

UNITED STATES BUREAU OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN, 1915, NO. 8

WHOLE NUMBER 632

PRESENT STATUS OF THE HONOR
SYSTEM IN COLLEGES AND
UNIVERSITIES

By BIRD T. BALDWIN

PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION
SWARTHMORE COLLEGE

Assisted by

HENRY L. MESSNER and GRACE W. GREENE



WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1915

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.

AT

5 CENTS A COPY

2

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Foreword.....	5
History.....	7
The investigation.....	8
Methods of electing or appointing student councils.....	11
Final jurisdiction and penalties.....	11
Faculty supervision.....	11
Violations.....	11
General aim and purposes of the honor system.....	12
Institutions using an honor system in all departments.....	13
Institutions just adopting an honor system.....	14
Institutions planning to adopt the honor system.....	15
Institutions having an honor system in vogue in spirit, but not in organization.....	15
Institutions favoring the honor system, but which do not have it.....	17
Institutions in which the sentiment is not sufficiently mature.....	17
Institutions in which peculiar conditions militate against adopting the honor system.....	18
Institutions that have not felt the need of the honor system.....	19
Institutions that frankly oppose the honor system.....	20
Institutions in which the honor system has failed.....	21
Institutions which reply negatively, without comment.....	22
Conclusions.....	22
Tabular summary as to the use of the honor system.....	24
Appendix.....	27
A. Type constitutions.....	27
Princeton University.....	27
Cornell University.....	28
B. Type pledges.....	30
C. Membership of type administration councils.....	30

FOREWORD.

The aim of this bulletin is to set forth the present status of a phase of college and university administration that enlists the cooperation of students for the maintenance of fair play and honesty in the preparation and performance of classroom activities. A personal letter, with 11 questions appended, was submitted early in 1913 to 475 American colleges and universities; 425 of these institutions responded with detailed answers and with such available literature as was at hand.¹

The term "honor system" is used to connote the formal recognition and adoption by students and faculty of a system of mutual responsibility among students for honest scholastic work. In several institutions student government is included under the general term "honor system"; in other institutions, especially the larger universities, the honor system is independent of any form of student government; in others, particularly the smaller colleges, it is the natural outgrowth of the participation of students in the direction and control of their various collegiate activities.

¹ All replies have been carefully indexed and placed in the archives of the Swarthmore College Library, where they are accessible for verification or for future study.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE HONOR SYSTEM IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

HISTORY.

There is considerable disagreement among the claimants for the credit of having initiated the first well-defined honor system in an educational institution of higher learning in this country. The University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., has almost universally been credited with being the originator. An excerpt from the faculty minutes of May 4, 1842, is as follows:

On motion of Judge Tucker,

Resolved, That in all future examinations for distinction and other honors of the university each candidate shall attach to the written answers presented by him on such examination a certificate in the following words: "I, A. B., do hereby certify on honor that I have derived no assistance during the time of this examination whether oral, written, or in print, in giving the above answers."

This excerpt is undoubtedly authentic and definitely fixes the date for the formal adoption of the organized system as far as the University of Virginia is concerned.

Claims have also been put forward for the University of South Carolina, or South Carolina College, as it was formerly called. Dr. Flinn, chaplain of the institution, stated that there had been an informal honor system in vogue from the beginning of South Carolina College. He based his assertion primarily, according to Prof. W. Le Conte, of Washington and Lee University, "on a by-law formulated by the trustees of the college," previous to 1805, which reads:

The sense of decency, propriety, and right, which every honorable young man carries in his bosom, shall be taken as a sufficient means of knowing these things, and he who pleads ignorance in such matters is unfit to be a member of the college.

This is not definite, nor is it indicative of an organized system of control. The authorities do not claim that the honor system was ever formally adopted at South Carolina College. They state:

The system is here traditional from the beginning. It means simply that here professors and students are gentlemen in all their relations. The system has been in vogue ever since the college was founded in 1801.

This, however, is not the institution that now claims the credit for initiating the honor system. President Lyon G. Tyler claims that it started with the College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.,

in 1779. Speaking of the University of Virginia he writes in a personal letter:

I think the evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that the honor system had its origin in its application to examinations at William and Mary. It seems to me absurd to say that the University of Virginia deserves the credit of its organization when it had been recognized here long before the university existed. It was introduced at the university by William and Mary graduates, of whom the first board of visitors of the university was almost entirely composed. It was not formally recognized at the university until 1842, when Henry St. George Tucker offered a resolution in regard to its application to examinations, but Tucker himself was a student and graduate of this college, and got his ideas from this institution.

In another letter President Tyler says:

It must be remembered that Mr. Jefferson and the large majority of the board of visitors of the University of Virginia were William and Mary alumni, and, therefore, were familiar with the system at William and Mary. Henry St. George Tucker was a brother of Judge Nathaniel Beverly Tucker, and both were educated at the college, and their father, Judge St. George Tucker, was a professor of law until 1804, when he resigned.

He also adds:

I know that the University of Virginia claims the system's beginning, but while she was a noble practitioner, she was not the beginner. Long before the university was established, it was practiced here and at other southern colleges.

So far as our data show, South Carolina College and William and Mary are the only institutions which practiced the honor system in or prior to 1842. While the appeal to the honor of the student may have been and no doubt was made in these and other colleges in this country, the University of Virginia was the first to inaugurate a definite system of control, legislation, and form of penalties. The honor system was apparently long in vogue in spirit before 1842, but at this time it was formally inaugurated at the University of Virginia. There are at present 123 institutions in which it is in actual practice. Of these, 45, or 37 per cent, are situated east of the Mississippi and south of Mason and Dixon's line; 5, or 4 per cent, are in New England; 35, or 28 per cent, are for men only; 8, or 6.5 per cent, are for women; and 80, or 65.5 per cent, are coeducational. Of these institutions, 101 have the honor system in all departments, 22 have it in some departments only. In addition to the 123 institutions included, 44 others claim to have the system in spirit but not in form, and 31 are considering its adoption in the near future.

THE INVESTIGATION.

METHOD AND DATA.

In order to get first-hand information on the practice of the honor system in one form or another in our American institutions of higher learning, the following letter with the appended 11 questions was sent to the presidents:

MY DEAR PRESIDENT: In cooperation with the Department of Education,¹ I am making a comprehensive study of the *present status of the honor system in all the colleges and universities of this country*. A report of this study, which is to be completed before June, will be published, and a copy will be sent to each institution furnishing data.

If the honor system exists in your institution, will you kindly express your opinion as to its efficiency and its desirability and also what you think of its future.

Any available literature that you may have on the subject will be of great help.

As far as possible, will you please answer briefly the following questions?

