

Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of University Students

¹Lyndonn Stephen D. Santos & ²Portia R. Marasigan

Abstract

The new normal of online learning eventually changed how students dress for online classes. It also highlighted the concepts of self-management through the exercise of self-discipline. This study determined the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of selected university students through a descriptive-correlational research design involving 100 purposively chosen students. The respondents are mostly young adults, female, third year level taking-up business administration. The researcher-made instrument measured the levels of dress code policy adherence and the self-discipline of the respondents. Results showed that students have high levels of dress code policy adherence and self-discipline. However, only age, sex, and course are significantly related to dress code policy adherence whereas only age and sex are significantly related to self-discipline. The study further reflected that past behavior is significantly related to the self-discipline. The results of the study may serve as inputs to the review of the institutional dress code policy in the new normal.

Keywords: *Dress Code, Dress Code Policy, Policy Adherence, Self-Discipline, University Students*

Received: October 28, 2021

Revised: December 2, 2021

Accepted: December 7, 2021

Suggested Citation: Santos, L.D. & Marasigan, P.R. (2021). Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of University Students. *International Review of Social Sciences Research*, Volume 1 Issue 4, pp. 44- 67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.53378/352595>

About the authors:

¹Student, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines

²Associate Professor 5, Laguna State Polytechnic University, Philippines



1. Introduction

Dress code policies are regulatory policies, or mandates composed and adopted by a university administration, that limit the discretion of students, or otherwise compel them to follow certain types of behavior. The university primarily has the prerogative to regulate the appropriate or inappropriate actions through a policy, guideline, memorandum, etc. Adhering to these policies is seen as good behavior. Dress code policy adherence plays a major role in identification and application of an educational institution's core values that will guide and encourage its students. However, there are institutions that do not implement a dress code policy. Their students are responsible for their own clothing and self-expression (Renales, 2016; Ramirez, 2017). Indeed, every university are distinct and cultural factors could be involved as it regulates student behavior inside the campus (Kaveh et al., 2015).

Students are expected to adhere to this imposed policy. However, given the challenges brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic and the predicaments that students are facing, the university moved meetings to an online platform. Dress codes become a second thought and there is currently no dress code policy being implemented for online classes. There are only online classroom rules like, *"Dress appropriately. No sleeveless, no topless, and no wearing of shorts when attending the virtual class."* These virtual setting will inevitably change the way people dress for classes. The way people dress and present themselves during online meetings gives them a sense of normalcy in unusual times (Shepherd, 2020). Before this change occurs, it is equally important to have a comparable study about what the situation was like when students used to engage in face-to-face interaction. It could be beneficial for future research with similar variables whether for the new normal of online classes or adjusting to face-to-face meetings.

According to Sequeira et al. (2014), researchers conducting studies on dress codes are mostly focused on primary, middle school, and high school students, and very few studies have been done on dress code for college students and especially one that includes all departments. Brookshire (2016) also stated that researchers have not conducted follow-up studies, reviews, or evaluations on the impact of uniforms and concluded that future correlational research is vital in acquiring statistical data about whether school uniforms impact behavior. One aspect across the broad spectrum of behavior is self-discipline.

The pandemic forced students to change and this highlighted the importance of principles like good self-management that can be achieved by exercising self-discipline. In this context,

studies demonstrate the positive impact of self-discipline on a wide range of life outcomes, emphasizing the importance of students having and being taught self-discipline early in life (Garcia & Subia, 2019; Gelles et al., 2020; Şimşir & Dilmaç, 2021). Self-discipline can be defined as a practice, habit, or skill and is established as an important factor for success. It is the ability to both begin tasks and carry them through to completion. Self-discipline is the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016). Students require sustained self-discipline to continue with their goal commitment and to successfully attain them.

The university administrators could consider strengthening student's self-discipline through reviewing and implementing a dress code policy that is adapted to the new normal (Momeni & Asghari, 2018). They could encourage the students to participate in policy-making. The students' past experiences could guide them to make suggestions (Villanueva, 2017). Most importantly, the university could extend their efforts by supporting and encouraging educators to employ self-regulation exercises and training programs. For instance, workshops for developing effective habits and routines in school and home is one strategy that could be followed to enhance self-discipline among students (APA, 2012). Studies also suggested providing appropriate feedback, better time management skills, creating and adhering to a schedule, removing distractions and setting boundaries can help (Momeni & Asghari, 2018; Garcia & Subia, 2019; Gelles et al., 2020). Furthermore, preparations could start to create guidelines for an updated dress code for when the students return to the university.

This study aimed to determine the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of the selected college students of Laguna State Polytechnic University and to relate them. Specifically, it sought to identify the profile of the respondents as to age, sex, year level, and course, the levels of the dress code policy adherence of the respondents in terms of attitude, subjective norms, past behavior, and behavioral intention, and the levels of self-discipline of the respondents in accordance to standards, motivation, monitoring, and willpower. Moreover, this study aimed to investigate the relationship between the profile of the respondents and the variables: dress code policy adherence and self-discipline, and lastly, the relationship between the dress code policy adherence and self-discipline in terms of attitude, subjective norms, past behavior, and behavioral intention. Results of this study may provide valuable insight to the local site to create more informed decisions regarding the implementation of dress code policies.

2. Literature review

2.1. Dress Code Policy Adherence

Dress code policies are implemented by schools to protect the health and safety of the students, meet standards of community decorum, and promote discipline (Lunenburg, 2011). Students are generally identified about their level of education and affiliation from their school uniform. It adds to the reputation of the institution and adopting dress codes and uniforms creates social uniformity among students and induces them to behave in a disciplined manner (Sequeira et al., 2014).

The students of Laguna State Polytechnic University should observe the expected norm of behavior in accordance with the *Student Handbook 2014 Edition*. The dress code policy is included in Article 3 Miscellaneous Rules and Regulations. Section 1 School Uniforms. It states the permitted and strictly prohibited acts, and attires or apparels, as well as disciplinary action if students commit deviations from the dress code policy. (LSPU *Student Handbook*, 2014).

