

4-1-2015

## Uniform Policies, School Violence, and School Outcomes: From Principal's Perspective

Seunghee Han

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcre>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Han, Seunghee (2015) "Uniform Policies, School Violence, and School Outcomes: From Principal's Perspective," *Journal of Contemporary Research in Education*: Vol. 3 : No. 3 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcre/vol3/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Education, School of at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Contemporary Research in Education by an authorized editor of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

**Seunghee Han**  
*Independent Researcher*

**Abstract**

This study explores the relationships between uniform policies and school outcomes by analyzing data from the School Survey on Crime and Safety 2007-2008. Data from 387 urban elementary schools indicate that schools with uniform policies tend to have more violent incidents than schools without uniform policies. Perceptions of principals indicate more frequent incidents (e.g., verbal abuse of teacher, disrespect to teacher, and classroom disorder) in schools with uniform policies than schools with no uniform policies. In addition, school violence measured by disciplinary outcomes shows that schools with uniform policies have more drug problems, physical attacks or fights, insubordination, gang-related incidents, and disruptions than schools without uniform policies. After controlling for school characteristics and school violence, multivariate regression analyses show that schools with uniform policies are positively associated with achievement and learning value, but negatively with students' aspiration.

During the last 10 years, there has been an increasing rate of public schools mandating a uniform policy. According to a recent report from the U.S. Department of Education (Robers, Zhang & Truman, 2012), about 19% of public schools required students to wear a uniform in the 2009-2010 school year, compared to the 1999-2000 school year when only 12% of public schools had uniform policies. Although more schools have adopted school uniform policies, the benefits have rarely been confirmed by empirical evidence. Proponents of uniform policies claim that uniform policies reduce problem behaviors, improve achievements, minimize the socioeconomic gap, and create a more orderly learning climate; however, others disagree (Anderson 2002; Evans 1996; Johnston 2009; Wilken 2012; Zernike 2002).

Many researchers have examined the effects of uniform policies on student outcomes such as attendance (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998; Hughes 2006; Stockton & Gullatt 2002), achievement (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998; Draa 2005; Yeung 2009), school climate (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998; Huss 2007; Murray 1997), and student behaviors (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998;

Han 2010; Johnson 2010; Polacheck 1996; Sanchez, Yoxsimer, & Hill 2012). By analyzing nationally representative samples, the current study attempts to add another piece of empirical evidence to determine how uniform policies influence the school outcomes. A few studies have simultaneously examined multiple types of student outcomes including violence, academic achievement, and educational motivation, which may be the most predictable benefits from uniform policies. The main purpose of the study is to seek associations between uniform policies and school outcomes in the hopes that the findings result in a better understanding of uniform policies' effects. The present study controls for ten potential factors (e.g., parental involvement, proportion of minority students, school violence and crime in school areas) that may influence associations between school uniform policies and school outcomes. By doing so, the results could minimize an overestimation of the effects of uniform policies on the school outcomes.

## Literature Review

### Uniform Policies and Violence

Reducing students' problem behaviors is one of the strong claims of proponents of uniform policies. Prior studies have demonstrated negative effects of uniform policies on violence, yet the findings are rather inconsistent (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998; Draa 2005; Han 2010; Hughes 2006; Polacheck 1996; Wade & Stafford 2003; Yeung 2009).

Researchers have found negative associations between uniform policies and violence at different school levels (middle or high school); urban area; and perceptions of various stakeholders, such as principals, parents, students, and teachers. A study of the Long Beach Unified School District in California examined the first implementation of uniform policies in U.S. public schools. The case clearly showed that a uniform policy was effective in reducing violent incidents (Polacheck 1996). In this study, uniform policies were implemented for approximately 60,000 students in 70 schools during the years 1993-1994 and 1994-1995. Overall, violent incidents were reduced about 35%, from 3,242 to 2,074, during the period.

Similarly, Draa (2005) found a significant reduction in the suspension rate over time in 64 urban high schools in Ohio. Furthermore, Wade and Stafford (2003) conducted a survey of 415 students and 83 teachers and reported a significant decrease in gang presence in six urban middle schools. In addition, Texas middle schools reported a decrease in students' problem behaviors and discipline outcomes (Hughes 2006) and a middle school in Nevada also reported a decrease in discipline outcomes and students' perceived violent incidents, such as gang and bullying problems (Sanchez et al., 2012). Han (2010), even after controlled for crime prevention efforts, the achievement level on standardized tests and school size, demonstrated negative relationships between uniform policies and a number of student

problem behaviors (e.g., weapons, drugs, alcohol, fights) at the elementary and middle school levels.