Thanking you for any aid that you may be able to give us, I am,

Very sincerely, yours,

1. Does the honor system exist for all or for a few departments in your institution?
2. Did the initiative for its adoption come from the faculty or from the students?
3. How long has the system been in vogue? Is it nominal or real? Growing in favor or not?
4. Does there exist, as a basis for its operation, a strong sentiment in its favor?
5. Does the operation of the system involve the signing of a pledge neither to give nor to receive aid? Does the pledge involve the obligation to report any infraction of the rules, especially as to examinations and reports?
6. Besides the work in examinations and reports, does the system cover any other activity in college life, such as student conduct or athletics?
7. What committee or council acts on cases arising? Is this composed of students, members of the faculty, or of both?
8. Are the members of the committees elected directly, or is the committee membership made up of certain class officers, captains of athletic teams, etc.?
9. Has the student committee final jurisdiction, or does the appeal from action of this committee and veto lie in a faculty committee or the college president?
10. To what extent do the members of the faculty have confidence in the honor of the students to live up to the system? Is the instructor present during examination?
11. How often have cases of violation of the rules or spirit of the system occurred?

In addition to the answers to these questions a large number of personal letters were received with printed matter, including constitutions, by-laws, pledges, reports, etc. As this appears to be the first exhaustive inductive study in this field, the contents of the bulletin will deal exclusively with the data at hand.

SCOPE.

Departments included.—It has been noted on page 24 that 123 institutions now practice the honor system in all or a few departments. In the Universities of Virginia, Texas, and California; in Princeton University; and in other institutions the honor system is in vogue in all departments and in all schools. In Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., it exists in the colleges of civil engineering, agriculture, and law; in George Washington University, Washington, D. C., and Leland Stanford Junior University, California, in the department of law; in the Universities of Cincinnati, Ohio, and Louisville, Ky., and in Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa., in the college of liberal arts;

¹I. e., of Swarthmore College.

in Syracuse University, New York, in teachers' college; in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., in the departments of medicine and surgery; in the University of Pennsylvania, in the Wharton school and the school of architecture; in Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., in the college and schools of mines, engineering, and chemistry; in Park College, Parkville, Mo., it is limited to juniors, and in several other colleges to seniors. In a number of institutions it is in vogue in a few or several departments, and is sometimes left to the discretion of the professors. In the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., a few organizations agreed to try it out for their own members, and at the University of Rochester, New York, the men are under the honor system, but the women are not.

Activities included.—In Princeton the honor system is limited to examinations, but extends to all departments and is entirely under student jurisdiction. In Barnard College, New York City, it applies to examinations, quizzes, and all written reports; in Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., to written tests and reserve books in the library; in Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., to all written exercises; in the University of South Carolina, to conduct; in Denison University, Granville, Ohio, to interlinears and "ponies;" in Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., to daily preparation of recitations; in William and Mary College, Virginia, to moral conduct; in Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C., to failure to pay debts, to hazing, and sub rosa fraternities; in Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa., to all rules made by student government association. In the University of Mississippi, "lying, stealing, gambling, drunkenness, or drinking in public places are dealt with by the council and punished by demerit, suspension, or dismissal."

Relation to student government.—Student government is a term used to indicate that the habits, privileges, and conduct of the students in all activities outside the classroom are regulated and controlled through an executive council elected by the student body; in other words, the administration of the college, as far as student activities are concerned, is in the hands of the students.

In adopting the honor system, students go a step further than mere student activities and make themselves responsible for classroom conduct, formerly entirely under the jurisdiction of the faculty. It is for this reason that, although the honor system is in reality a subdivision of student government, it is ordinarily dignified by a separate constitution and frequently by a separate council or executive committee.

Usually the honor system is an indication of a highly developed form of student government, but in some cases it exists without a student government; in such an event it is usually inaugurated by the faculty under careful supervision.

METHODS OF ELECTING OR APPOINTING STUDENT COUNCILS.

The administrative council is commonly assembled in three ways; by election, by appointments made by the president of the college or the president of the student body; and by automatic choice—that is, a student becomes a member of the honor council because he is a member of some other organization. Of the colleges having the system, 116 replied to this question. In 63 cases the council is elected, in 18 cases it is appointed, and in 14 chosen. Of the remaining institutions, 12 report that part are elected and part chosen automatically; 5 that part are elected and part appointed; and 4 that part are appointed and part automatically chosen.

FINAL JURISDICTION AND PENALTIES.

Of the 116 colleges reporting on final jurisdiction in cases of violation of the honor system, 81 report that final power lies in the faculty, 12 that it lies in the president, and 1 that it lies in the president and faculty. In all but 22 cases, then, the last decision is taken out of the hands of the student council, although, as a rule, the recommendation of the council is taken by the higher authorities. In these 22 cases, however, a student violating the honor system may be punished, suspended, or expelled from college without other authority than that of the student council.

FACULTY SUPERVISION.

Sixty-four colleges and universities report that the instructor may be present or absent from the room, as he may choose. This gives the instructor an opportunity to answer questions and make the examination quite clear. At 29 institutions the instructor is absolutely excluded from the room, while at 21 institutions he must be present throughout the examination. It is noticeable that this is the case where the faculty are largely in control of the system.

VIOLATIONS.

It is impossible to estimate the number of violations that have happened in each college since the adoption of the honor system. In most cases it is impossible to estimate even the average number of cases that come up per year, since no adequate records have been kept. (The majority of colleges report that violations are "seldom" or "rare," and others that they occur two or three times a year. Only two large institutions have reported any considerable number of cases, the larger being on an average of 10 per year.)

GENERAL AIM AND PURPOSES OF THE HONOR SYSTEM.

The function and scope of the honor system are clearly set forth in the letters given below. The reply from Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., aside from its statement of the general plan, is a forceful argument in favor of the efficiency of the system.

Dean Elliott writes:

(As a student under the system during the 4 years of my college course, as a member of the faculty for 12 years, and as dean of the college for 3 years, I have been brought into close touch with the system and believe in it with all my heart, and am sure that here it is a great success.)

In a subsequent letter from Princeton, Editor Gilbert F. Close states:

You will see from the [following] description that the honor system at Princeton has been remarkably successful ever since its organization and has the cordial support and entire confidence of the faculty, as of the student body. The honor system at Princeton is one of our institutions of which we are exceptionally proud.

The system arose at Princeton in the only way in which it can with real vitality come into existence, namely, upon the initiative of the undergraduates themselves. It was first put into practice amongst us in the year 1894, and, being backed by a very sincere and solid body of opinion among the leading undergraduates, it was an unqualified success from the first. We have every reason to believe that it has secured absolute honesty in examination.

The establishment of the system has had many consequences. In the first place, the faculty has naturally followed the rule that in case anyone applying for admission to the university is found to have cheated in the entrance examinations, he must not only be refused admission to the university, but must understand that it will never be possible for him to enter. More than that, the effect of the system upon the general undergraduate morals has been very marked and very gratifying. It has brought about a frank and candid relation in respect of all matters of behavior and honor as between the undergraduates and the authorities of the university which has made all dealings between them satisfactory. I do not know anything in the history of the university which has had more extensive or more gratifying results or which has been less open to criticism in its operation.