On the other hand, the University of the Philippines is known for its liberal education, which translates into freedom of expression (Ramirez, 2017). UP is a platform for self-expression and does not have any dress code. Students can make their own choices in deciding what to wear (Renales, 2016). In the university, both students and professors could dress themselves in the way they want every single day without judgments.

Villanueva (2017) investigated the perceived gaps in transmission of these policies and rules from the perspective of the policy actors, which are the students, parents, and authority (teacher/administration). When participants were asked regarding the origin or history of the dress code policy, Villanueva summarized that they simply were “*following or continuing what had already been established or what is being practiced.*” Villanueva concluded that students get lost in translation on the phenomenon of uniform policies because “*policies in transmission may seemingly be misunderstood or get filtered.*”

Sarwari (2020) believed that the virtual setting will inevitably change the way people dress for work and even in class. In a remote work setting, Smith (2020) found that about half of employees do not adhere to a modified dress code. If there is an existing dress code for the virtual setting, it should be consistently enforced and should provide guidelines that maintain professionalism. Resistance will be present when people get back into uncomfortable clothes from work. But on the other hand, there are people that may want to reinvent themselves again after the pandemic.

According to Momeni and Asghari (2020), students who had a lack of interest in their chosen field of study did not care about the goals of adherence to professional dress. Through appropriate educational methods and being constantly scrutinized in their implementation and compliance with engagement to policy actors, belief in dress codes can be internalized. Thus, the barriers against the student's adherence to professional dress can be overcome (Villanueva, 2017; Momeni & Asghari, 2020; Smith, 2020).

2.2. Self-Discipline

Self-discipline is the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts between normative preferences and temptations (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016). It is of pivotal importance for students to exercise this skill as sustained self-discipline is required to continue with their goal commitment and to successfully attain them. A lack of self-discipline may cause student's intellectual potential to shorten. However, there are relatively simple self-regulatory strategies students could learn to use that may substantially improve their ability to attain their academic goals. This further implies that educational institutions could consider if their missions and objectives should extend to directly optimizing self-regulatory strategies to their students, as well as opportunities to maintain and practice them (Duckworth et al., 2011). Furthermore, when students abide and conduct themselves accordingly, they can maintain self-discipline and uphold the LSPU system's policies, rules and regulations (LSPU Handbook, 2014).

A student's level of self-discipline is positively related to their level of emotional intelligence (Moneva & Gatan, 2020). They can identify several factors in coping with stress by employing their emotional intelligence and self-discipline. In addition, students could improve their intellectual capacities and associate themselves with positive affirmations and encouragements in facing problems they may encounter in school and in life.

Wu (2016) claimed that at the university level, students who want to understand and master a large number of operating rules and mainstream social values, put these rules and values into their own inner thoughts and motives, so that their actions are consistent with the requirements of society. Students' self-discipline is formed and developed under the influence of constraints. These constraints come from school, family, and society that forms a restraining force. So, the development of self-discipline encouraged students to better consciously accept the influence of external constraints that may lead to its improvement. Improving college students' self-discipline can achieve college students' self-management.

According to Han (2019), college students are in the critical period of personal growth and success. Students' personal growth and development totally depends on their own sense of self-discipline. Hence, the sense of self-discipline plays a particularly important role in their development. Students with strong self-discipline will make full use of resources, better plan their own time, study hard, and enrich their college life.

Surprisingly, studies have shown that women might have troubles with self-discipline. According to Meyers (2016), if a woman falls short of the expectations they have to meet, they often view their unsuccessful attempts as personal failures. This may be attributed to how women are presented with unreasonable standards that they have to achieve. These expectations may cause them overwhelming feelings of shame, stress, inadequacy, etc. Also, women tend to report stress more than men as stressful events have a different impact on women (Núñez-Rocha et al., 2020).

Various research revealed the positive impact of self-discipline on a wide range of life outcomes. According to Garcia and Subia (2019), self-discipline helps student athletes develop better time management skills. It also prepared them thoroughly for competitions and improved focus on their plans. Meanwhile, Gelles et al. (2020) found that most students identify time management, creating and adhering to a schedule, removing distractions and setting boundaries as actions rooted in being self-disciplined. Lastly, Şimşir and Dilmaç (2021) discovered that self-discipline makes a significant contribution to a peaceful life. It promotes numerous human behaviors with positive psychological outcomes.

2.3. Theoretical Framework

The study was anchored on Martin Fishbein and Icek Azjen's Theory of Reasoned Action (1975). According to this theory, a person's behavior is determined by their behavioral intention. It is described as the intention to perform a certain behavior in a specific way in certain situations. This theory also focused on a person's attitude towards a behavior and the subjective norms that potentially affects their behavior, attitude, views, and perception. These subjective norms are influenced by the beliefs of the people around them like parents, friends, partners, colleagues, etc. In addition, Ryu and Han (2010) found that attitude and past behavior were significant predictors of tourists' behavioral intention. They found that based from past studies, the inclusion of the past behavior as a predictor significantly enhanced the predictive ability of the TRA model in intentions and/or actual behaviors. Findings showed a positive causal relationship from past behavior to behavioral intentions.

According to Kaveh et al. (2015), the theory of reasoned action can be efficiently used in determining and studying students' behavior regarding university dress code. Based from the survey on 472 students of Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, 26 percent of the students had negative attitude towards the dress code. For the student's subjective norms, the results were considerably far from the expected level as only 8 percent were informed about the dress code through professors and other students but 67 percent reported that it was important for them because of the support of parents, instructors, and peers. Meanwhile, the behavioral intention of the participants towards dress code-based dressing was relatively good, with 62.3 percent of the students adhering to the dress code, while 26.4 percent did not have the same intention. Most importantly, Kaveh et al. (2015) stated that subjective norms played a more critical role in explaining the dress code behavior among the students.