Contrary to those studies, a national study showed no such effect of uniform policies. Brunsma and Rockquemore (1998), who analyzed a nationally representative sample from the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988 (NELS: 88), found no direct associations between uniform policies and student problem behaviors (e.g., suspension, fights, being in trouble, and substance use), holding school characteristics and school preparedness and attitudes constant. On the other hand, Wade and Stafford (2003) showed mixed results of the effect of uniform policies by different stakeholders. Based on data from six public urban middle schools, the researchers found that students' perceptions of gang presence did not change with uniform policies, but the teachers in schools requiring uniform policies perceived less gang presence than their counterparts (Wade & Stafford 2003). Similarly, Johnson (2010), based on data from 38 high schools in North Carolina from the 2004-2005 through 2008-2009 school years, found no significant change in violent incidents and suspensions after schools adopted uniform policies. However, the school administrators from those schools perceived an increase in school safety. Huss (2007) also found that elementary school teachers perceived a positive effect of uniform policies on school order and discipline, yet only suspensions decreased and the actual number of discipline referrals remained unchanged.

### Uniform Policies and School Outcomes

Although proponents of uniform policies believe that uniforms improve student academic performance (e.g., achievement, graduation rate, and attendance rate), only a few studies provide firm empirical evidence for this claim.

Schools having mandatory uniform policies improved attendance and graduation rates in urban high schools in Ohio (Draa 2005) and raised the attendance rate in secondary schools in a large urban school district (Gentile & Imberman 2012). Yet other national studies failed to show such positive effects. In Brunsmas and Rockquemore's (1998) study, the result of regression analyses using more than 4,500 samples from NELS:88 showed negative associations between uniform policies and standardized achievement scores. For tenth graders in schools adopting uniform policies, a 3-point decrease in standardized test scores was observed. In addition, Brunsmas and Rockquemore reported no direct effect of uniform policies on attendance rates (Brunsmas & Rockquemore 1998). Another national study also failed to demonstrate that a uniform policy increases academic achievement. Using two nationally representative data sets, the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study, Kindergarten Class (ECLS-K) and the NELS:88, Yeung (2009) measured students' achievement using multiple subjects and examined the association between school uniforms and achievement among second and tenth graders. In his study, no significant association between uniform policy and achievement was found, after controlling for previous achievement level (Yeung 2009).

While no significant effect of uniform policies on attendance rates was reported in two middle schools in Texas during the 1995-1996 school year (Hughes 2006), positive effects of uniform policies on student achievement and attendance rate were observed in Louisiana (Stockton & Gullatt 2002). There was a positive effect on student achievement at the middle and secondary schools, but only the secondary schools reported improvement in attendance rates (Stockton & Gullatt 2002).

Another strong claim from uniform proponents is that uniforms create a sound learning climate, yet there is very weak

evidence as well as inconsistent research findings.

Murray (1997) conducted a survey of 306 students in two middle schools to determine the effects of uniform policies on school climate. School climate was measured with 10 subitems, such as the students' academic orientations, students' behavioral values, and relationships with teachers and peers. Comparing the means of the responses, Murray found higher means for the school climate items (9 out of 10 subitems) in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools. Although Murray indicated differences in students' perceptions of school climate between uniform schools and non-uniform schools, no statistical tests were performed in the study. Huss (2007), conducting an interview of six elementary school teachers in Ohio, found a positive effect of uniform policies on school climate. Interview results indicated that uniform policies promote respect, trust, and a caring environment by decreasing clothing-related discrimination toward students in poverty. In addition, the teachers perceived that school order, discipline, and students' academic motivation, such as doing homework and participating in class, improved (Huss 2007).

Even though some previous studies have demonstrated the benefits of having uniform policies, others showed no such findings. Wade and Stafford (2003) performed a multivariate analysis of variance using data from 415 students and 83 teachers in urban middle schools and there was no significant difference in students' self-perceptions between uniform schools and non-uniform schools. Moreover, students with uniforms had lower scores in the self-worth test than those without uniforms. Additionally, students' and teachers' responses to perceived school climate (e.g., teacher-student relationships, student-peer relationships, and security and maintenance) were not statistically different with uniform policies in place (Wade & Stafford 2003).

controlling for school characteristics and school violence?

