Iranian Journal of Comparative Education, 2024, 7(3), 3099-3113

Research Article **DOI: 10.22034/IJCE.2024.416602.1525** http://journal.cesir.ir

A Comparative Thematic Analysis of Muslim and Non-Muslim Nations' University Dress Code Policies

Alireza Rasti[1](Corresponding author)

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 16 September 2023
Revised: 19 November 2023
Accepted: 31 December 2023
Online: 28 August 2024

K E Y W O R D S

Dress Code Policy
Higher Education
Non-Muslim Nations
Muslim Nations

ABSTRACT

The present investigation aimed at uncovering the commonalities and differences between the dress code policy texts mandated by the universities of Muslim and non-Muslim nations. Given the controversial nature of the issue, investigations into it remain few and far between. To address the gap, the investigation has comparatively probed into the texts of Muslim countries' university dress code policy and those of non-Muslim ones using a qualitative methodology. The first twenty dress codes of both contexts, rendered through a web search, underwent a thematic analysis to arrive at themes pointing to the (dis)similarities of attire policies. The findings revealed policy documents in both contexts had strategically deployed linguistic resources to make them come across as normative, homogenizing, and consensus-building so that they would be taken more seriously by those addressed. Non-Muslim university dress codes appeared to have more of a justificatory power, thereby seemingly making them better suited to sell their ideas. Unlike the dress policies in place in the Muslim context, which were aimed mostly at students, those mandated in non-Muslim countries addressed a wider range of stakeholders including the staff and faculty, and they were occasionally subsumed under a general code of conduct and appearance. The policies promoted in Muslim nations were more particular about enforcing the rules and taking disciplinary action in the event of their breach. In order for such policies to achieve maximal efficiency and effectiveness, Muslim countries' policy-makers, especially those operating in Iran, are recommended to make them more justificatory to the audience targeted.

[1] Associate Professor, Department of Foreign Languages, Salman Farsi University of Kazerun, Kazerun, Iran, Email: a.rasti@kazerunsfu.ac.ir

1. Introduction

Dress code policies at large and work-place/academic dress code mandates as promoted and put in place by regulating agencies in diverse societies have been around for quite some time now. The trend has gained unprecedented momentum not only in deeply religious countries and, in particular, some Muslim nations and theocracies, but also in some sectors in secular countries. Mostly because of the socializing nature of educational arena (Biesta, 2016) and the great weight it bears with the world's governments, it has been a site of enactment of such policies across the globe. Thompson Ford (2021) reports on how the U.S. public schools have witnessed and been exposed to enforcement of a strict dress code from the academic year1999-2000 to 2013-2014. The trend has been most noticeable in countries with a Muslim-majority population such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, and Malaysia. Education authorities in those contexts have not been hesitant to introduce and mandate dress code policies, especially in their countries' formal schooling settings.

University dress code texts, as mandated by some centralist governments and put into effect by the many universities across nations, are a reflection as well as fine-tuning of the broad attire-related policies in a nation. Regardless of what such attire and appearance policies mean to establishments and institutions as well as individuals themselves, and the various functions they serve, they are considered to be a part and parcel of campus life experience in the universities of both religious and secular countries, albeit in various forms and formats (Quamar, 2016).

Dress code policies in general and university dress codes in particular deserve to be paid more academic attention due to their rather controversial nature both locally and internationally. From an ideological point of view, it turns out that policies and sometimes heated discussions around them at the global level has created a dichotomized us-versus-them mindset. The controversy surrounding the issue of attire (in the general sense of the word) seems to stem from the observation that to some, especially in the Western world, state-mandated use of the hijab, or the Islamic veil, comes to be considered 'a problem' (Bucar, 2017) in that they can serve as a kind of social control (Ramírez, 2014) "intended to mask … women in their social surroundings" (Koo, 2014, p. 29). In Islamic countries, on the other hand, they are deemed a 'solution', enabling women to function at their best and be more productive in a society where they are not to be seen as sex objects and treated as playing subsidiary roles and functions. Selod (2008) echoes the same view: "It gives them greater mobility in the public sphere, protects them from unwanted sexual advances, commands greater respect …" (1360).