The Self-Regulation Theory by Roy Baumeister was also used to support the study. This theory outlines the system and process of conscious personal management where the mind exerts controls over its drives, functions, and states. It helps individuals to become in line with a preferred state on a regular basis, in both short- and long-term situations. There are four (4) components of SRT: (1) standards of desirable behavior, (2) motivation to meet standards, (3) monitoring of situations and thoughts that precede breaking standards and (4) willpower or internal strength to control urges. The SRT relates to self-discipline as it is a system and process where it can outline the effort an individual exerts to regulate their own moods, that results in reducing their internal conflicts (Mihm & Ozbek, 2016).

Self-regulation theory fits the investigation of self-discipline and how it is related to dress code policy adherence as an individual's goals can be attained by their standards, motivation, monitoring, and willpower. Further, Cepe (2014) used the delay of gratification theory to measure the self-discipline of college students but still required a multi-informant approach, while Mbaluka (2017) used the self-determination theory which also needed an additional questionnaire to gather reports from parents and teachers. Furthermore, the self-regulation theory, paired with the theory of reasoned action, seems to be the most appropriate theoretical approach in assessing student's perspectives and self-report on their self-discipline. Lastly, Walukouw and Simbolon (2019) stated there is a significant relationship between self-regulation and discipline. Thus, discipline requires self-regulation.

3. Methodology

The study used descriptive-correlational design since it described the behavior of the respondents and determined the relationship between the independent variable and dependent variable. The respondents of the study are 100 college students of Laguna State Polytechnic University – San Pablo City Campus. Using purposive sampling technique, the criteria set in the selection of respondents are as follows: (1) respondents must be a college student of LSPU-SPCC who has studied with face-to-face class for at least a semester in the university, and; (2) they must be willing to participate. Demographics of the participants showed that: 91% were 18 to 23 years old; 58% were female; 77% were in the third year level; and 30% were Bachelor of Science in Business Administration.

Researcher-made questionnaires were used to measure the level of dress code policy adherence and level of self-discipline of the respondents. The instruments were validated by experts in the field of psychology. Suggestions and recommendations were considered for refinement before going to the actual phase of the study, where the researchers selected college students qualified in the criteria set in choosing the respondents. The researchers explained the purpose of the study and were ensured that all answers gathered will be kept confidential. They were administered questionnaires through an online survey. After answering the provided test, the researcher gathered, tabulated, analyzed the results.

Lastly, the study used the following statistical tools: frequency and percentage distribution were used to describe the respondents' profile data. Mean was used to measure the average of the scores of the tests taken. Lastly, Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to measure the relationship between dress code policy adherence and self-discipline.

4. Findings and Discussion

Table 1 shows the level of attitude of the respondents. Indicator 1 *“I feel confident when I’m wearing the prescribed uniform.”* had the highest Mean = 3.45 and Standard Deviation = 0.72 interpreted as *“High”*. This implied that the respondents follow the dress code because the feelings of confidence surfaces when they do so. When they wear their uniforms, they view themselves with pride and honor.

Table 1*Level of Attitude of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I feel confident when I'm wearing the prescribed uniform.	3.45	0.72	High
2. Dress code policy restricts student's way of self-expression.	2.00	0.83	Low
3. I feel uncomfortable with the dress code policy.	2.64	0.87	High
4. Implementing dress code promotes a positive image to students.	3.44	0.72	High
5. Having a dress code makes it inconvenient to attend classes.	2.54	0.88	High
6. Following the dress code is beneficial for me.	3.22	0.69	High
7. I feel that complying with the dress code policy is no good.	2.99	0.82	High
8. I am satisfied following the dress code policy.	3.25	0.73	High
Overall	2.94	0.92	High
<i>Legend: 3.50 – 4.0</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>1.50 - 2.49</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>2.50 - 3.49</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>1.00 - 1.49</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

On the other hand, Indicator 2 “*Dress code policy restricts student's way of self-expression.*” had the lowest Mean = 2.00 and Standard Deviation = 0.83 interpreted as “*Low*”, which would likely mean that respondents may have a low level of dress code policy adherence because they believed that it interfered with their freedom of expression. Dress and grooming are generally viewed as a form of self-expression. Restrictions on these behaviors could make students feel that they have no freedom in expressing themselves.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.94 and a Standard Deviation = 0.92, it is implied that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of attitude. The respondents could have mixed feelings about the dress code. Most notably, the positive feeling is confidence and honor while the negative feeling can be restriction on self-expression. Nevertheless, the positive outweighs the negative when it comes to college student's attitudes, resulting in a high level of dress code policy adherence.

Table 2 shows the level of subjective norms of the respondents. Indicator 7 “*I am aware that the dress code policy should be followed as I am seeing my fellow students doing it.*” has the highest Mean = 3.44 and Standard Deviation = 0.66 interpreted as “*High*”. This indicates that college students become aware of following the dress code when they see people like them doing the same thing. If their peers adhere to the dress code policy, then they will likely perform the same behavior.