### **Current Study**

Using a nationally representative sample, the current study investigated relationships between uniform policies and school outcomes. One possible reason for the inconsistent results of the previous studies is that the adequate control variables were not considered. Failing to do so may have caused an overestimation of the effects of uniform policies. The current study controlled for necessary confounding factors such as school size, percentage of disadvantaged students (e.g., ethnic minority, limited English proficient [LEP] students, and special education students), parental involvement, and crime level in the school area and students' residence. The results may increase accuracy in determining whether or not a uniform policy influences in the achievements, aspirations, and learning values. The present study used data from only public elementary schools, because the school sector and the school level may influence the effects of uniform policies on student outcomes (Brunsma & Rockquemore 1998). Finally, many previous studies assessed perceptions of student problem behaviors (Huss 2007; Johnson 2010; Sanchez et al., 2012; Wade & Stafford 2003) and showed contradictory findings across stakeholders. To improve the method of measurement of violence, the present study used both the principals' perceived violence, the number of students who committed offenses based on official school records, and number of violent incidents measured by disciplinary actions.

Specific research questions of the study are as follows. First, are the principals' perceptions of school violence in uniform schools significantly different from that of non-uniform schools? Second, are actual violent incidents in uniform schools significantly different than those in non-uniform schools? And third, how are uniform policies associated with school outcomes, after

### **Method**

#### **Data**

The School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) is one of the most comprehensive data sets that contains information about school crime and safety, including crime prevention programs, school security practices, and student problem behaviors with disciplinary actions. The SSOCS program was established by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to meet the need in ensuring safe, high-quality education in the wake of multiple school shootings in 1999. On behalf of the U.S. Department of Education, the NCES developed the 2007-2008 SSOCS and the U.S. Census Bureau conducted the survey. During February 25 and June 17 in 2008, a total 3,367 of questionnaire packets were sent to public elementary, middle, high, and combined schools. A total of 2,560 usable questionnaires were collected and 77.2% was obtained as a weighted response rate (Ruddy, Neiman, Hryczaniuk, Thomas, & Parmer 2010). As a nationally representative data set, SSOCS has been collected every 2 years since the 1999-2000 school year and the SSOCS 2007-2008 data, which was used in the current study, is the latest that has been released to the public. In the present study, 387 elementary schools in urban areas were selected from the SSOCS 2007-2008 data set.

#### **Variables**

Uniform policies were measured whether or not schools required uniforms and used it as a dichotomous variable (yes = 1, no = 0). In addition, uniform polices and uniform schools both mean schools that require students to wear uniforms in the study. School violence for the multiple regression models was measured by using the total number of students who committed offenses based on schools' official records. Achievement,

aspiration, and learning value were measured based on principals' report. Achievement was measured as the percentage of students who scored above the 15th percentile on standardized tests. Aspiration was measured by the percentage of students who were likely to go to college after graduating high school. Learning value was assessed by the percentage of students who perceived the importance of academic achievement.

Principals' perceived school violence was measured by eight forms of school violence including student racial/ethnic tensions, bullying, sexual harassment, disorder in classrooms, verbal abuse of teachers, disrespect towards teachers, gang activities, and cult or extremist group activities. Principals responded to each item as 1 = happens daily, 2 = happens at least once a week, 3 = happens at least once a month, 4 = happens on occasion, and 5 = never happens. This variable was reverse-coded for the analysis.

Actual violent incidents for the second research question were assessed as number of disciplinary actions for each firearms, weapons, drugs, alcohol, physical attacks or fights, insubordination, gang-related hate crimes and classroom disruption.

Parental involvement in school events was measured using four items (e.g., open house and parent-teacher conferences) and obtained the following responses: 1 = 0% to 25%, 2 = 26% to 50%, 3 = 51% to 75%, 4 = 76% to 100%, and 5 = school does not offer. For the analyses, response 5 (school does not offer) was excluded and the sum was computed as a composite of parental involvement in school events (Cronbach's  $\alpha = .76$ ). Parental involvement in discipline was assessed using three items (i.e., formal process of parental input on crime and discipline policies, training for dealing with student problem behavior, and involvement in discipline) and the alpha coefficient for the three items was .52.