Prof. Frank W. Nicolson, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., answered very fully. His answer to the question numbered 11 is:

I should say we have cases of violation of the rules on the average about once every three years. It seems to be the case that after a certain period has elapsed and a new generation of men have come to college, a certain laxity begins. Some one violates the honor system and is detected, when there is a general revival of interest in the system and more attention is paid to its provisions. Reporting by the students constitutes, of course, the crux of the situation, and unless they are willing to accept that obligation, the honor system will not succeed; nor will it succeed, I believe, if it is imposed upon the student body against their will or against the protest of any considerable minority. My judgment is, further, that it will succeed better in a small college than in a large college. As a graduate of Harvard I have expressed doubt to the authorities there, from time to time, whether such a system would succeed at Harvard. I have no hesitation in saying that it has succeeded splendidly at Wesleyan.

Prof. Farnham P. Griffiths, of the University of California, Berkeley, Cal., replies to question 5 as follows:

I take it that you mean by the "honor system" some method to insure honesty in examinations. Our student self-government is far larger and more comprehensive

in its scope. It means that the responsibility in matters of student discipline rests with the students themselves. Incidentally and as a portion of a larger program, the question of honesty in examinations is, of course, involved. Our students do not sign any pledge. They take it in a measure to be an insult to ask a man to say that he has received no help in examinations. As a matter of fact, however, a student observing dishonesty in a classroom would ordinarily report the case to the undergraduate student affairs committee, who would then take evidence, hear witnesses, and recommend a penalty varying from deprivation of credit in the course to suspension from the university. An instructor observing a case of dishonesty would similarly report the circumstance to the undergraduate committee.

The significance of the honor system is emphasized by Jesse H. Holmes, Ph. D., professor of philosophy in Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., in the following words:

There are only two systems possible in dealing with examinations. These are the "honor" system and the "dishonor" system. A student does not cheat to himself alone. A cheating student dishonors his whole class and lowers the tone of the college. He cheapens the degree of every student who graduates from the college. In my judgment, it is the duty of the students of this college to see to it that no dishonest paper ever goes into the hands of an instructor. This does not mean that the student must tell the instructor of the dishonest work, but it does mean that he is to make it impossible for the dishonest student to receive credit for stolen work or to remain permanently in the college.

In a statement, recently, Ex-President Taft said that he approved of the honor system proposed for Yale, provided that a punishment, is imposed for violations. He added:

In effect it is a request that the immediate responsibility for the student's fairness in the examinations be transferred from the faculty to the class. I have not the slightest objection to this, if the class as a whole takes the responsibility. This responsibility, however, should involve an obligation by the class as a whole to secure the fairness which ought to obtain.

If, therefore, the class will stipulate, as the class does in the scientific school under its honor system, that unfair conduct by any member of the class in the examination, known to the other members of the class, shall be made the subject of investigation and trial by a class tribunal, with a report of the facts and a recommendation of a penalty, if any is deemed necessary, to the dean for confirmation and action, I strongly approve the change proposed; otherwise I do not.

INSTITUTIONS USING AN HONOR SYSTEM IN ALL DEPARTMENTS.

Letters were received from practically all the institutions written to, in addition to the replies to the questionnaire. From these letters and replies the following selected excerpts are given. They produce strong evidence in favor of the honor system.

The dean of Beloit College, Beloit, Wis., remarks:

Though many feel that the honor system is not thoroughly adequate, yet I know of no one in the faculty who would go back to the old proctor system of supervising examinations.

Dean H. D. Campbell, of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., in a detailed explanatory letter, states that the honor system is

satisfactory and he does not see how they could get along without it. At Barnard College, New York City, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve finds it growing in favor; at Smith College, Northampton, Mass., President Marion L. Burton states that students feel it obligatory to report, but they do not wish final jurisdiction at this time. Ex-President Francis P. Venable, of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., maintains the sentiment in its favor is practically universal after 50 years of experience. The method amply justifies its existence at Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Va., according to President William A. Webb. President R. S. Hyer, of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Tex., regards it as the only agency that will prevent cheating in examinations. The State University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., has been greatly benefitted by the system according to President Henry S. Barker.

President Alexander C. Humphreys, of Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., emphasizes the view that the honor system is successful, but it will not work itself; the president and a majority of the faculty must believe in it; the students must give their unqualified adherence to the system; and there must be hearty cooperation between students and faculty. Practically the same point of view is brought out by President Joseph Swain, of Swarthmore College, who says that the students must have a clear-cut conviction that it is their duty to be honest themselves and insist on honesty in others, and that the offenders must be treated kindly but justly. As an evidence of the success of the honor system, Ex-Chancellor Andrew A. Kincannon, of the University of Mississippi, University, Miss., says: "All students of lawless tendencies oppose it vigorously." Prof. Edward S. Joynes, of the University of South Carolina, who has frequently contributed articles to *The Nation* in defense of the method of relying on student honor in class activities, writes that "the only true system for the education of a gentleman by gentlemen is the honor system—that is, the system of mutual respect and confidence."

President Harry A. Garfield, Williams College, writes:

I beg to say that I have observed the working of the honor system both here and at Princeton, and I believe in the system in principle and can testify to the efficiency with which it works in both places.

INSTITUTIONS JUST ADOPTING AN HONOR SYSTEM.

Among the large institutions that have recently initiated an honor system, the following are cited. Registrar F. S. Ball, of Johns Hopkins, Baltimore, Md., says:

The authorities have always taken the ground that the only effectual way of securing honesty in examinations is through appeal to the honor of the students. They are given to understand that we assume that they can be trusted.

Dean James R. Angell, January 12, 1914, wrote concerning the University of Chicago:

The university has not officially adopted this system. The students have voted on this matter and decided by a rather large majority to give the plan trial under a somewhat peculiar form suggested to fit our local conditions. What the university authorities will decide I can not say.

Among other institutions recently adopting the honor system may be noted the architectural and science departments of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., and the arts department at Columbia University, New York City.

INSTITUTIONS PLANNING TO ADOPT THE HONOR SYSTEM.

Among the prominent institutions that do not have the honor system (although most of them have some form of student council at present) are several which are planning to adopt it in the near future. This is true of De Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.; Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa; Hamline University, St. Paul, Minn.; Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.; State University of Nevada, Reno, Nev.; University of North Dakota, University, N. Dak.; University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.; University of Pittsburgh, Pa.; and the University of South Dakota, Vermilion.

As to the future policy of some other well-known institutions, the following excerpts indicate the trend of opinion:

Ex-President Ethelbert D. Warfield, of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., writes:

At the present time there is nothing in operation with regard to the honor system in this college. Several experiments in participation of students in carrying out the rules have been made, but they have gradually lapsed.

W. W. Smith, of the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., states:

We have not as yet established the honor system in the University of Oregon. The subject is at present being debated by the faculty, but to be of permanent help we realize that the initiative must come from the student body.

INSTITUTIONS HAVING AN HONOR SYSTEM IN VOGUE IN SPIRIT BUT NOT IN ORGANIZATION.

In addition to those institutions that have the honor system or are considering its adoption, others may be said to have it in spirit if not in form. The following will indicate the drift of opinion:

President Samuel Dickie, of Albion College, Albion, Mich., says:

Several years ago, upon my own suggestion, there was organized among the students a self-government association, membership in which was open to all the students. The entire student body acting by classes and departments select members of a small body known as the student senate.

In Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C., the student government association has general direction of the administration of the examinations. President Robert P. Pell says:

We have an excellent system of student government, and all cases, short of those demanding expulsion, are handled by the board of managers constituting the student government judicial body.

In Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., the class deans and fraternities have been enlisted to help solve the problem of examinations and written work.

President Thomas McClelland, of Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., writes that "for several years there has existed in Knox College a student council which has been found to be advantageous."

Among the larger institutions that have the system in spirit is Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. In a sense everything at Bryn Mawr is on the honor system; the students cooperate with the faculty just as the faculty cooperates with the students in self-government.

The secretary to the president at Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass., writes:

Mount Holyoke has never adopted the honor system. The instructors are present during examinations, and cases of cheating either in examinations or in reports have been very rare. The students are on their honor to report on the daily exercise requirement and also in the matter of registration for leaving town. The student government association has the oversight of chapel and church attendance. The students are placed upon their honor in the matter of reporting church attendance, but there are proctors who look after the chapel attendance.

Dean Holgate, of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., states that "full confidence exists between student and instructor, and examinations are conducted on that basis."

President Le Baron R. Briggs, of Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass., replies: "Not in vogue in the usual sense. Of course, in themes students are put on their honor."

President Carl Lee Mees, of Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute, Ind., reports:

Inasmuch as we have no straight honor system, it will be rather difficult to answer the categorical questions as you ask them. We try to combine the honor system with a reasonable amount of supervision, and though the results are not all we would wish, they are as satisfactory as any system so far used.

Dean J. G. Eldridge, of the University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, writes that the "honor system exists not at all formally, though individual teachers often leave the conduct of examinations to the students."

President John Cavanaugh, of the University of Notre Dame, Ind.:

No action of the university as a whole. Honor system is left to individual professors. Cheating in examination is among the causes for expulsion.

At the University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., President George F. Bovard replies:

The University of Southern California has no regular honor system. However, the students are placed quite largely upon their honor in their general conduct and in their work. We have student committees and faculty committees who give special attention to the general conduct of the students, but we have no system worthy of being designated an honor system.

The University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., reports that both faculty and students desire the honor system, but so far it has been tried only by a few departments.

INSTITUTIONS FAVORING THE HONOR SYSTEM, BUT WHICH DO NOT HAVE IT.

Among the institutions that do not have the honor system there are several whose replies state, directly or indirectly, that they believe it to be worth striving for, as opportunity permits. For example, Dean H. M. Raymond, of Armour Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill., states: "We are hoping that such a system may be established in the near future."

Chancellor Samuel Avery, of the University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr., after calling attention to an effort on the part of some student organizations to have a system binding upon their own members, concludes: "The faculty in this institution have always taken the attitude that the honor system would be welcomed whenever general student sentiment should make possible its enforcement."

President Palmer C. Ricketts, of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., comments: "We do not have the honor system here. I am sorry we do not have it, and hope some time to see it established."

President J. T. Kingsbury, of the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, says: "The honor system is a problem that we have not yet undertaken to solve. I believe that it would be a good thing to try."

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE SENTIMENT IS NOT SUFFICIENTLY MATURE.

Among those institutions that do not have the honor system, a small group do not find the "time ripe for its adoption and application." Dean Frank G. Wren, of Tufts College, Tufts College, Mass., writes:

As yet Tufts College has not adopted the honor system. It has seemed unwise to the faculty to consider the adoption of such a system until student sentiment is strongly in favor of it. As yet there is no evidence that such a sentiment exists.

President George E. Vincent, of the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., says:

The honor system has never been adopted in this university. There has been some agitation at various times for the introduction of this plan, but so far opinion has never crystallized in such a way as to justify the introduction of the policy.

President Ellen F. Pendleton, of Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., says:

The subject of an honor system has been discussed by our students somewhat, although not formally, and it has been occasionally suggested by our faculty, but no action has been taken by either body.

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH PECULIAR CONDITIONS MILITATE AGAINST ADOPTING THE HONOR SYSTEM.

There are a number of institutions where peculiar conditions either militate against the adoption of the honor system or take its place. For example, President G. Stanley Hall writes:

Clark University, Worcester, Mass., has only graduate students fitting for the higher degrees, and no examinations save personal oral ones. The professors test the students individually, then each candidate is brought before all the professors in the departments where he has studied. Therefore you see that your inquiry is not relative here.

President Edmund C. Sanford, Clark College, Worcester, Mass., writes:

The chief arguments against the undertaking of the system here were, first, that we had a genuine honor system already in operation, though an informal and unorganized one; second, that the requirement of any pledge at the end of examination papers and the like was something of an insult to honest men—like asking a reputable man to hang up a sign in his store that he does not use short weights; and, third, that it is no honorable student conduct to bring the cheating of a fellow student to the notice of the authorities either in the student body or in the faculty.

It is my idea that a good deal of what might be called cheating—for example, the transcription of notebooks when these must be submitted to the instructor, or the obtaining of translations by weaker students from the abler in the daily work—are matters which are determined in a large measure by student custom, and never raise the question of conscience with many students of honest intention who make use of them. In such cases the matter lies largely in the hands of the instructor, who usually can get work done in the way he desires by making clear just what he wants.

Among the larger universities, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., has always taken the point of view that its size materially makes the application of the honor system very difficult. President Abbott Lawrence Lowell says:

The honor system at examinations does not exist at Harvard University at all, and, indeed, there are great difficulties to introducing it, arising from the size and cosmopolitan nature of the student body. I take it that the honor system depends not only on the individual, but on the fact that the whole student body will resent and prevent any breach of it by any member. This is much easier to carry out in a body which is small and homogeneous.

Dean B. S. Hurlbut, of Harvard, remarks on the subject:

We have a student council. This is an undergraduate organization and deals only with undergraduate affairs. As it is a most excellently representative body, however, I find it of the greatest service for consultation and in dealing with a good many matters of government that come within the province of the dean. The influence of our council is, I think, steadily growing, and I try to do everything in my power to increase this influence.

Another type of institution in which the formal honor system is seldom in vogue is the theological seminary and school. President John P. Chadwick, of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y., replies:

I beg to state that the honor system, as it is generally known, does not exist in our seminary. With us conscience receives such attention that the development of naturally good character aspiring for the priesthood does not require the honor system. Our training, of course, includes honor, inasmuch as our students are taught to reproduce in their life by prayer, self-denial, and earnest work the virtues of our Blessed Lord. However, I can see the advantages of the honor system in a secular college, and I wish you every success.

President Francis Brown, of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, says:

The question of the adoption of the honor system, technically so called in educational circles, has never come up at this seminary because, doubtless, of the conditions involved in seminary life. We rely greatly upon the honor of our students, but there is no occasion for us to emphasize this by any organic law. In fact, we secure all the advantages of such a law without its enactment. Under these circumstances it would not be possible for me to answer your questions in detail.

Aside from the types of institutions just discussed, there is another type where a breach of honor is considered a serious offense, with uniform and definite penalties. These are the military colleges, academies, and schools. The United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., is a striking example, and ex-Supt. John H. Gibbons, captain, United States Navy, writes:

I have to inform you that, owing to the difference between conditions at this institution and those at civil institutions of learning, it is difficult to make answer to the categorical questions presented.