Table 2*Level of Subjective Norms of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am encouraged to follow the dress code policy imposed by the school.	3.41	0.55	High
2. I believe that adhering to the dress code policy is promoted in the school.	3.42	0.59	High
3. Most people tolerate me in what I want to wear in school.	2.61	0.90	High
4. I feel compelled to follow the dress code policy due to social pressure.	2.55	0.77	High
5. It is expected of me to not wear prohibited attires inside the campus.	2.76	0.99	High
6. I will not follow the dress code policy since there are school personnel who do not conform also.	3.16	0.83	High
7. I am aware that the dress code policy should be followed as I am seeing my fellow students doing it.	3.44	0.66	High
8. Most people whose opinions I value thinks that I should not comply with the university's dress code.	2.80	0.90	High
Overall	3.02	0.86	High
<i>Legend: 3.50 – 4.0</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>1.50 - 2.49</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>2.50 - 3.49</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>1.00 - 1.49</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

In contrast, Indicator 4 “*I feel compelled to follow the dress code policy due to social pressure.*” has the lowest Mean = 2.55 and Standard Deviation = 0.77 interpreted as “*High*”. This means that as college students, they feel that their actions partly comply to social norms but is not entirely reliant on them when it comes to deciding what actions to take in regards to their adherence to the dress code policy. It is also possible that they may choose to do so as well on their own volition.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.02 and Standard Deviation = 0.86, it can be understood that the respondents has high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of subjective norms. This implied that college students may perceive their fellow students as individuals that have important and effective expectations regarding the performance or avoidance of a behavior, particularly their dress code policy adherence. As they see them performing the stated behavior, they would be aware that they should follow the dress code. However, it is possible that college students understand and are aware of their own interests which could also influence their adherence. Nonetheless, the college student’s subjective norms result in a high level of dress code policy adherence.

Table 3*Level of Past Behavior of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I wear the proper school uniform in every day classes.	3.62	0.55	Very High
2. I follow the standard hair policy adhered on the dress code.	3.44	0.70	High
3. I go to school wearing incomplete school uniform.	3.20	0.93	High
4. I borrow my classmate's Identification Card at times that I forgot mine.	3.42	0.82	High
5. I like to follow the on-trend hair styles not stated on the policy.	3.09	0.94	High
6. I wear my Identification Card in school at all times.	3.67	0.57	Very High
7. I wear accessories such as multiple piercings in school.	3.31	0.95	High
8. I don't wear unnecessary accessories in school so I look neat.	3.06	0.96	High
Overall	3.35	0.84	High

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 3 shows the level of past behavior of the respondents. Indicator 6 “*I wear my Identification Card in school at all times.*” had the Highest Mean = 3.67 and Standard Deviation = 0.57 interpreted as “*Very High*”. This implied that the respondents wear their Identification Card regularly as it allows them to enter the university and access the provided services. It could easily be placed on their body using lanyards or clips. Most importantly, it is part of the school uniform stated in the dress code policy that provides easy identification.

On the contrary, Indicator 8 “*I don't wear unnecessary accessories in school so I look neat.*” had the lowest Mean = 3.06 and Standard Deviation = 0.96 interpreted as “*High*”. This implied that the respondents avoid wearing unnecessary accessories in school because it would give them an unpleasant appearance. They could prefer to keep things simple and decide that it is better to stay in line with what is prescribed to wear. Furthermore, they do not wear unnecessary accessories as it could possibly be a hindrance in their bodies as well as give them an unlikeable impression from other people.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.35 and Standard Deviation = 0.84, it implied that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of past behavior. Students may follow or continue to follow the dress code as it is what had already been established and what is being practiced. This indicated that past experience of following the dress code could strengthen college students' dress code policy adherence.

Table 4*Level of Behavioral Intention of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I like to follow the dress code policy of the school.	3.43	0.74	High
2. I want to violate the school dress code policy.	3.36	0.84	High
3. I plan to comply with the school's dress code.	3.03	0.90	High
4. I find it unclear on how students will be given sanctions imposed on the dress code policy.	2.53	0.86	High
5. I intend to adhere to the dress code policy.	3.10	0.69	High
6. I follow the dress code because I am required to.	1.49	0.63	Very Low
7. I find myself having a hard time following the dress code.	2.81	0.93	High
8. I understand that going with the dress code policy is needed for compliance.	3.41	0.73	
Overall	2.90	1.00	High
<i>Legend: 3.50 – 4.0</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>1.50 - 2.49</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>2.50 - 3.49</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>1.00 - 1.49</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 4 shows the level of behavioral intention of the respondents. Indicator 1 “*I like to follow the dress code policy of the school.*” had the Highest Mean = 3.43 and Standard Deviation = 0.74, interpreted as “*High*”. This implied that most of the respondents follow the dress code policy of the school because they like doing it. College students prefer to wear their uniforms because they enjoy them.

On the other hand, Indicator 6 “*I follow the dress code because I am required to.*” had the lowest Mean = 1.49 and Standard Deviation = 0.63 which is interpreted as “*Very Low*”. This means that the respondents may have a very low level of dress code policy adherence because they are required by the university. Being a requirement means that following the dress code is mandatory for college students. The respondents may feel that they are forced to conduct adherence since the student’s control over the behavior is incomplete. Therefore, they may not engage with the desired behavior.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.90 and Standard Deviation = 1.00, it means that the respondents have high level of dress code policy adherence in terms of behavioral intention. This implied that college students may decide to follow the dress code on their own due to them personally liking the uniforms and that they desire to have a pleasant appearance. However, they may also see that adhering to the dress code is not motivated by their own decisions as they are expected to do so as students of the university. Nonetheless, the college students’ intention has a high level in following the dress code.

Table 5*Summary Results of Level of Dress Code Policy Adherence of the Respondents*

Factors	Mean	Level
Attitude	2.94	High
Subjective Norms	3.02	High
Past Behavior	3.35	High
Behavioral Intention	2.90	High
Overall Mean	3.05	High

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

Table 5 shows the summary results of level of dress code policy adherence. It shows that majority of the respondents have a high level of adherence with an overall Mean = 3.05, with past behavior having the highest Mean = 3.35. This indicates that the respondents stay in line with the dress code as they follow what is prescribed to wear. This implied that most college students highly adhere to the dress code based from their previous behaviors, specifically in always wearing their Identification Card inside the campus as part of the school uniform.

Table 6 shows the level of standards of the respondents. Indicator 5 “*I admit my mistakes as part of learning.*” had the highest Mean = 3.62 and Standard Deviation = 0.51 which is interpreted as “*Very High*”. This implied that the respondents own up to their mistakes in order to grow and become a better person. They have the potential to acknowledge the usefulness of mistakes. They recognized their setbacks and failure as lesson that make them continue with additional knowledge.