Since there appears to be challenges in the way of enactment of such policies in some Muslim countries including Iran, exhausting numerous stakeholders' energies, it seems more

studies into the issue are warranted in order to fathom out how the policies play out in real life. Research, especially tapping into such policy conception-implementation gap could help with finding a less resistant solution to the contentious issue. In keeping with this, the present research has accordingly undertaken to reveal especially their likely strengths in both contexts so that policy 'lesson-drawing' (Rose, 1993) could be achieved in/for both sides, that is, some useful aspects of the policy in one context would be transferred to and employed by policymakers working in a different setting.

2. Literature Review

A thorough look at the literature, produced around university dress code policies/texts, clearly attests to a dearth of high-quality investigations in this particular regard. The following brief literature review is an attempt at rendering the few topics and trends surrounding the issue of university dress code policy in Muslim and non-Muslim contexts in the contemporary world.

In the context of Muslim countries, several studies have probed into the issue of perceptions of students of medical schools with regard to dress code mandates. In the Iranian medical education arena, Momeni and Asghari (2020) interviewed 23 students of dentistry in an attempt to arrive at the root causes of what they considered to be barriers to the proper implementation of dress code mandates. Having conducted conventional content analysis on the interview data, they were able to categorize the codes gleaned in the course of the study into four categories of reasons for the poor adherence of the participants to the said policies, namely shortcomings in education, mismanagement, cultural shifts, and personal factors. In yet another investigation with somewhat conflicting results, Heidarzadeh et al. (2019) surveyed 368 medical students at Kerman University of Medical Sciences only to find positive attitudes toward the professional dress code in use in that academic/work setting and a high level of adherence to the said policy. Other studies have delved into the views of physicians and patients (Fathian, Shakibi, Fasihi Harandi, Ahmadipour, & Mobasher, 2020), professors (Darabinia & Hoseini Karnami, 2020), and interns and trainees (Lorestani, Dehghan Nayeri, Nouroozi, & Aramesh, 2010) on this matter.

Studies such as the above, carried out in the Iranian context, point to medical researchers' growing interest in the phenomenon of dress code policies as practiced in universities of medical sciences (UMSs) and (teaching) hospitals. They further showcase an almost total absence of dress-code-related research in the universities falling within the remit of the Iranian Ministry of Science, Research and Technology (MSRT) – the governmental body in charge of the country's higher education sector. As far as other Muslim countries' formal schooling dress code policies at large is

concerned, several studies have treated the issue or arrived at some relevant attire-related themes and patterns in their findings (Bigger, 2006; Quamar, 2016; Ramirez, 2015; Thio & Neo, 2008).

The situation in other overseas contexts is not much different from that of the Muslim environments with regard to attire-related policy mandates. At the international level, one could also readily spot a dearth of studies into the issue of dress code policies (Fayokun, Adedeji, & Oyebade, 2009, and Humphreys & Brown, 2002 for just two notable exceptions). In addition to this gap, it appears that almost no studies have tapped into how such texts create meanings intended to galvanize students into action, that is, make them comply with the policy mandates.

Given the research gap identified by the present study, it seems that the issue of university dress code policies/texts is one in dire need of conduction of new investigations and adoption of fresh outlooks. In line with this, the current research has attempted to comparatively dig deep into the commonalities and differences between the policy texts employed and promoted by the universities in both Muslim and non-Muslim worlds, and, as a subsidiary aim, to highlight the implications of such a research for how policy-makers and policy actors might benefit from the lessons drawn from such an analysis. The investigation has, therefore, advanced the following overarching research question:

- What are the (dis)similarities, if any, between dress code policy texts promoted by universities in Muslim and non-Muslim countries?