Midshipmen are appointees of the Government, being officers of the Navy in a qualified sense. They are paid for their services, and the duties that they perform under orders from superior authority are in the nature of contract obligations. They are responsible for their conduct, and for any derelictions they may legally undergo punishment, including dismissal from the naval service. Their relations to the constituted authorities are therefore different from those of an individual who attends a civilian institution, paying for the privilege of so doing, and whose only responsibility to the constituted authorities is such as he may voluntarily assume for the privilege of continuance at the institution.

The honor system has always been a basic principle of this institution, and a failure to meet the requirements thereof constitutes a most serious offense which, in its most flagrant forms, affords grounds for dismissal.

INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE NOT FELT THE NEED OF THE HONOR SYSTEM.

Another group of institutions have not felt the need of the honor system according to their letters.

Vivian B. Small, of Lake Erie College, Painesville, Ohio, writes:

Examinations are given under the old-fashioned faculty proctoring system. So far as I know, no difficulties have ever arisen to cause either faculty or students to desire any change.

Ex-President Arthur H. Wilde, of the University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz., replies:

The honor system is not in effect in this university. There seems to be no criticism of the present conditions, and a mutual feeling of good understanding and of confidence exists between the faculty and students, so that neither faculty nor students have seriously raised the honor question.

President William F. Dooley anticipates the probable future policy of the University of Detroit, Michigan, by saying:

The honor system does not exist in any of the departments of this institution, has never existed, and there is no likelihood that it will be adopted.

INSTITUTIONS THAT FRANKLY OPPOSE THE HONOR SYSTEM.

In addition to the points of view in regard to collegiate and university policy in reference to the honor system as outlined above, several institutions have expressed the view that they do not have the honor system and do not believe in it. Prof. W. E. Everett, of Brown University, Providence, R. I., states:

The question has been discussed, but always adversely. We do not believe in the system, although we endeavor as far as possible to cultivate ideals and standards of honor among our students.

Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, has not considered its introduction. President Alston Ellis declares:

Conditions here do not seem to suggest that its adoption by us would be any help to the students or governing body. In the main our students are self-supporting and law-abiding and give those in charge of the institution but very little trouble of a disciplinary nature. I suppose my own view of the questions presented would be of no special service to you, but I can say that I do not feel disposed to give any large amount of control to the student body.

President William P. Few, of Trinity College, Durham, N. C., says:

We do not have, and I do not believe in, the so-called "honor" system, but we try here as in everything else to have students bear their share of responsibility for the moral safety of the community.

The view of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., as given by Secretary Ella W. Caleb, is:

The jurisdiction of the students does not extend to the conduction of the examinations, which are still proctored by the instructors. The greatest danger in self-government among students is that they will so burden themselves with the details of administration that they can not properly do the special work for which they came to college. We can rely upon them to do the right thing, but feel that they need to be guarded a little against undertaking too much. It is from no unwillingness to trust them that they do not have fuller powers, though in fact, I think, that they have been granted everything they asked for.

Acting President J. B. Van Meter, of Goucher College, Baltimore, Md., summarizes the situation there in the following letter:

We have nothing organized in this college that would seem to admit of replies to your specific questions. There is a students' organization which takes cognizance

of student conduct in all its reaches, and the general consciousness of the student body is such as would lie back of what is usually denominated an honor system. Eight or ten years ago there was a good deal of talk about an honor system, but it did not come to anything. I think students and faculty were equally interested in the matter. Personally I do not like the honor system. It has a suggestion in it that under a specific system there are principles controlling conduct which need not control it apart from that system. It seems to me that it is very desirable to recognize principles of honor as inhering in the very constitution of society and not growing out of a particular legislation or organization.

Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., holds practically the same idea of the honor system as that held by Brown University. President William De Witt Hyde, who has previously written against the honor system, tersely writes in reply to the questions submitted:

We have no honor system at Bowdoin. Our effort here is to get the honor without the system, and while we are not entirely successful with incoming students, it is a very rare thing for a man in the upper classes to cheat.

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH THE HONOR SYSTEM HAS FAILED.

It is frequently assumed that a large number of institutions have tried the honor system without success; when studied in the last analysis that number, however, is small. Bowdoin has been mentioned as an example of one of these institutions, but President Hyde says the system has never been formally tried in his college.

The following institutions have discarded the honor system temporarily or permanently, and it will be of interest to see what their comments are. Prof. H. M. King, of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, says:

No general honor system is in vogue with us. From time to time there has been some small agitation about the matter among the students, sometimes apparently only for the sake of having something to discuss in the college paper. One department, under an instructor not now with us, tried the plan in his examinations for some short time, but gave it up. There has been no general faculty action on the matter, and no machinery of any general use.

President Henry A. Apple, of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., writes:

The system did not work satisfactorily, mainly, it is thought, on account of the "reporting" feature, the students being reluctant to report violations of the rules, even to their own chosen representatives on the administrative board or senate. It was accordingly abolished in 1906 by the faculty, without a word or sign of protest on the part of the student body.

The other institutions that have definitely stated that this system has been dropped claim that this has been due in the main to unsatisfactory conditions, and they are working toward its reestablishment. Registrar Forest C. Ensign, of the State University of Iowa, Iowa City, says:

I must say that the honor system does not prevail here. The college of medicine had installed the honor system some years ago, but this year, at the request of the

students, it was abandoned. We are not quite ready for it. We have some student control now, largely through an advisory committee known as the greater university committee. Through the leadership of this committee it is likely that a well-organized student council will be created with the honor system in view. We feel that such a system must come as a genuine demand on the part of the students themselves, and the matter will not be pushed.

Prof. H. G. Parker, of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., says:

I am really at a loss to answer your inquiries, as our honor system is in somewhat of a chaotic condition. Some years ago we supposedly had an honor system which involved the signing of a pledge on the part of the students, but it did not prevent trouble, and the whole scheme fell into disrepute. An attempt was made about two years ago to perfect a complete honor system, but as the crux of the whole matter rested on the willingness of a student to report a fellow student, the matter again fell through. Just recently a movement has been started to put this sort of business in the hands of a student senate, elected from the junior and senior classes. We have not time to try it out, and I can not report, therefore, as to how it will work.

INSTITUTIONS WHICH REPLY NEGATIVELY, WITHOUT COMMENT.

In reply to the information solicited from the 475 institutions in regard to the use of the honor system, 147 replied without many comments that it was not in operation.

CONCLUSIONS.

The material in this monograph would lead to the conclusion that, to secure the best results from any form of the honor system, both student and faculty sentiment should be in favor of its adoption. Frequently, starting in one class or department, it has been found to be most successfully developed when applied to the whole institution, but loses in efficiency when applied to too wide a range of activities.

The 123 institutions that are trying the system are its strongest advocates, and there has been a steady but marked tendency toward general adoption throughout this country. This tendency has gained most in strength during the past three years.