School size was assessed as a categorical variable indicating 1 = less than 300, 2 = 300 to 499, 3 = 500 to 999, and 4 = greater than 1,000. Minority students were defined as Black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaska Native, and they were assessed as a percentage of the categorical variable (1 = less than 5%, 2 = 5% to less than 20%, 3 = 20% to less than 50%, and 4 = 50% or more). Special education students were measured as a percentage and were categorized as students who have disabilities or other needs for special education and related services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The LEP students were measured as a percentage based on principals' reports. High-crime in school location was assessed as 1 = high level of crime, 2 = moderate level of crime, and 3 = low level of crime. It was created as a dummy variable indicating a high level of crime. High-crime in student residence was assessed as 1 = high level of crime, 2 = moderate level of crime, 3 = low level of crime, and 4 = students come from areas with very different levels of crime. For the analysis, excluding item 4 (students come from areas with very different levels of crime), a dummy variable indicating a high level of crime was created.

### **Data Analyses**

The independent samples t-test was performed to answer the first research question (Are the principals' perceptions of school violence in uniform schools significantly different from that of non-uniform schools?) and the second research question (Are actual violent incidents in uniform schools significantly different than those in non-uniform schools?). The third research question (How are uniform policies associated with school outcomes (e.g., academic achievement, aspiration, and learning value, after controlling for school characteristics and school violence?) was answered by using multivariate regression

analyses. In the multivariate regression analyses, 10 control variables were included: parental involvement in school events, parental involvement in discipline, school size, minority student, special education students, LEP students, perceived school violence, school violence, high-crime in school location, and high-crime in students' residence. School violence in the multiple regression model showed a positively skewed distribution, so this variable was transformed using log 10 for the multivariate regression analyses. To detect multicollinearity, the average Variation Inflation Factor (VIF) of regression models was examined. The results showed that the VIF of each variable ranged from 1.03 to 3.10, and the average VIF was 1.70. Multicollinearity is considered when values of VIF are greater than 10 (Field 2009), thus it was concluded that none of the variables in the multiple regression models were highly correlated with others. All analyses were performed with SPSS 17.0, and the weighted data (FINALWGT variable) that were provided by the SSOCS data set were used.

## Results

### Principals' Perceived School Violence between Uniform and Non-Uniform Schools

Table 1 (See Appendix) displays the results of independent samples t-test indicating whether a principal's perceived school violence differs between uniform schools and non-uniform schools. The findings show that uniform schools have more frequent violent incidents than non-uniform schools. Four out of eight forms of school violence (e.g., verbal abuse of teacher, disrespect to teacher, classroom disorder and gang activities) occur more frequently in uniform school than non-uniform schools. Students' verbal abuse of teachers in uniform schools ( $M = 1.04$ ,  $SD = .99$ ) is more frequent than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .61$ ,  $SD = .68$ ). The results of this test indicate that there is a statistically significant difference in students' verbal abuse of teachers between the schools with/without a uniform policy,  $t(385) = 4.91$ ,  $p = .000$ . The

size of the effect as indexed by Cohen's coefficient  $d = .51$ , which is medium. Students' disrespectfulness towards teachers is more frequent in uniform schools ( $M = 1.28$ ,  $SD = 1.14$ ) than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .86$ ,  $SD = .82$ ) with  $t(385) = 3.74$ ,  $p = .000$ . The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is .39, which is small. Classroom disorder is more frequent in uniform schools ( $M = .68$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ) than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .31$ ,  $SD = .62$ ) with  $t(385) = 4.36$ ,  $p = .000$ . The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is .44. Gang activity is more frequent in uniform schools ( $M = .28$ ,  $SD = .58$ ) than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .13$ ,  $SD = .37$ ) with  $t(385) = 2.46$ ,  $p = .014$ . The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is .23.