3. Research Method

Present investigation has adopted a qualitative research methodology to the analysis of attire-related textual data gleaned through an Internet search. Being generally inductive as well as having an emergent nature (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010), the new findings arrived at in such a design emerge over time and as a result of careful (re)reading of the texts. There are various ways of and orientations toward the analysis of the data in the literature on qualitative research (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Razavieh, 2010). The particular approach drawn on in this qualitative analytic investigation, as will be instantly referred to in the ensuing discussion, has been the thematic analysis model developed and promoted by Braun and Calrke (2006).

The data for this study consists of university dress code policy texts culled using an online search. The first 20 dress code texts publicly available in the website of Muslim universities and the first 20 ones in the website of universities in non-Muslim nations were selected for analysis. Due to the comparative nature of the present work, the focus of (re)reading data was on identifying any

(dis)similarities between the policy texts of Muslim countries' universities and those of non-Muslim ones. Table 1 has provided the name of the first 20 Muslim universities with a dress policy publicized via the web as well as their location and type in terms of being private or public:

Table 1

List of Muslim Countries' Universities Used as Data

Name of University	Location	Type
1. International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM)	Malaysia	Public
2. International Islamic College	Malaysia	Private
3. University Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah	Malaysia	Public
4. Almadina International University	Malaysia	Private
5. Islamic Science University of Malaysia	Malaysia	Public
6. Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology	Malaysia	Private
	No. 6	
7. Bahria University	Pakistan	Public
8. Muhammad Ali Jinah University	Pakistan	Private
9. International Islamic University	Pakistan	Public
10. Riphah International University	Pakistan	Private
	No. 4	
11. Brac University	Bangladesh	Private
12. International Islamic University of Chittagong	Bangladesh	Private
13. Islamic University of Technology	Bangladesh	Not specified
	No. 3	
14. Tehran University of Medical Sciences	Iran	Public
15. Shiraz University of Medical Sciences	Iran	Public
16. Golestan University of Medical Sciences	Iran	Public
	No. 3	
17. Prince Sultan University	Saudi Arabia	Private
18. Alfaisal University	Saudi Arabia	Private
	No. 2	
19. Sultan Sharif Ali Islamic University	Brunei	Public
	No. 1	
20. Hamad Bin Khalifa University	Qatar	Public
	No. 1	

As can be seen in Table 1, the online search yielded a wide range of geographical contexts with 7 countries representing south-east Asia (Malaysia and Brunei), 7 south Asia (Pakistan and Bangladesh), and 6 south-west Asia (Iran and Saudi Arabia). The geographical context seems to be sufficiently wide-ranging covering an almost equal number of nations in Asia's thickly-populated Islamic areas.

Table 2 gives a taste of diversity of non-Muslim-nation universities with published dress codes with regard to the geographical locations. As is evident from the table, most such universities are located in the northern hemisphere, especially in mostly Christian Anglo-Saxon countries. U.S. universities (No. 11) constitute the largest number of such institutes on the list.

Table 2

List of Non-Muslim Countries' Universities Used as Data

Name of University	Location	Type
1. University of Michigan	U.S.	Public
2. Virginia Union University	U.S.	Private
3. University of Southern Indiana	U.S.	Public
4. Dillard University	U.S.	Private
5. Illinois State University	U.S.	Public
6. Kentucky State University	U.S.	Public
7. UHSP	U.S.	Private
8. Vanguard University	U.S.	Private
9. Biola University	U.S.	Private
10. Maranatha Baptist University	U.S.	Private
11. Hampton University	U.S.	Private
	No. 11	
12. University of Oxford	England	Public
13. Imperial College London	England	Public
14. St. George's University	England	Private
	No. 3	
15. Nanyang Technological University	Singapore	Public
	No. 1	
16. Daystar University	Kenya	Private
	No. 1	
17. University of Lagos	Nigeria	Public
	No. 1	
18. Manipal University	India	Public
	No. 1	
19. University of Strathclyde	Scotland	Public
	No. 1	
20. Universitatea Moldo-Americană	Brazil	Public
	No. 1	

