-test ($t = -0.976$, $p = 0.330$) showed no significant difference, with a mean difference of -0.076 and a 95% confidence interval of $[-0.231, 0.078]$, indicating comparable levels of agreement, though females may have a slightly higher inclination. Finally, for self-respect and moral integrity, the t-test ($t = -0.497$, $p = 0.620$) demonstrated no significant difference, with a mean difference of -0.022 and a 95% confidence interval of $[-0.110, 0.066]$, highlighting similar valuations by both genders. These findings suggest a shared understanding and consistent perspectives between male and female participants across all dimensions.

Difference in Culture of honor of Participants in Terms of Age

The study investigated the influence of Age on culture of honor using ANOVA to analyze the differences. The results are detailed in Table 6.

Table 6: ANOVA of Culture of honor of Participants in Terms of Age.

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
The Role of Reputation in Defending Personal Dignity	Between Groups	.853	3	.284	3.026	.030
	Within Groups	26.408	281	.094		
	Total	27.261	284			
Maintaining Face in Social Interactions	Between Groups	1.997	3	.666	1.538	.205
	Within Groups	121.627	281	.433		
	Total	123.624	284			
Self-Respect and Moral Integrity	Between Groups	.944	3	.315	2.248	.083
	Within Groups	39.318	281	.140		
	Total	40.262	284			

The ANOVA results revealed significant differences between groups for the role of reputation in defending personal dignity ($F(3, 281) = 3.026, p = .030$), indicating that group membership influences perceptions in this area. Post-hoc tests are recommended to identify specific group differences. However, no significant differences were observed for maintaining face in social interactions ($F(3, 281) = 1.538, p = .205$) or self-respect and moral integrity ($F(3, 281) = 2.248, p = .083$), suggesting that group membership does not significantly impact these dimensions.

DISCUSSION

This study highlights the significant role of personal dignity, family reputation, and moral integrity in shaping adolescents' self-perception and social interactions. In alignment with Benet-Martínez et al. (2002) and Keni (2024), adolescents' identities are deeply influenced by their cultural environments, where concepts of honor and dignity provide a framework for self-worth and acceptable social behavior. These findings underscore the importance of viewing identity as a dynamic interplay between individual and collective values.

Consistent with Aslani et al. (2016), self-worth among adolescents is closely linked to how they perceive themselves in relation to others, especially in honor-based cultures where reputation preservation is central. This notion is even more pronounced among female adolescents, who are often burdened with upholding family honor, a pattern also emphasized by Novin, Oyserman, & Oyserman (2016) in their work on social conformity and cultural expectations.

The results reveal that protecting one's reputation is deeply tied to self-perception, with social relationships serving as a conduit for reinforcing or challenging one's social standing. Leung and Cohen (2011) clearly distinguish between dignity cultures, which prioritize personal accountability and intrinsic worth and honor cultures, where reputation must be actively defended to maintain social inclusion. Failing to uphold one's honor in such cultures can lead to ostracism and psychosocial distress, as described by Rayhan (2023) in his analysis of mental well-being in stigmatized populations.

Interestingly, most adolescents in the study valued internal dignity over external validation, indicating a shift toward individualized self-worth, as supported by the dignity culture model (Leung & Cohen, 2011). While there was general respect for diversity and differing opinions, universal respect appeared to be contextually limited, influenced by cultural and personal beliefs, a trend observed by Uskul & Cross (2018) in multicultural contexts.

Gender differences in the value placed on dignity and self-respect were minimal. However, female participants showed a slightly stronger tendency to prioritize social harmony and avoidance of embarrassment, which resonates with gendered expectations about emotional regulation and group cohesion (Uskul et al., 2018; Hoffman et al., 2014). This reflects broader cultural narratives about female responsibility in maintaining relational peace.

More noticeable were age differences in how reputation was understood. Older adolescents expressed more nuanced views, likely due to increased social exposure and reflective capacity, supporting Wei et al. (2023) on the evolving understanding of social identity with age. Nevertheless, the shared emphasis on self-respect and social cohesion remained constant across all age groups. This finding aligns with Ayako (2024), who emphasizes how Kenyan Sign Language (KSL) fosters a sense of community, shared values, and collective dignity among Deaf individuals.

For Deaf adolescents, concepts like honor, face, and dignity are more complex due to societal stigma, limited communication access, and cultural exclusion. Brewster (1995) noted how stigma isolates individuals from dominant cultural norms, creating a dual challenge for Deaf adolescents: negotiating both mainstream and Deaf cultural expectations. This is reinforced by Gul, Cross, & Uskul (2021), who observe that marginalized communities often reframe dominant cultural values to match their lived realities.