### Actual Violent Incidents between Uniform and Non-Uniform Schools

Table 2 (See Appendix) shows how the mean number of violent incidents is different between uniform schools and non-uniform schools. All eight forms of incidents occur more frequently in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools. Specifically, uniform schools have a statistically significantly more drug-related incidents than non-uniform schools ( $M = .09$  vs.  $.01$ ;  $t = -2.84$ ,  $p = .005$ ). The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is  $-.30$ . Uniform schools have more incidents involving physical attacks or fights than non-uniform schools ( $M = 14.03$  vs.  $8.98$ ;  $t = -2.02$ ,  $p = .044$ ). The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is  $-.21$ . Students' insubordination incidents occur more frequently in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools ( $M = 29.52$  vs.  $13.43$ ;  $t = -2.12$ ,  $p = .034$ ). The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is  $-.22$ . Gang-related incidents and hate crimes occur more frequently in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .69$  vs.  $.09$ ;  $t = -2.90$ ,  $p = .004$ ). The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is  $-.30$ . The disruption incidents occur more often in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools ( $M = .70$  vs.  $.42$ ;  $t = -2.63$ ,  $p = .009$ ). The effect size of Cohen's  $d$  is  $-.27$ .

### Effect of Uniform Policies on School Outcomes

Table 3 (See Appendix) presents relationships between uniform policies and school outcomes including academic achievement, aspiration and learning value. After controlling for school characteristics and school violence, uniform policies may improve the mean achievement score measured by standardized tests ( $p < .001$ ) and positively influence students' learning value ( $p < .001$ ), but they may negatively influence students' aspiration. The results of multivariate regression model indicate that the proportions of variation in school outcomes explained by all school variables is .30 for achievement ( $p < .001$ ), .34 for aspiration ( $p < .001$ ) and .27 for learning value ( $p < .001$ ). According to the model, the percentage of students who are above 15 percentile on standardized tests is predicted as 90.68% for non-uniform schools and 95.28% for uniform schools, respectively. The percentage of students who are likely to go to college after high school is predicted as 38.18% for non-uniform schools and 35.98% for uniform schools. The percentage of students who value academic achievement is predicted as 49.35% for non-uniform schools and 52.48% for uniform schools.

Additionally, principals' perceptions of school violence, actual school violence measured by number of students who committed in offenses and high-crime in school area show negative relationships with achievement, aspiration, and learning value ( $p < .001$ ).

### **Discussion**

This study explored whether or not uniform policies have positive influences on school safety and school outcomes. Analyzed data of 387 urban elementary schools from SSOCS 2007-2008 had results from the current study as follows.

First, the results of the study do not support that uniform policies contribute to creating a safer school. School principals in uniform schools perceived that classroom

disorder and school violence (e.g., verbal abuse of teacher, disrespect to teacher, classroom disorder and gang activities) occurred more frequently than their counterparts in non-uniform schools. Interestingly, principals in uniform schools perceived more violent incidents between students and teachers rather than between students. There could be potential conflicts between students and school staff in uniform schools, because students seem to view uniform policies as restricting their freedom of expression and may not believe in the benefits of the policies (DaCosta, 2006). It is recommended that principals reconsider when they adopt uniform policies as an alternative means of promoting an orderly learning environment. At the same time, the current findings based on the cross-sectional study were not able to determine a cause and effect among the variables, thus future studies should further examine whether having a uniform policy causes conflicts between students and school staff, and if such conflicts lead a school or school district to adopt a uniform policy. Regarding school violence measured by official school records also showed that drug-related incidents, physical fights and attacks, insubordination, gang-related incidents and other disruptions occurred more frequently in uniform schools than in non-uniform schools. Urban elementary school principals should be aware that adopting uniform policies might not be the answer in increasing school safety.

Second, the results of the study support the idea that uniform policies positively influence academic achievement and learning value among urban elementary school students. This is an inconsistent result from previous studies. Brunsmma and Rockquemore (1998) found that uniform policies decrease achievement in 10<sup>th</sup> graders and Yeung (2009) found no significant relationships between uniform policies and achievement in 2<sup>nd</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> graders. Such mixed results could be caused by the use of different analysis strategies, different control variables, and students' grades and school locations. Based on the findings of the present

study, urban elementary schools may have benefits from adopting uniform policies with an increase in achievement and improved learning value among students.

Third, the results of the study do not support that adopting uniform policies tends to positively influence students' aspiration. It is understandable that students prefer not to wear uniforms and tend to be against uniform policies, especially when schools start mandating uniforms without the students' input on the policy (DaCosta, 2006). Such a circumstance may develop negative school experiences and negatively affect students' intrinsic motivation for further schooling. Principals in urban elementary schools should be aware that uniform policies may discourage students' future learning motivation.

In conclusion, the study provides little evidence of the effects of school uniforms on creating a safer school and promoting aspiration among urban elementary school students, yet shows that school uniforms may increase academic achievement and students' learning value.