The above policy texts were subsequently downloaded and recorded in a computer file for subsequent references and examination. Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase thematic analytic model was then applied to them to arrive at initial categories and final themes that could be compared across as well as within the contexts. The six stages of conducting thematic analysis on textual data are given below:

Table 3

Phases of Conducting Thematic Analysis (Adapted from Braun & Clarke, 2006)

Phase	description of the phase
1. familiarization	(re)reading the data and taking note of any relevant ideas
2. initial code generation	capturing interesting features of the data in the form of initial broad codes
3. theme searching	relating similar codes and developing them into themes
4. theme reviewing	Creating a thematic 'map'
5. theme naming	generating definitions and names for themes
6. producing the report	finding compelling extract examples, elaborating on them, relating them to the research questions and the pertinent literature and producing a final report of the analysis

If the final themes were found to exist in both data sets, they would be recorded as similarities of attire policy texts. If not, they would be considered distinctive features of one type of policy or another and captured as distinctions between the two contexts. Where relevant, country-specific distinctions were also noted and reported in the final analysis.

In the ensuing section, (dis)similar themes across as well as within the religious locations are presented with illustrative extracts drawn from them.

4. Findings

In what follows, the main findings of the study are given followed by a discussion of how they relate to the pertinent literature in education in general and university dress policy in particular. First, themes found to be more or less similar across the two contexts are presented accompanied by relevant illustrative excerpts from them:

4.1. Similarities across the Two Religious Contexts

With regard to the similarities of both policy texts, it was found that they had deployed linguistic tools to make them possess three characteristics: being normative, homogenizing, and consensus-forging. In other words, they were intended to make individuals addressing comply with the demands or dictates of the policy so that people would come to agree with them. Such functions of policy have been aptly pointed to by Rizvi and Lingard (2012) when they assert that "policies … are normative, expressing both ends and means designed to steer the actions and behaviour of people" (p. 4).

Among the linguistic resources employed by the policy text producers to realize the above functions, one can point to an abundance of auxiliary verbs and expressions of high obligation (such as *must*, *should*, etc.) and certainty (e.g. *will* or *shall*) as well as impersonal structures (i.e., where, by glossing over the agency of the policy-maker, the recipient of the policy, e.g. the student, becomes the focus of attention). The following extracts illustrate the shared characteristics between the two attire policies, respectively, in non-Muslim and Muslim institutes of higher education:

> The University does not permit the wearing of clothes or display of tattoos, badges, screensavers etc. which show obscene material or sectarian or discriminatory slogans (including in languages other than English).
> Any breach of this policy may be subject to disciplinary action. (The University of Strathclyde dress code policy)

> Any violation of the dress code policy by any employee or student will be subject to disciplinary action case by case. However, minor breaches of the policy will be dealt with in an informal manner. (Prince Sultan University dress code policy)

As can be noticed in the above excerpt, often (at the end of the document) policies assume a legal turn when they are about to issue warnings that any violation of the content of dress codes are subject to various kinds of penalties. The language and tone definitely resemble those of legal documents and such hybridity and mixing of genres is intended to galvanize especially students into 'proper' attire-related behavior. The force and rigor of the text is also apparent in the use of auxiliaries of certainty (e.g. the case of use of *will* in the second policy extract).

In addition to the normativity in sight in the above typical examples, the policy documents have adopted an impersonal matter-of-the-fact tone to accentuate their full force. This is often achieved via the frequent use of passive structures (see e.g. *will be dealt with* in the previous excerpt) placing emphasis on the targets of policy text rather than on the issuers of those mandates:

> Mini-skirts that are above the knee line, necklines that are four inches below the shoulders, body-tight trousers, bare-backs, leggings and joggings, navel-gazers ("tumbo-cut"), and see through, among others, *should be avoided*. (Daystar University dress code policy)

> Socks, tights and stockings **must** (boldface in the original) *be worn* and must cover the ankle entirely. (Oxford University dress code policy)

The ultimate goal in most dress code policies, regardless of the type of religious context, is to ensure homogeneity of action and behavior, especially among students. To fulfill such a function, a policy needs to deploy all its linguistic resources.