Table 6*Level of Standards of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I accomplish my daily tasks.	3.38	0.63	High
2. I find it difficult to set my plans on time.	2.37	0.80	Low
3. I am responsible of my actions.	3.61	0.51	Very High
4. I always make excuses for doing unpleasant acts.	2.96	0.82	High
5. I admit my mistakes as part of learning.	3.62	0.51	Very High
6. I blame others for my wrong actions.	3.52	0.70	Very High
7. I try to live up with my personal standards.	3.16	0.65	High
8. I live up to other people’s expectations of me.	2.77	0.93	High
Overall	3.17	0.82	High

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low

On the other hand, Indicator 2 "*I find it difficult to set my plans on time.*" had the lowest Mean = 2.37 and Standard Deviation = 0.80 which is interpreted as "*Low*". This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because they could have difficulties making plans and scheduling when to carry them out. Uncertain plans or conflicting schedules could cause them to struggle.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.17 and Standard Deviation = 0.82, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of standards. This implied that college students have personal standards for mistakes and plans. They could acknowledge mistakes as "lessons" that may help them grow deeper. Also, there could be failures in setting plans and processing schedules. Nonetheless, college students have personal standards, and set their goals and efforts towards them, making them disciplined.

Table 7 shows the level of motivation of the respondents. Indicator 8 "*I am motivated in fulfilling my goals.*" had the highest Mean = 3.53 and Standard Deviation = 0.56 which is interpreted as "*Very High*". This implied that the respondents are motivated to fulfill their own goals. They could deal with tasks and challenges but they are motivated to overcome them for their goals and ambitions. Students that recognize the value of their goals will be motivated to invest effort.

On the other hand, Indicator 6 "*I feel overwhelmed in facing problems or challenge.*" had the lowest Mean = 2.17 and Standard Deviation = 0.79 which is interpreted as "*Low*". This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because those who are faced with problems or challenges, feel overwhelmed by them. Students may be burdened with weighing and choosing among alternatives and solutions to problems and challenges. Thus, they may fail to achieve their goals.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 3.03 and Standard Deviation = 0.89, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of motivation. This implied that college students that has goals can become motivated. These goals can give them a clear view of what they want in the future. After they set a goal, the next step is to pursue it. However, they could face overwhelming challenges and problems along the way. Nonetheless, college students have a high level of motivation to overcome them.

Table 7*Level of Motivation of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I find it demanding overcoming my difficulties in life.	2.38	0.83	Low
2. I find it enjoying pushing myself towards challenging goals.	3.43	0.54	High
3. Rewarding myself is a waste of time.	3.42	0.75	High
4. I reward myself whenever I accomplished my tasks.	3.41	0.71	High
5. I feel out of control doing improvement for myself.	2.50	0.86	High
6. I feel overwhelmed in facing problems or challenge.	2.17	0.79	Low
7. I approach challenges with a positive mindset.	3.41	0.59	High
8. I am motivated in fulfilling my goals.	3.53	0.56	Very High
Overall	3.03	0.89	High
<i>Legend: 3.50 – 4.0</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>1.50 - 2.49</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>2.50 - 3.49</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>1.00 - 1.49</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Table 8 shows the level of monitoring of the respondents. Indicator 1 “*I am confident on keeping my progress on track.*” had the highest Mean = 3.37 and Standard Deviation = 0.58, which is interpreted as “*High*”. This implied that the respondents that can track their progress, can often foster the feeling of confidence. They feel happy, proud, and energized in monitoring their actions towards their goals in life.

Table 8*Level of Monitoring of the Respondents*

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am confident on keeping my progress on track.	3.37	0.58	High
2. At times, I am losing track of my goals.	2.12	0.74	Low
3. I always show my true self to others.	3.26	0.69	High
4. I always speak up for myself.	3.02	0.77	High
5. I am not the person I always appear to other people.	2.33	0.83	Low
6. I am afraid to tell what is on my mind.	2.18	0.85	Low
7. I try to be the person I want to become.	3.36	0.64	High
8. It bothers me when things are not the way I expect for myself.	1.92	0.68	Low
Overall	2.69	0.92	High
<i>Legend: 3.50 – 4.0</i>	<i>Very High</i>	<i>1.50 - 2.49</i>	<i>Low</i>
<i>2.50 - 3.49</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>1.00 - 1.49</i>	<i>Very Low</i>

Meanwhile, Indicator 8 “*It bothers me when things are not the way I expect for myself.*” had the lowest Mean = 1.92 and Standard Deviation = 0.68, interpreted as “*Low*”. This means that the respondents may have a low level of self-discipline because they feel bothered when

their expectations about themselves are not what they see from their progress and the results they show. If the self falls short, they may cause feelings of frustration, inadequacy, and shame.

With an Overall Weighted Mean = 2.69 and Standard Deviation = 0.92, this means the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of monitoring. This implied that college students are responsible for their individual progress. They monitor their behavior working towards the achievement of the goal. Keeping track of how much they improved towards specific goals could make them closer to reaching it, exercising their self-discipline.

This implies that the respondents are confident in keeping track of their individual progress as they work towards the achievement of their goals.

Table 9

Level of Willpower of the Respondents

Indicators	Mean	SD	VI
1. I am open to different opportunities in life.	3.60	0.53	Very High
2. I set limitations for the things I need to focus on.	3.24	0.73	High
3. I am afraid to leave my comfort zone.	2.33	0.91	Low
4. I find it hard putting boundaries on what I want to do.	2.18	0.76	Low
5. I am optimistic in overcoming my challenges.	3.25	0.63	High
6. I have difficulty handling stress.	2.23	0.86	Low
7. I do not allow myself to lose patience.	3.00	0.71	High
8. I struggle working towards my goals.	2.08	0.75	Low
Overall	2.74	0.93	High

Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 *Very High* 1.50 - 2.49 *Low*
 2.50 - 3.49 *High* 1.00 - 1.49 *Very Low*

Table 9 shows the level of willpower of the respondents. Indicator 1 “*I am open to different opportunities in life.*” had the highest mean=3.60 and Standard Deviation = 0.53, which is interpreted as “*Very High*”. This implied that as college students, the respondents are open to life opportunities because they know that they should have the capacity to walk on different paths to reach their goals. They may seize opportunities in order to succeed.