### Study Limitations

Although this study highlights the value of using a nationally representative sample with multiple control variables to explore the benefits of school uniform policies, several cautionary notes should be applied to the findings. The SSOCS data used in the study were based on responses at one point in time in 2008 and therefore constitutes a cross-sectional data set. The relationships among the variables cannot be determined as a cause and effect. This study relied on school principals' reports, and lacks the insights of other stakeholders (e.g., teachers, parents, and students). Finally, the public-use of SSOCS data does not provide information on lunch status. This study included parental involvement and information on crime level in the school area and student's residence instead, yet those variables may not fully measure the socioeconomic status.

### References

- Anderson, W. (2002). School dress codes and uniform policies. *Policy Report: Reporting on Policy Issues in K-12 Educational Management*. Retrieved from [https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/mlui/bitstream/handle/1794/3464/dress\\_code.pdf?sequence=1](https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/mlui/bitstream/handle/1794/3464/dress_code.pdf?sequence=1)
- Brunsmas, D., & Rockquemore, K. A. (1998). Effects of student uniforms on attendance, behavior problems, substance use, and academic achievement. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 92(1), 53–62
- Draa, V. A. B. (2005). *School uniforms in urban public high schools*. (Unpublished doctoral Dissertation), Youngstown State University, Ohio. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED497409.pdf>.
- DaCosta, K. (2006). Dress code blues: An exploration of urban students' reactions to a public high school uniform policy. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 75(1), 49-59.
- Evans, D. L. (1996). School uniforms: An 'unfashionable' dissent. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78 (2). Retrieved from ERIC database. (EJ532355)
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Gentile, E., & Imberman, S. A. (2012). Dressed for success? The effect of school uniforms on student achievement and behavior. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 7(1), 1-17.

- Han, S. (2010). "A mandatory uniform policy in urban schools: Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety 2003-04." *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, 5 (8), 1-13.
- Hughes, E. (2006). Effects of mandated school uniforms on student attendance, discipline referrals and classroom environment. In D. L. Brunsmma (Ed.). *Uniforms in public schools: A decade of research and debate* (pp.51-77). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Huss, J. A. (2007). The role of school uniforms in creating an academically motivating climate: Do uniforms influence teacher expectation? *Journal of Ethnographic and Qualitative Research*, 1, 31-39.
- Johnson, W. S. (2010). *Analyses of the impact of school uniforms on violence in North Carolina public high schools*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). East Carolina University, North Carolina.
- Johnston, H. (2009). Student dress codes and uniforms. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED537953)
- Murray, R. K. (1997). The impact of school uniforms on school climate. *National Association of Secondary School Principals(NASSP) Bulletin*, 81(593), 106-112.
- Polacheck, K. (1996). Uniforms help solve many school problem. Long Beach Press-Telegram. Retrieved from [http://www.lbusd.k12.ca.us/uniforms/article\\_9.cfm](http://www.lbusd.k12.ca.us/uniforms/article_9.cfm).
- Robers, S., Zhang, J., & Truman, J. (2012). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2011* (NCES 2012-002/NCJ 236021). National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2012/201202rev.pdf>.
- Ruddy, S. A., Neiman, S., Hryczaniuk, C. A., Thomas, T. L., & Parmer, R. J. (2010). 2007–08 *School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) Survey Documentation for Public-Use Data File Users* (NCES 2010-307). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010307.pdf>.
- Sanchez, J. E., Yoxsimer, A., & Hill, G. C. (2012). Uniforms in the middle School: Student opinions, discipline data, and school police data. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(4), 345-356.
- Stockton, C., & Gullatt, D. E. (2002). School uniforms: Policies and procedures. *Research in Middle Level Education*, 25(1) 1-13.
- Wade, K. K., & Stafford, M. E. (2003). Public school uniforms: Effect on perceptions of gang presence, school climate, and student self-

- perceptions. *Education and Urban Society*, 35(4), 399–420.
- Wilken, I. (2012). School uniforms: Tradition, benefit or predicament? *Education as Change*, 16(1), 159-184.
- Yeung, R. (2009). Are school uniforms a good fit? : Results from the ECLS-K and the NELS. *Education Policy*, 23(6), 847-874.
- Zernike, K. (2002). Plaidke, K. (2002). As schools give up requiring uniforms. *The New York Times*, September 13, 2002. Retrieved from <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9A0DE3DE1131F930A2575AC0A9649C8B63>.