4.2. Dissimilarities across the Two Religious Contexts

The differences between the two types of policy texts were mostly related to the findings that, unlike those mandated in Muslim universities, those issued in the context of non-Muslim countries occasionally addressed more stakeholders than simply targeting students, and that they were also sometimes presented within a more general framework of a code of conduct. It was additionally found that the attire policy texts in the universities of the Muslim countries were more particular about the issues of enforcing the rules and taking any disciplinary action deemed necessary in the event of breach of regulations.

The first significant difference arrived at in the course of the data analysis was the observation that some non-Muslim universities had started their dress code specifications with an account of the rationale for the existence of a dress code in their affiliated universities. This would evidently give policy texts a more justificatory touch, thereby facilitating students' acceptance of the dress code mandates and possibly helping to put those requirements into effect more smoothly and making university authorities probably face less resistance in applying rules. The following paragraph from the opening of one such dress code specification is likely to help illustrate the point. To indicate that this particular policy is a logical one and therefore far from being sensational, the opening line states explicitly that it is 'based' on some theory. This imbues the policy text with more legitimatory force:

> The Dress Code is based on the theory that learning to use socially acceptable manners and selecting attire appropriate to specific occasions and activities are critical factors in the total educational process. Understanding and employing these behaviors not only improves the quality of one's life, but also contributes to optimum morale, as well as embellishes the overall campus image. They also play a major role in instilling a sense of integrity and an appreciation for values and ethics (Hampton University Dress Code).

Although the statement subsequently moves on to become more prescriptive and even proscriptive, as a set of do's and don'ts are mentioned with regard to proper attire, it clearly shows that the authorities and policy-makers' mindset is, first and foremost, one of helping convince students of the usefulness, efficiency, and professionalism of having a dress code in place at university. This is achieved in the main through provision of a crystal-clear rationale for understanding the required dress code specifications and adoption of the said policy.

In the above typical excerpt from the whole data set, the many numerous benefits of introducing the dress code policy to the various higher education stakeholders are justified through the changes about to happen to their lives in the aftermath of the policy. The use of 'language of legitimation' in policy processes, especially in education policy, has been pointed to in the field of education policy studies by some scholars (see e.g. Bell, 2020).This is because policies are meant to carry much weight with the individuals they target. In other words, they are intended to sell as a product.

The second distinction between universities in Muslim and non-Muslim countries was that, in the latter, sometimes attire policies were part a more general framework of a code of conduct and appearance. In other words, policies were not confined only to how students were to get dressed but also how to appear to the staff, faculty, and public, and how to behave in different social circumstances. In addition to this, such universities occasionally addressed a wider range of stakeholders than most Muslim-nation ones did. The following policy excerpt reflects such a wide coverage of policy actors:

> Kentucky State University has established the following Business Casual Dress Code Policy, which defines dress and grooming guidelines. The purpose of this policy is to promote a consistent, professional image throughout the university. Proper dress, grooming, and personal cleanliness contribute to the morale of all employees and affect the business and institutional image that the university presents to students, parents, alumni, and the public. Maintaining a professional, business like appearance is important to the success of the university. (Kentucky State University dress code policy)

The final major difference between universities in both religious contexts was that Muslim universities were more explicit, and occasionally stricter, about the enforcement of the apparel policy in place and the kind(s) of disciplinary action taken in the case of breach of the rules. This, as the following typical excerpt illustrates, imbues them with a more prescriptive/proscriptive tone:

> Following Dress Code must be strictly observed. Students violating the dress code will be fired, marked absent, and may even be referred to the Proctorial Board for more severe punishment. (Riphah International University dress code policy)

As is evident from the above Muslim university attire policy, it is outright explicit with regard to the type of specific disciplinary action(s) taken by authorities in the event of violation of the details of the policy.