In contrast, Indicator 8 “*I struggle working towards my goals.*” had the lowest mean=2.08 and Standard Deviation = 0.75, which is interpreted as “*Low*”. This means that the respondents may have low levels of self-discipline because they experience struggles in achieving their goals. College students may struggle to strive towards their goals because they may be pushed by their parents, and not their own selves.

With an Overall Weighted Mean=2.74 and Standard Deviation=0.93, it means that the respondents have high level of self-discipline in terms of willpower. This implied that college students have the willpower to seize opportunities and make healthy choices in various areas of life, and accomplish their dreams and goals. Thus, student who possess willpower would successfully work towards their dreams and goals.

Table 10

Summary Results of Level of Self-Discipline of the Respondents

Factors	Mean	Level
Standards	3.17	High
Motivation	3.03	High
Monitoring	2.69	High
Willpower	2.74	High
Overall Mean	2.91	High

*Legend: 3.50 – 4.0 Very High 1.50 - 2.49 Low
2.50 - 3.49 High 1.00 - 1.49 Very Low*

Table 10 shows the summary results of level of self-discipline. It shows that majority of the respondents have a high level of self-discipline with an Overall Mean=2.91, with standards having the highest Mean=3.17. This may indicate that respondents are highly disciplined to set goals, driven to reach them, monitor their progress, and be energized to successfully attain them. Most college students can practice self-discipline by following and evaluating their own standards of success and making sense of their personal strengths and resources.

Table 11

Test of Correlation between Profile and Dress Code Policy Adherence of the Respondents

Variables	Attitude		Subjective Norms		Past Behavior		Behavioral Intention	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Age	0.143	0.072	0.236	0.024*	0.197	0.066	0.127	0.063
Sex	0.101	0.068	0.226	0.021*	0.000	N/A	0.053	0.057
Year Level	0.154	0.055	0.026	0.111	-0.050	0.103	0.007	0.052
Course	0.230	0.026*	0.171	0.069	0.259	0.030*	0.115	0.059

*Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant*

Table 11 presents the test of correlation between profile of the respondents and their dress code policy adherence. Among the variables, it is found out that the variable “Course” have a

positive significant relationship ($r = 0.23$, $p = 0.026$). In this study, those studying business administration are more likely to have a positive attitude towards following the dress code policy than other courses. According to Sequeira et al. (2014), college students in business administration believes that having uniforms, incorporates discipline among them and develop their image to suit the corporate world as professionals.

On the other hand, “Age” ($r = 0.236$, $p = 0.024$) and “Sex” ($r = 0.226$, $p = 0.021$) has positive significant relationship. As the age of the female students’ increases, the level of their subjective norms increases. In this study, female college students who are ages 18 to 23 are more likely to be influenced by their peers than male students who are ages 17 or younger, and 24 or older in their dressing behavior. According to Kaveh et al. (2015), a student's type of dressing is influenced by their parents in lower ages. However, as the child ages and enters social networks, such as school and friends, the role of parents would diminish and replaced by that of peers. Kaveh et al. referred to the effect of peers on the dress code behavior in girl adolescents where female students were more affected by peers when compared to male students. The girls’ higher scores of subjective norms in their study could also demonstrate the higher importance of social preferences in selection of type of dressing for girls.

For past behavior, it shows that only the variable “Course” is significant ($r = 0.259$, $p = 0.030$) and has a positive significant relationship. In this study, those studying business administration are more likely to have regularly wear their uniforms and adhered to the dress code policy than students in other courses. According to Sequeira et al. (2014) and Kaveh et al. (2015), for business administration students wearing the uniform reflects on their personality and adds to the reputation of the institution. Their past behavior could be a significant factor for determining their adherence as they explained that a college student’s field of study may have different subcultures and may display different behaviors.

Table 12

Test of Relationship between Profile and Self-Discipline

Variables	Standards		Motivation		Monitoring		Willpower	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Age	0.236	0.038*	0.222	0.031*	0.166	0.073	0.127	0.068
Sex	0.024	0.052	-0.080	0.059	-0.200	0.036*	-0.060	0.082
Year Level	-0.110	0.079	-0.020	0.055	0.068	0.059	0.017	0.051
Course	0.163	0.082	0.132	0.071	0.177	0.062	0.065	0.089

Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant

Table 12 presents the test of correlation between profile of the respondents and their self-discipline. It shows that all factors, aside from willpower, have a correlation with some profile factors. For standards, only age is significant ($r = 0.236$, $p = 0.038$) with a positive significant relationship. As the age of the respondent increases, the level of their standards increases. In this study, those who are ages 18 to 23 were more likely to be disciplined by having a clear and well-defined standard than the ages 17 or younger, or 24 or older. According to Bhana (2010), during the period of middle childhood and pre-adolescence, a student would have the ability to monitor their own behavior, and eventually adopt acceptable standards of good and bad behavior. In adolescence, they are finishing a bachelor's degree and are setting goals that require sustained self-discipline. (Duckworth et al. 2011).

For motivation, only age is significant ($r = 0.222$, $p = 0.031$) with a positive significant relationship. As the age of the respondents' increases, the level of their motivation increases. In this study, those who are ages 18 to 23 were more likely to be disciplined by being motivated to fulfill their goals than the ages 17 or younger, and 24 or older. According to Vicaria & Isaacowitz (2016), the aging process is naturally and inevitably associated with change, both physical and psychological. As life situations and mental capabilities transform, it is logical that older adults' motivations towards social goals may shift as well.