The chief arguments against the honor system may be summed up as follows: Classroom honesty is an academic matter; some people believe, therefore, that it should be under faculty jurisdiction and control. Some executives do not care to give more control to students, since these duties are difficult to define and take the students' time from the regular studies. Students contend also that it tends to burden the better or more honest students with the shortcomings of the delinquent ones. In some communities there is a sentiment that signing a pledge implies dishonesty, and in many institutions there is still a feeling that individual honor does not involve the reporting of theft and dishonesty on the part of others. Some large institutions have such a cosmopolitan group of students that homo-

generosity in the classroom ideals is difficult to secure and maintain; small institutions have younger preparatory students to include in their regulations.

The immediate and ultimate aims of the honor system which may be considered of most significance are: It rests fundamentally upon the initiative of undergraduates, and initiative always has potential good as a possibility; it is dependent upon unity of purpose and community of effort, which is another valuable asset when turned in the right direction; it tends to bring about a frank and candid relation between the students and the administrative force of an institution; it tends toward increasing the loyalty to an institution, by strengthening public opinion in regard to the virtue of honesty; it increases individual responsibility, which may take a marked drop during college days; it breeds confidence and self-respect in similar situations; as a rule it appeals to the better class of students, and leads them to look at their own actions and the actions of other fellows from the point of view of an adult; it utilizes the stronger characters to help bolster up the weaker ones.

The success of the honor system is due in the main to the natural desire of students to formulate ideals for themselves, the interest for cooperative activity and team work and the pride involved in creating college public sentiment and college loyalty.

It is not possible to recommend a single type of constitution for organization of the honor system, but the constitution and by-laws should be short, simple, and definite, since new and untried students must be educated yearly. Likewise the enthusiasm is sure to wane every two or three years.

In general a formal pledge is desirable, and ultimately this should include the willingness or obligation to report all infractions by others.

The administrative council is apparently most effective when composed of students only, and the membership when both elective and automatic.

Final jurisdiction in regard to penalties is very successfully administered in a number of large institutions by the students, but, in general, it is better to have this power rest ultimately with the faculty and the board of regents or trustees.

Tabular summary as to the use of the honor system.

Institutions.	Institution established.	Exists in all departments (+) or in some departments (-).	Initiative in faculty (F.), or students (S.), or from students (S.), or both.	Year of adoption.	Growing favor (+) or not (-).	Personal pledge (+), no pledge (-), pledge to report others (++).	System extends beyond examinations (+) or examinations (-).	Administrative council of students (S.), or faculty (F.), or both.	Council elected (E.), appointed (A.), automatically (M.), or chosen (C.).	Final power in students (S.), president (P.), faculty (F.).	Instructor present (+), absent at times (±), absent (-).
Adelphi College, New York.....	1896	-	S.	1901	+	-	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Adrian College, Michigan.....	1859	-	F.	1905	+	-	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Agnes Scott College, Georgia.....	1887	+	F.	1906	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Alabama Polytechnic Institute, College, Texas.....	1876	+	F.	1876	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Albright College, Pennsylvania.....	1872	+	S.	1902	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Alfred University, New York.....	1898	+	S.	1910	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Amherst College, Massachusetts.....	1821	+	S.	1908	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Antioch College, Ohio.....	1853	+	S.	1900	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Auburn Theological Seminary, New York.....	1820	+	F.	1901	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Barnard College, New York.....	1889	+	S.	1912	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Beloit College, Wisconsin.....	1846	+	F.	1858	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Bradgewater College, Virginia.....	1850	+	F.	1898	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Butler College, Indiana.....	1850	+	F.	1911	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pennsylvania.....	1900	+	F. & S.	1913	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Central University, Iowa.....	1853	+	F.	1908	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Citadel, South Carolina.....	1783	+	F.	1843	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Citadel the Military, South Carolina.....	1842	+	F.	1908	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Clemson Agricultural College, South Carolina.....	1887	+	F.	1903	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Coe College, Iowa.....	1837	+	F.	1911	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Columbia University, New York.....	1754	+	F.	1871	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Concordia College, Indiana.....	1859	+	F.	1907	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Cornell University, New York.....	1868	+	F.	1912	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Cumberland College, Arkansas.....	1855	+	F.	1907	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Dartmouth College, North Carolina.....	1837	+	F.	1857	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Denison University, Ohio.....	1831	+	F.	1913	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Eastern University, Virginia.....	1899	+	F. & S.	1909	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Emory College, North Carolina.....	1827	+	F. & S.	1889	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Emory College, Georgia.....	1857	+	F. & S.	1889	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Erskine College, South Carolina.....	1852	+	F. & S.	1911	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Fairmount College, Kansas.....	1889	+	F.	1911	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Fargo College, North Dakota.....	1897	+	F.	1912	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Furman University, South Carolina.....	1821	+	F.	1913	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Gallaudet College, District of Columbia.....	1851	+	F.	1913	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Georgia School of Technology, Georgia.....	1864	+	F.	1906	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
Georgetown College, Kentucky.....	1858	+	S.	1906	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
George Washington University, District of Columbia.....	1820	+	S.	1906	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+
George Washington University, District of Columbia.....	1821	+	S.	1910	+	+	+	S. S.	E.	F.	+

Table for summary as to the use of the honor system—Continued.

Institutions.	Institution established.	Exists in all departments or in some departments (+), or in some departments (-).	Initiative from faculty (F.), or from students (S.), or from both.	Year of adoption.	Growing in favor (+), or not (-).	Personal pledges (+), no pledges (-), pledge to report others (++) (+).	System extends beyond examinations (-), or limited to examinations (-).	Administrative council of students (S.), faculty (F.), or both (S. & F.).	Council elected (E.), appointed (A.), or both (E. & A.).	Final power in honor system (S.), or in faculty (F.).	Instructor present (+), or absent (-).
University of Michigan	1857	+	S.	1903	+	++	+	S.	E.	F.	(+)
University of Mississippi	1848	+	S.	1907	+	(+)	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of North Carolina	1789	+	S.	1903	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of North Carolina, North Carolina	1740	+	S.	1905	+	+	+	S. & F.	E. & C.	F.	+
University of Pennsylvania	1740	+	S.	1910	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of East Carolina, Washington	1903	+	F.	1910	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of South Carolina	1850	+	S.	1912	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of South Carolina, South Carolina	1871	+	S.	1907	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of Tennessee	1827	+	(?)	1908	+	+	+	(?)	(?)	(?)	+
University of Tennessee, Tennessee	1794	+	(?)	(?)	+	+	+	(?)	(?)	(?)	+
University of Texas	1863	+	S.	1868	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of Virginia, Kentucky	1798	+	S.	1868	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
University of Virginia, Virginia	1819	+	S.	1842	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Vincennes University, Indiana	1806	+	S.	1842	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Virginia Military Institute, Virginia	1839	+	F. & S.	1911	+	+	+	F. & S.	A.	E.	+
Wake Forest College, North Carolina	1872	+	F.	1889	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Washington and Lee University, Virginia	1834	+	F.	1911	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Wells College, New York	1853	+	S.	1911	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Western University, Connecticut	1866	+	S.	1897	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Western College for Women, Ohio	1831	+	S.	1893	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Western Maryland College, Maryland	1845	+	F.	1909	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Western Reserve University, Ohio	1826	+	S. & F.	1910	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
William and Mary College, Virginia	1779	+	S. & F.	1903	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Williams College, Massachusetts	1793	+	F. & S.	1893	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Wilson College, Pennsylvania	1870	+	S.	1905	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Wofford College, South Carolina	1854	+	S.	1912	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+
Yale University, Connecticut	1701	-	S.	1912	+	+	+	S.	E.	F.	+

APPENDIX.