4.3. Minor Within-group Differences

This section deals with the minor, yet potentially insightful, differences found between the universities in the same religious context. Such a comparison night help with policy lesson-drawing, that is, it might contribute to how policy-makers in other contexts possibly make the best of insights they reach in examining policy texts and processes operative across the world.

The first notable point to be made at this stage is that, compared to policies in other Muslim countries, those mandated by Iranian universities seem to be thin in bulk and scope, and that they need to be fleshed out by the addition of an introductory part stating the goals or proving the rationale for the existing attire policies. They could further benefit from addressing more educational stakeholders than simply targeting students. Two out of the three such policies in the Iranian context were in the form of an itemized list of what students are expected to wear and they lacked a smooth introductory part showcasing the rationale for announcing and enforcing them in universities.

With regard to Malaysian universities' dress policies scrutinized, it was found that, in addition to providing some general recommendations of the type of dress to be worn, they also encouraged the use of their national apparel thus apparently highlighting their shared and collective sense of identity. Malaysian dress code texts were also being accompanied by illustrations of how students in particular should get dressed in various locations – academic or otherwise:

> … Students are encouraged to wear complete *national dresses/attires* provided that they do not violate or infringe the IIUM Dress Code and Islamic values and norms. (International Islamic University Malaysia, IIUM, dress code policy)

A point worth noting and further probing into with regard to non-Muslim universities was that, unlike the dress policies issued by Muslim ones, a few of them had come with room for students' likely grievances. It goes without saying that problems might arise in the course of implementation of a given policy, especially one as contentious as the attire policy – problems needing an official arbiter to deal with. This is a significant point needing to be considered in policy texts of the same religious context or those of a different setting. The following is an example of one such policy aiming to see to the likely grievances made by those subject to the dress code mandates, especially students:

> Any discipline/recommendation for corrective action for non-compliance will follow the standard process within the area for review and shall have *an opportunity for appeal* (i.e., Code of Student Conduct for health/safety or compliance issues, standard procedures for student teaching appeals, etc.) (Illinois State University dress code policy) .

5. Conclusion

Dress code texts mean different things to different people. They have always provoked some controversy among the producers and consumers of such policies. Given the fact that such codes prove to be a constant bone of contention among a vast array of social actors, especially in such educative settings as universities, it is unfortunate that investigations into the issue are few and far between both at national and global levels. Likewise, studies of the function language fulfills in making and mobilizing meaning in the genre of university dress codes, as touched upon in this research, are almost nonexistent. To help redress the imbalance, the present research looked into Muslim countries' university dress code texts and those adopted by the universities in some secular nations to help arrive at similarities and differences they are imbued with. More specifically, the study adopted a comparative thematic analytic procedure (Braun & Clarke, 2006) to come up with any likely commonalities or differences detected in respect to how the policies in both settings function.

The findings revealed that, vis-à-vis similarities, dress code policy texts in both religious contexts had strategically drawn on a range of linguistic resources such as expressions of an obligation or certainty subtype to try to homogenize the intended policy action. As for the differences, non-Muslim university dress codes appeared to be more legitimatory thus making them better adapted to bring home the ideas in them. They also targeted a wider range of educational stakeholders than those mandated in Muslim universities did, and were occasionally subsumed under a more general code of conduct. Muslim-nation universities were more explicit with regard to any likely disciplinary action taken in the event of breach of the attire-related laws.