**Seunghee Han** received her doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia. Her research focuses on school safety, student problem behavior, discipline policies, corporal punishment, and international comparative studies. **Dr. Han** can be reached at shhanedu2013@hotmail.com

**Appendix**

Table1

*Principals' Perceived School Violence in Uniform Schools and Non-Uniform Schools*

		N	M	S.D.	95% CI for Mean Difference	t
Racial/ethnic tensions	Non-uniform schools	113	.65	.71	-.10, .22	.70
	Uniform schools	274	.71	.81		
Bullying	Non-uniform schools	113	1.65	.96	-.05, .39	1.52
	Uniform schools	274	1.82	1.07		
Sexual harassment	Non-uniform schools	113	.61	.62	-.06, .22	1.08
	Uniform schools	274	.69	.68		
Verbal abuse of teacher	Non-uniform schools	113	.61	.68	.26, .60	4.91***
	Uniform schools	274	1.04	.99		
Disorder in classroom	Non-uniform schools	113	.31	.62	.20, .54	4.36***
	Uniform schools	274	.68	1.02		
Disrespect for teacher	Non-uniform schools	113	.86	.82	.18, .59	3.73*
	Uniform schools	274	1.25	1.14		
Gang activities	Non-uniform schools	113	.13	.37	.02, .22	2.46*
	Uniform schools	274	.25	.58		
Cult or extreme group activities	Non-uniform schools	113	.01	.12	-.04, .01	-1.29
	Uniform schools	274	.00	.00		

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Note.  $df = 385$

Table 2

*School Violence in Uniform Schools and Non-Uniform Schools*

School violence	Uniform policy	N	Mean	S.D.	95% CI for Mean Difference	t
Firearm or explosive device	Non-uniform schools	274	.22	2.73	-.59, .52	-.13
	Uniform schools	113	.26	1.96		
A weapon other than a firearm or explosive device	Non-uniform schools	274	.35	1.13	-.49, .10	-1.29
	Uniform schools	113	.54	1.75		
Drugs	Non-uniform schools	274	.01	.09	-.14, -.03	-2.84***
	Uniform schools	113	.09	.45		
Alcohol	Non-uniform schools	274	.05	.38	-.08, .08	-.05
	Uniform schools	113	.05	.32		
Physical attacks or fights	Non-uniform schools	274	8.98	20.29	-9.96, -.13	-2.02**
	Uniform schools	113	14.03	26.68		
Insubordination	Non-uniform schools	274	13.43	64.60	-30.98, -1.19	-2.12**
	Uniform schools	113	29.52	74.95		
Gang-related and hate crimes	Non-uniform schools	274	.09	.50	-1.00, -.19	-2.90***
	Uniform schools	113	.69	3.32		
Disruptions	Non-uniform schools	274	.42	.90	-.49, -.07	-2.63*
	Uniform schools	113	.70	1.10		

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ Note.  $df = 385$

Table 3

*Relationships Between Uniform Policies and Educational Outcomes*

	Achievement	Aspiration	Learning value
	B (SE)	B (SE)	B (SE)
Uniform policies	4.60*** (.29)	-2.22*** (.44)	3.13*** (.41)
PI in school event	2.35*** (.20)	13.35*** (.30)	11.24*** (.28)
PI in discipline	-0.24* (.11)	1.71*** (.17)	1.47*** (.15)
LEP students	-0.08** (.01)	-0.23*** (.01)	-0.10*** (.01)
Special education Student	0.08*** (.01)	-0.34*** (.01)	0.06*** (.01)
Minority students	-1.77*** (.17)	-3.44*** (.26)	-0.70** (.24)
School size	1.90*** (.14)	1.45*** (.21)	0.56** (.20)
Perceived school violence	-4.58*** (.26)	-6.49*** (.39)	-5.10*** (.37)
School violence	-5.41*** (.20)	-1.62*** (.30)	-4.72*** (.28)
High-crime in school location	-10.81*** (.52)	-3.60*** (.79)	-13.05*** (.73)
High-crime in student residence	-4.54*** (.49)	-.73 (.75)	1.43* (.69)
N	387	387	387
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.30	.34	.27

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$

*Note.* PI refers to parental involvement; LEP refers to limited English proficient students