A. TYPE CONSTITUTIONS.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

ARTICLE I.

SECTION 1. There shall be a committee consisting of six members who shall represent the student body and deal with all cases involving violations of the honor system.

SEC. 2. The members of this committee shall be the presidents of the four classes and two others, one a member of the senior class and one a member of the junior class.

SEC. 3. The president of the senior class shall be chairman of the committee, and the president of the junior class shall be clerk.

ARTICLE II.

SEC. 1. Early in the fall of each year, immediately after the election of the officers of the four classes, the chairman of the committee shall convene the presidents of the three other classes and that member of the senior class who served as the elected junior member on the previous committee, and they shall complete their number by the election of one member from the junior class.

SEC. 2. If this member of the junior class be afterwards elected president of his class, or be otherwise incapacitated from holding the office, a member of the same class shall be chosen to fill the vacancy according to the method of section 1.

SEC. 3. If action of the committee becomes necessary before the fall elections of the class presidents have taken place, the four presidents at that time, together with the senior member who had served in his junior year, will constitute a temporary committee for the particular cases, with the same regulations of powers, procedure, and penalties adopted in this constitution.

ARTICLE III.

SEC. 1. The committee shall have the power to summon the accused persons and witnesses and conduct a formal investigation, and in case of conviction the penalty shall be recommendation to the faculty of the separation from college of the man convicted, with the addition in extreme cases of publication to a mass meeting of the college.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a single report to the faculty of all cases acted upon during one series of examinations, consisting of a brief résumé of evidence taken, their decision in the case, and the recommendation of the penalty to be imposed.

SEC. 3. The committee may at any time summon a mass meeting for instruction or to support their action in any disputed question, or to report the name and case of any extreme offender.

ARTICLE IV.

SEC. 1. The place and time of meeting shall be left to the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 2. The trial shall be formal and conducted in the following manner, with the president of the senior class as the chairman, and the president of the junior class as

clerk: Witnesses against the accused shall be taken first and then testimony taken in full. The accused shall be called separately and allowed to make his statement, presenting witnesses for his defense. All witnesses and the accused may be questioned by members of this committee and a decision then rendered according to the law and evidence.

SEC. 3. Five of the six votes shall be necessary to conviction.

SEC. 4. All evidence possible shall be procured in every case, and in no event shall a man be tried the second time for the same offense except in the light of new and important evidence.

ARTICLE V.

SEC. 1. Violations of the honor system shall consist of any attempt to receive assistance from written aids or from any person or paper, or in any attempt to give assistance, whether the one so doing has completed his own paper or not. This rule holds both within and without the examination room during the entire time the examination is in progress; that is, until all papers have been handed in.

SEC. 2. Violations shall also consist in obtaining or attempting to obtain previous to any examination copies of the examination papers or the questions to appear thereon, or to gain any illegal knowledge of these questions.

SEC. 3. Any man not signing the pledge placed on the examination paper will be notified by the professor holding the examination, and if unable then to sign he will be reported to the committee for investigation.

ARTICLE VI.

The several committees shall keep a record of all cases acted upon in their sessions, without mentioning names of the accused, also a record of successive actions of mass meetings with respect to the honor system. These records, together with the constitution, shall be preserved by the senior member of the committee of each year for the instruction of that committee.

ARTICLE VII.

This constitution may be amended by a three-fourths vote of those present at a mass meeting of the college.

ARTICLE VIII.

This constitution shall be published in the Daily Princetonian during the first month of each college year.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

ARTICLE I.

(A) This honor system shall apply to students in all courses given in the College of Agriculture and, pending the adoption of an honor system by the other colleges, to all agricultural students in such colleges.

ARTICLE II.

(A) All students shall be given an opportunity to sign these articles, and if a majority of students shall sign them they shall hold for all students. New students shall each year be given an opportunity to sign these articles.

(B) Students thus included shall be on their honor to refrain from "cribbing" in classrooms and examinations.

(C) Students shall personally reprimand any violation and report the offense to the student committee as defined hereinafter.

ARTICLE III.

- (A) The committee shall be known as the "Committee on student honor."
- (B) The committee shall consist of three (3) seniors, two (2) juniors, one (1) sophomore, and one (1) freshman.
- (C) The chairman shall be elected from the committee by them at their first meeting at the beginning of each college year.
- (D) The senior, junior, and sophomore members shall be elected from their respective classes at meetings held at the first agricultural assembly of each college year.
- (E) The freshman member shall be selected by this committee during the following December.
- (F) The chairman shall fill vacancies in the committee by appointment.
- (G) The committee shall also serve until their successors are appointed.

ARTICLE IV.

- (A) It shall be the duty of the chairman to record all offenses reported; to call meetings of the committee when necessary; and to act in accordance with the finding of the committee.
- (B) It shall be his further duty to notify a student of any offense reported against him, and to bring his case before the committee immediately.
- (C) The chairman shall have no vote upon any question except in case of a tie.

ARTICLE V.

- (A) It shall be the duty of the committee to pass upon all evidence relating to cases brought before it.
- (B) The conviction of an offense shall be made only upon the unanimous vote of the committee present.
- (C) It shall be the duty of the committee, if they find the offense of sufficient gravity, to require the withdrawal of the student from the university for such a length of time as may be deemed just. But if the offense be less serious, or the circumstances ameliorating, the student may be deprived of credit either for the course or the examination in question. And in case of failure to comply with the decision, the committee shall report the case to the proper authorities.

ARTICLE VI.

- (A) In case the chairman or the member of the committee be reported, his place shall be deemed vacant and shall be filled in accordance with the provisions of Article III, Section B; if, however, he be found innocent, he shall resume his former position.

ARTICLE VII.

- (A) The findings of the committee shall be published in the university press, but all names shall be withheld.

ARTICLE VIII.

- (A) Amendments to or alterations of these articles shall be binding when adopted by a majority vote of the entire number of students in the College of Agriculture regularly assembled, provided that one week's notice of this action shall have been given.

ARTICLE IX.

- (A) The pledge which all students shall be asked to sign shall be as follows:
"I hereby pledge upon my honor to abide by the conditions of the above articles, provided they are adopted by a majority of the students of the College of Agriculture."

B. TYPE PLEDGES.

Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y.:

"I have neither given nor received aid in this examination."

Miami University, Oxford, Ohio:

"I pledge myself to support the honor system to the utmost of my ability, and not only myself to act in accordance with what I conscientiously believe to be its spirit, but also to encourage others to do the same."