Comparison of dress code polices in both university contexts, that is Muslim and non-Muslim, is likely to provide those involved with policy making and/or implementation at every conceivable level with fresh insights. The first one concerns how they go about putting such inherently controversial policies as dress code into practice as smoothly as possible facing the least resistance from the target group, namely university students. The literature on public policies is no short of instances of policy intension-response divide (Bache & Taylor, 2003; Lam, 2011). For this reason, it behaves higher education policymakers, especially in religious contexts such as those working in such Muslim nations as Iran to give the policy more thought to flourish and less room to

go wrong. One way they could tackle the issue is to at least initially tone down a prescriptive/proscriptive policy by providing it with more explanatory power. Provision of the rationale for introducing a specific dress policy could give it a higher chance of acceptance. Supplying it, especially at the beginning of a policy document, is further liable to render the policy-maker a less disinterested image. Analogies of this sort are apt to help policy actors with better policy 'lesson-drawing' (Bache & Taylor, 2003).

Another implication which could be drawn from a comparison of attire polices in both cultural contexts is that since no policy conceived and promoted is perfect, there should be some room for the policy recipients to negotiate the course of action adopted by the top decision-maker. This might also help with (partial) acceptance of a given policy as well as better 'policy diffusion' (Bache & Taylor, 2003), that is, the influence of policies in one unit (country, state, city, etc.) on those operative in other units (Gilardi & Wasserfallen, 2019). Given the under-researched area and the highly contentious nature of attire-related policy not in religious but also in secular educational contexts, more investigations are warranted to shed light on the different phases of policy development as well as the various aspects of such policy processes.

References

Ary, D. Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C. Razavieh, A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bache, I., & Taylor, A. (2003). The politics of policy resistance: Reconstructing higher education in Kosovo. *Journal of Public Policy*, *23*(3), 279-300. https:/doi.org/10.1017/50143814X03003131.

Bell, L. A. (2020). Education policy: Development and enactment – The case of human capital. In G. Fan & T. S. Popkewitz (Eds.) *Handbook of education policy studies: Values,governance, globalization and methodology, Volume 1* (31-52). Singapore: Springer Open.

Biesta, G. J. (2016). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. New York: Taylor & Francis.

Bigger, S. (2006). Muslim women's views on dress code and the hijaab: some issues for education. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, *27*(2), 215-226. https://doi.org/10.1080/13617670600849978.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

Bucar, E. (2017). *Pious fashion: How Muslim women dress*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Darabinia, M., & Hoseini Karnami, S. H. (2020). Islamic behavior and dress code of the students from the standpoint of the professors of Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences. *Journal of Religion and Health*, *8*(1), 1-10.

Fathian, F., Shakibi, M. R., Fasihi Harandi, M., Ahmadipour, H., & Mobasher, M. (2020). patients' and physicians' viewpoints on interns' professional outfit: A survey in an Iranian teaching hospital. *Strides in Development of Medical Education*, *17*(1), 1-7.

Fayokun, K. O., Adedeji, S. O., & Oyebade, S. A. (2009). Moral crisis in higher institutions and the dress code phenomenon. *US-China Education Review*, *6*(2), 58-66.

Ford, R. T. (2021). *Dress codes: How the laws of fashion made history*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Gilardi, F., & Wasserfallen, F. (2019). The politics of policy diffusion. *European Journal of Political Research*, *58*(4), 1245-1256. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475.6765.12326.

Heidarzadeh, A., Azizzadeh Forouzi, M., Mobasher, M., Safizadeh, H., Nakhaei, N., Faseiherandi, M., & Haghdost, A. A. (2019). Investigation of students' attitudes toward professional dress code and the level of adherence to this code at Kerman University of Medical Sciences, Kerman, Iran. *Health, Spirituality and Medical Ethics*, *6*(4), 10-15.

Humphreys, M., & Brown, A. D. (2002). Dress and identity: A Turkish case study. *Journal of Management Studies*, *39*(7), 927-952. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467.6486.00318.

Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage Publications.

Koo, G. Y. (2014). Women as subject of defiance and everyday politics of hijab as dress code in modern Iran. *Asian Women*, *30*(4), 29-51.