For monitoring, only sex is significant ($r = -0.200$, $p = 0.036$) with a negative significant relationship. This implies that female college students may have troubles on how they monitor themselves to achieve their goals in life than male students. According to Meyers (2016), women are presented with unreasonable standards that they have to achieve more than men. These expectations may cause overwhelming feelings of shame, stress, etc.

Table 13

Test of Correlation between Dress Code Policy Adherence and Self-Discipline of the Respondents

Variables	Standards		Motivation		Monitoring		Willpower	
	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value	r-value	p-value
Attitude	0.231	0.032*	0.260	0.028*	0.191	0.063	0.177	0.071
Subjective Norms	0.418	0.019*	0.385	0.023*	0.159	0.068	0.379	0.019*
Past Behavior	0.434	0.011*	0.367	0.024*	0.310	0.025*	0.202	0.021*
Behavioral Intention	0.315	0.027*	0.285	0.021*	0.202	0.020*	0.057	0.077

Legend: * = $p < 0.05$, significant; $p > 0.05$, not significant

Table 13 presents the test of correlation between dress code policy adherence and self-discipline of the respondents. From the variables which include standards ($p=0.032$), motivation ($p=0.028$), monitoring ($p=0.063$), and willpower ($p=0.071$), only standards and motivation have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to attitude. This implies that as the respondents highly adhere to the dress code because of positive attitudes, they may likely have high standards and motivation. According to Coleman et al. (2011) and Kaveh et al. (2015), factors such as attitude and feelings could influence beliefs and that a university student would have a positive evaluation in following the dressing pattern, if they believed that it's beneficial. In addition, Wyer et al. (2012) found that operations for a goal-directed behavior could influence the plan that individuals select for attaining the goal they happen to be pursuing.

From the variables which include standards ($p=0.019$), motivation ($p=0.023$), monitoring ($p=0.068$), and willpower ($p=0.019$), only standards, motivation, and willpower have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence to subjective norms. This implies that as the respondents highly adhere to the dress code because of high perceived social support, they may likely have high standards, motivation, and willpower. According to Heidarzadeh et al. (2019), the professional attire and student adherence to these clothes respects social standards and develops a positive professional image. Furthermore, Coleman et al. (2011) reported that subjective norms could motivate a person to take socially desirable action, and wide-ranging social implications are brought by willpower (APS, 2012).

The variables which include standards ($p =0.011$), motivation ($p=0.024$), monitoring ($p=0.025$), and willpower ($p=0.021$), all have a positive significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to past behavior. This implies that previous adherence to the dress code, like regularly wearing their Identification Card, may likely increase their self-discipline. As part of the prescribed uniform, Identification Cards could be used by college students to highly set clear standards, be motivated, monitor their thoughts, situations, and past mistakes, and possess the strength to meet their goals, to assess and gather feedback and use this information to improve their self-discipline. According to Shepherd (2020), individuals could subconsciously remind themselves about their past behavior by practicing it in these virtual settings where it takes even more discipline to stay productive, now that there is less direct face-to-face interaction and supervision. In addition, goal-directed behavior in a past, albeit unrelated situation may influence an individual's plan for goal attainment (Wyer et al., 2012).

Lastly, from the variables which include standards ($p=0.027$), motivation ($p=0.021$), monitoring ($p=0.020$), and willpower ($p=0.077$), only standards, motivation, and monitoring have a significant relationship with dress code policy adherence as to behavioral intention. This implies that as the respondents highly intend to adhere to the dress code, they may have high standards and motivation, and highly monitor their situations, decisions, and progress to attain their life-goals. According to Norman & Conner (2017), an important aspect of intentions is awareness of standards which is often necessary to maintain an initiated behavior. Furthermore, a complete lack of intention to behave is at the lowest level of motivation along a continuum. College students could move their level of motivation along the continuum, and hopefully led to more self-determined forms of motivation (Yarborough & Fedesco, 2020). Also, if people have a high self-monitoring skill, they could be more sensitive to their external environment, and their behavioral intentions would have a greater degree of consistency with their behavior (Nantel & Strahle, 2021).

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings, respondents have both a high level of dress code policy adherence and a high level of self-discipline. Age, sex, and course are significantly related to factors of dress code policy adherence whereas only age and sex are significantly related to factors of self-discipline. Attitude is only significantly related to standards and motivation; subjective norms to standards, motivation, and willpower; and behavioral intention to standards, motivation, and monitoring. Finally, only past behavior is significantly related to the self-discipline of college students.

In view of the findings and conclusions drawn from this study, the following are hereby recommended: Consider a follow-up study using the same variables in other settings and with an increase in the number of participants. Other related factors which may influence students across all levels may be included in future studies. Also, educators may consider requesting students to wear their Identification Cards during online classes to improve their self-discipline in the current virtual setting. At the same time, college students may consider wearing their Identification Cards as it is easy to put, using a lanyard or clip, to help them remain disciplined.

Lastly, the community or the university administrators may develop new and updated policies for the new normal or for the return of face-to-face classes to guide and encourage their students.

Acknowledgement

The present study was approved and financially supported by the Laguna State Polytechnic University and the Department of Science and Technology-Science Education Institute (DOST-SEI).