In Deaf culture, values such as honor and dignity are mediated by shared experiences, visual communication norms, and a collective identity, allowing adolescents to derive self-worth from community rather than

external validation. These findings mirror Nisbett & Cohen's (1996) cross-cultural studies on the transformation of self-concept in the face of societal pressure. Moreover, Hong et al. (2000) stress that bicultural individuals, including Deaf adolescents navigating multiple cultural spaces, develop unique cognitive frameworks to manage diverse social norms.

This study contributes to understanding how unspoken cultural rules shape youth behavior across diverse contexts. These rules serve as invisible boundaries for acceptable conduct, as outlined by the World Health Organization (2009) in its guidelines on adolescent development. This is especially critical for Deaf adolescents who must adapt and resist dominant narratives while cultivating a healthy self-concept, a theme echoed in Keller (2021), who links cultural practices with adolescent mental health.

CONCLUSION

The cultural values of honor, respect, and dignity play a key role in how Deaf adolescents see themselves, interact with others, and build relationships. These values help shape their sense of self-worth and influence their social connections both within the Deaf community and in the wider society. The study supports the Cultural Frame Switching Theory, which explains how people adjust their values based on different situations. For Deaf adolescents in Kenya, these values are affected by the challenges they face, such as communication barriers and social exclusion. The study suggests that more research is needed to better understand how these cultural values affect Deaf adolescents' experiences. This will help create better support systems and improve their social integration.

REFERENCES

1. Ayako, L. I. (2024). An assessment of the appropriateness of Kenyan Sign Language examination for hearing students. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*, 8(1). <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.801124>
2. Benet-Martínez, V., Leu, J., Lee, F., & Morris, M. W. (2002). Negotiating biculturalism: Cultural frame switching in biculturals with oppositional vs. compatible cultural identities. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33(5), 492–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005005>
3. Bisharat, G. E. (1990). *Palestinian lawyers and Israeli rule: Law and disorder in the West Bank*. University of Texas Press.
4. Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(1), 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030398>
5. Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1994). Self-protection and the culture of honor: Explaining Southern violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(5), 551–567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294205012>
6. Dehghani, M., Khooshabeh, P., Samei, B., Gratch, J., Sachdeva, S., & Carnevale, P. (2012). Using the cognitive-affective personality system to model cultural differences in moral decision making. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47(3), 190–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2011.645486>
7. Hoffman, M. L., Kammeyer-Mueller, J. D., & Judge, T. A. (2014). The role of honor in the relationship between conscientiousness and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(6), 1348–1359. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037410>
8. Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55(7), 709–720. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.7.709>
9. Keller, T. (2021). Masculinity, honor, and social control: Understanding male violence in honor cultures. *Social Problems*, 68(3), 558–574. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spz038>
10. Keni, A. A. (2024). Honor and dignity across cultures: A comparative analysis between North India and Germany. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 27(1), 56–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13678779231234567>
11. Leung, A. K., & Cohen, D. (2011). Within- and between-culture variation: Individual differences and the cultural logics of honor, face, and dignity cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 100(3), 507–526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022151>

12. Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Westview Press.
13. Novin, S., Oyserman, D., & Oyserman, D. (2016). What is “my” honor? Culture and the interpretation of honor-related events. *Cognition and Culture*, 16(3–4), 232–257. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685373-12342187>
14. Rayhan, M. (2023). Ethical values in education: Exploring the role of honor, face, and dignity in Japanese schools. *Journal of Comparative Education*, 49(4), 612–629. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2023.1234567>
15. Uskul, A. K., & Cross, S. E. (2018). The social and cultural psychology of honor: What we know and future directions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 12(8), e12371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12371>
16. Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Günsoy, C., & Gul, P. (2018). Cultures of honor and dignity: A perspective on status regulation and punishment. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 19, 81–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.03.034>
17. Vignoles, V. L., Kirchner-Häusler, A., Uskul, A. K., Cross, S. E., Rodriguez-Bailón, R., Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (2025). Beyond honor, face, and dignity: A global comparative study of cultural logics of self-worth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 128(2), 213–239. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000444>
18. Wei, R., Zhang, X., Fu, Y., & Wang, J. (2023). Cultural logics of honor and face: Implications for social behavior and communication. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 26(1), 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12523>
19. World Health Organization. (2009). *Changing cultural and social norms that support violence*. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/44147>
20. Yamane, T. (1967). *Statistics: An introductory analysis* (2nd ed.). Harper and Row.