Lam, E. (2011). Sharing best practices in Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago: Patterns of policy implementation and resistance. *Compare*, *41*(1), 25-41. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2010.530746.

Lorestani, F., Dehghan Nayeri, N., Nouroozi, M., & Aramesh, K. (2010). Dress code: Interns' and trainees' perspective. *Iranian Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, *4*(1), 40-46.

Momeni, N., & Asghari, F. (2020). Barriers of students' adherence to dress code policy in clinical settings: Dental students' viewpoint. *Iranian Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, *13*(20), 1-14.

Quamar, M. M. (2016). Sociology of the veil in Saudi Arabia: Dress code, individual choices, and questions on women's empowerment. *Digest of Middle East Studies*, *25*(2), 315-337. https://doi.org/10.1111/dome.12085.

Ramírez, Á. (2015). Control over female 'Muslim' bodies: culture, politics and dress code laws in some Muslim and non-Muslim countries. *Identities*, *22*(6), 671-686. https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2014.950972.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2009). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.

Rose, R. (1993). *Lesson-drawing in public policy: A guide to learning across time and space* (Vol. 91). Chatham: Chatham House Publishers.

Selod, S. F. (2008). Veil. In R. T. Schaefer (Ed.) *Encyclopedia of race, ethnicity, and society* (V. 1) (pp. 1359-1360). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Thio, L. A., & Neo, J. L. C. (2008). Religious dress in schools: The serban controversy in Malaysia. *International & Comparative Law Quarterly*, *55*(3), 671-688. https:/doi.org/10.1093/iclq/lei110.

Appendix

An Example of a University Dress Code Policy Text

Virginia Union University

Dress Code

Virginia Union University has a prescribed dress code and some attire is considered inappropriate in specific settings on/off campus. Furthermore, dressing appropriately is considered a part of the learning process. Students and their guests who do not adhere to the dress code may be denied access to university services including, but not limited to the classroom, the cafeteria and other academic buildings. If an instance occurs wherein a student feels that a request regarding the dress code is unreasonable, the student should first adhere to the request of the faculty or staff member, and then follow up with a written document using the appropriate appeal procedure. To report an incident: https://www.vuu.edu/incident-reporting-form

The items below provide an overview of items prohibited by the VUU dress code (but not limited to) except in the residence halls and at designated University activities and events, on and off campus:

- Pajamas, bathrobes, bras, lingerie, and boxer shorts, worn in public spaces and/or as outerwear (except in the residence halls),
- Bedroom slippers (except in the residence halls),
- Pants worn in a "baggy" fashion (mid-hip with undergarments revealed),
- Undershirts (wife beaters) without a top shirt (except in the residence halls),
- Appearing in public spaces without a shirt, top or blouse (except in the residence halls),
- Du-rags, head rags/scarves, and bonnets for men and women (except in the residence halls),
- Caps and hats for men and women worn inside of buildings (except for the residence halls or with permission from an administrator),
- Curlers, rollers, and other items used to groom hair (except in the residence halls),

- Shirts worn as head wraps (except in the residence halls),
- Hoodies with hoods over the head while inside a building,
- Micro-mini skirts, midriff shirts, see-through blouses, low cut blouses, and/or other such attire that reveal s excessive cleavage in classroom buildings,
- Clothing, jewelry, hats and/or other garments/or other accessories with obscene or offensive language, gestures, and/or profanity, or the display/elude to drugs, drug paraphernalia, and other illegal substances

Students are expected to use good judgment in determining what to wear at special events. Examples of special events are:

New Student Orientation activities, Fall Convocation, Founders Day, Career Fairs, On-Campus interviews, Honors programs, and Convocation. The attire for these events is outlined below:

- Dress pants (no jeans), business suit, dress shirt, tie and dress shoes
- Professional skirt, blouse, dress, or two-piece suit (skirt or pants), and dress shoes.

Students requesting special permission for head attire due to religious affiliation should give notice to the Dean of Students Office.