References

- American Psychological Association. (2012, December 1). *What you need to know about willpower: The psychological science of self-control*. APA. <http://www.apa.org/topics/personality/willpower>
- Association for Psychological Science - APS. (2012). *Where Does Self-Discipline Come From*. Psychological Science. <https://www.psychologicalscience.org/news/full-frontal-psychology/where-does-self-discipline-come-from.html>
- Bhana, A. (2010). Middle childhood and pre-adolescence. *Promoting mental health in scare-resource contexts*, 124-142.
- Brookshire, A. N. (2016). The Impact of School Uniforms on School Climate.
- Cepe, M. (2014). The effect of Facebook use, self-discipline and parenting styles on the academic achievement of high school and university students.
- Coleman, L. J., Bahnan, N., Kelkar, M., & Curry, N. (2011). Walking the walk: How the theory of reasoned action explains adult and student intentions to go green. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, 27(3), 107-116.
- Duckworth, A. L., Grant, H., Loew, B., Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2011). Self-regulation strategies improve self-discipline in adolescents: Benefits of mental contrasting and implementation intentions. *Educational Psychology*, 31(1), 17-26.
- Garcia, M. G. G., & Subia, G. (2019). High school athletes: Their motivation, study habits, self-discipline and academic performance. *International Journal of Physical Education, Sports and Health*, 6(1), 86-90.
- Gelles, L. A., Lord, S. M., Hoople, G. D., Chen, D. A., & Mejia, J. A. (2020). Compassionate flexibility and self-discipline: Student adaptation to emergency remote teaching in an integrated engineering energy course during COVID-19. *Education Sciences*, 10(11), 304.
- Han, Y. (2019). Cultivating college students' self-discipline consciousness under the new media environment. *American Journal of Educational Research and Reviews*, 4, 50-50.

- Heidarzadeh, A., Mobasher, M., Nakhaei, N., Faseiherandi, M., & Haghdoost, 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.
- Kaveh, M. H., Moradi, L., Hesampour, M., & Zadeh, J. H. (2015). A survey of the effective factors in students' adherence to university dress code policy, using the theory of reasoned action. *Journal of Advances in Medical Education & Professionalism*, 3(3), 133.
- Laguna State Polytechnic University-*Student Handbook* (2014). San Pablo City, Laguna.
- Lino, C. (2016, October 2). *The Psychology of Willpower: Training the Brain for Better Decisions*. PositivePsychology.com. <https://positivepsychology.com/psychology-of-willpower/>
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Can schools regulate student dress and grooming in school. *Focus On Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, 5(1), 1-5.
- Mbaluka, S. N. (2017). The Impact Of Student Self-Discipline And Parental Involvement in Students' Academic Activities on Student Academic Performance.
- Meyers, L. (2016, March 28). *Falling short of perfect - Counseling Today*. Counseling Today. <https://ct.counseling.org/2016/03/falling-short-of-perfect/>
- Mihm, M., & Ozbek, K. (2016). A model of self-discipline.
- Momeni, N., & Asghari, F. (2020). Barriers of students' adherence to dress code policy in clinical settings: dental students' viewpoint. *Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine*, 13.
- Moneva, J. C., & Gatan, B. P. (2020). Emotional Intelligence and Self-Discipline in Senior High School. *International Journal of Research-GRANTHAALAYAH*, 8(1), 69-77.
- Nantel, J. A., & Strahle, W. (2021). The Self-Monitoring Concept: a Consumer Behavior Perspective. *ACR North American Advances*, NA-13. <https://www.acrwebsite.org/volumes/6470>
- Norman, P., & Conner, M. (2017). *Health Behavior ☆. Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology*. doi:10.1016/b978-0-12-809324-5.05143-9
- Núñez-Rocha, G. M., López-Botello, C. K., Salinas-Martínez, A. M., Arroyo-Acevedo, H. V., Martínez-Villarreal, R. T., & Ávila-Ortiz, M. N. (2020). Lifestyle, Quality of Life, and Health Promotion Needs in Mexican University Students: Important Differences by Sex and Academic Discipline. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(21), 8024.
- Ryu, K., & Han, H. (2010). Predicting tourists' intention to try local cuisine using a modified theory of reasoned action: The case of New Orleans. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 27(5), 491-506.
- Sarwari, K. (2020). Will the COVID-19 pandemic change how people dress for work in the future? <https://news.northeastern.edu/2020/12/14/will-the-covid-19-pandemic-change-how-people-dress-for-work-in-the-future/>

- Sequeira, A. H., Mendonca, C., Prabhu, K., & Narayan Tiwari, L. (2014). A Study on Dress Code for College Students. *Mandeep and Prabhu K., Mahendra and Narayan Tiwari, Lakshmi, A Study on Dress Code for College Students (September 29, 2014)*.
- Shepherd, M. (2020, April 16). *Dressing for Online Meetings In The Coronavirus Era*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/marshallshepherd/2020/04/16/dressing-for-online-meetings-in-the-coronavirus-era/?sh=492ef3723855>
- Sieber, V., Flückiger, L., Mata, J., Bernecker, K., & Job, V. (2019). Autonomous goal striving promotes a nonlimited theory about willpower. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(8), 1295-1307.
- Şimşir, Z., & Dilmaç, B. (2021). The mediating roles of grit and life satisfaction in the relationship between self-discipline and peace: Development of the self-discipline scale. *Current Psychology*, 1-11.
- Smith, A. (2020, September 29). *Dress-Code Policies Reconsidered in the Pandemic*. SHRM. <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/legal-and-compliance/employment-law/pages/coronavirus-dress-code-policies.aspx>
- Vicaria, I. M., & Isaacowitz, D. M. (2016). Age-related changes in motivation: Do they influence emotional experience across adulthood and old age? In T. S. Braver (Ed.), *Motivation and cognitive control* (pp. 361–380). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Villanueva, M. P. S. B. G. (2017). Dress Code Policy: Gaps in Transmission... Lost in Translation.
- Walukouw, Y. R., & Simbolon, M. (2019, December). Self-Regulation and Discipline of Unai Girls Dormitory on 2018/2019 Proposed for A Program. In *Abstract Proceedings International Scholars Conference* (Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 860-867).
- Wu, H. (2016). The Research on the Ideological Education and Self-Discipline of College Students.
- Wyer, R. S., Xu, A. J., & Shen, H. (2012). The Effects of Past Behavior on Future Goal-Directed Activity. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 237–283. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-394281-4.00014-3>
- Yarborough, C. B., & Fedesco, H. N. (2020). Motivating students. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. Retrieved from <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/cft/guides-sub-pages/motivating-students/>.