Ohio Wesleyan University:

"In view of the introduction of the honor system in Ohio Wesleyan University, I pledge myself to support that system to the utmost of my ability, and not only myself to act in accordance with what I conscientiously believe to be its spirit, but also to encourage others to do the same and strongly to discountenance any violation of it."

University of Texas:

"I have upon my honor neither given nor received help in this examination, neither have I seen any one else give or receive help."

University of Virginia:

"I, A. B., do hereby certify on honor that I have derived no assistance during the time of this examination from any source whatever, whether oral, written, or in print, in giving the above answers."

Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C.:

"I have neither given nor received help from any source."

Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.:

"I hereby pledge my honor as a student of Wilson College that I will endeavor to abide by all rules of the student government association; that I will do no dishonest work in daily preparations and recitations, nor in written work, and that I will report to the honor board of the self-government association any dishonest work that comes to my notice."

C. MEMBERSHIP OF TYPE ADMINISTRATION COUNCILS.

Amherst College:

- Class presidents.
- 1 member of the senior class.
- 1 member of the junior class.

Denison University:

- 3 seniors.
- 2 juniors.
- 1 sophomore.
- 1 freshman.

Hobart College:

- 1 upper classman from each fraternity.
- 1 from the nonfraternity men.

Lehigh University:

- Members of the "Arcadia," a club of 15 members composed of the highest officer of each organization.
- 3 lower class officers.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College:

- President and vice president from seniors of each dormitory.
- Secretary from juniors.
- Treasurer from sophomores.

Tulane University:

All officers of classes.

President of student body.

University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.:

3 from theological department.

3 from senior class.

3 from junior class.

2 from sophomore class.

2 from freshman class.

Wells College:

2 members from each class.

Wofford College:

Presidents of classes.

2 men from each class elected by presidents.

BULLETIN OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

[NOTE.—With the exceptions indicated, the documents named below will be sent free of charge upon application to the Commissioner of Education, Washington, D. C. Those marked with an asterisk (*) are no longer available for free distribution, but may be had of the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., upon payment of the price stated. Remittances should be made in coin, currency, or money order. Stamps are not accepted. Documents marked with a dagger (†) are out of print.]

1906.

- †No. 1. Education bill of 1906 for England and Wales as it passed the House of Commons. A. T. Smith.
- †No. 2. German views of American education, with particular reference to industrial development. William N. Hallmann.
- *No. 3. State school systems: Legislation and judicial decisions relating to public education, Oct. 1, 1904, to Oct. 1, 1906. Edward C. Elliott. 15 cts.

1907.

- †No. 1. The continuation school in the United States. Arthur J. Jones.
- †No. 2. Agricultural education, including nature study and school gardens. James R. Jewell.
- †No. 3. The auxiliary schools of Germany. Six lectures by B. Maennel.
- †No. 4. The elimination of pupils from school. Edward L. Thorndike.

1908.

- †No. 1. On the training of persons to teach agriculture in the public schools. Liberty H. Bailey.
- *No. 2. List of publications of the United States Bureau of Education: 1867-1907. 10 cts.
- *No. 3. Bibliography of education for 1907. James Ingersoll Wyer, Jr., and Martha L. Phelps. 10 cts.
- †No. 4. Music education in the United States: schools and departments of music. Arthur L. Manchester.
- *No. 5. Education in Formosa. Julian H. Arnold. 10 cts.
- *No. 6. The apprenticeship system in its relation to industrial education. Carroll D. Wright. 15 cts.
- *No. 7. State school systems: II. Legislation and judicial decisions relating to public education, Oct. 1, 1906, to Oct. 1, 1908. Edward C. Elliott. 30 cts.
- No. 8. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State, 1907-8. 5 cts.

1909.

- *No. 1. Facilities for study and research in the offices of the United States Government in Washington. Arthur T. Hadley. 10 cts.
- *No. 2. Admission of Chinese students to American colleges. John Fryer. 25 cts.
- *No. 3. Daily meals of school children. Caroline L. Hunt. 10 cts.
- No. 4. The teaching staff of secondary schools in the United States; amount of education, length of experience, salaries. Edward L. Thorndike.
- No. 5. Statistics of public, society, and school libraries in 1908.
- *No. 6. Instruction in the fine and manual arts in the United States. A statistical monograph. T. Bailey. 15 cts.
- No. 7. Index to the Reports of the Commissioner of Education, 1867-1907.
- *No. 8. A teacher's professional library. Classified list of 100 titles. 5 cts.
- *No. 9. Bibliography of education for 1908-9. 10 cts.
- No. 10. Education for efficiency in railroad service. J. Shirley Eaton.
- *No. 11. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State 1908-9. 5 cts.

1910.

- *No. 1. The movement for reform in the teaching of religion in the public schools of Saxony. Arley B. Show. 5 cts.
- No. 2. State school systems: III. Legislation and judicial decisions relating to public education, Oct. 1, 1908, to Oct. 1, 1909. Edward C. Elliott.
- †No. 3. List of publications of the United States Bureau of Education, 1867-1910.
- *No. 4. The biological stations of Europe. Charles A. Kofoid. 50 cts.
- *No. 5. American schoolhouses. Fletcher B. Dresslar. 75 cts.
- †No. 6. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State, 1909-10.

1911.

- *No. 1. Bibliography of science teaching. 5 cts.
- *No. 2. Opportunities for graduate study in agriculture in the United States. A. C. Monahan. 5 cts.
- *No. 3. Agencies for the improvement of teachers in service. William C. Ruediger. 15 cts.
- *No. 4. Report of the commission appointed to study the system of education in the public schools of Baltimore. 10 cts.
- *No. 5. Age and grade census of schools and colleges. George D. Strayer. 10 cts.
- *No. 6. Graduate work in mathematics in universities and in other institutions of like grade in the United States. 5 cts.
- †No. 7. Undergraduate work in mathematics in colleges and universities.
- †No. 8. Examinations in mathematics, other than those set by the teacher for his own classes.
- No. 9. Mathematics in the technological schools of collegiate grade in the United States.
- †No. 10. Bibliography of education for 1909-10.
- †No. 11. Bibliography of child study for the years 1908-9.
- †No. 12. Training of teachers of elementary and secondary mathematics.
- *No. 13. Mathematics in the elementary schools of the United States. 15 cts.
- *No. 14. Provision for exceptional children in the public schools. J. H. Van Sickle, Lightner Witmer, and Leonard P. Ayres. 10 cts.
- *No. 15. Educational system of China as recently reconstructed. Harry E. King. 10 cts.
- †No. 16. Mathematics in the public and private secondary schools of the United States.
- †No. 17. List of publications of the United States Bureau of Education, October, 1911.
- *No. 18. Teachers' certificates issued under general State laws and regulations. H. Updegraff. 20 cts.
- No. 19. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State, 1910-11.

1912.

- *No. 1. A course of study for the preparation of rural-school teachers. F. Mutchler and W. J. Craig. 5 cts.
- †No. 2. Mathematics at West Point and Annapolis.
- *No. 3. Report of committee on uniform records and reports. 5 cts.
- *No. 4. Mathematics in technical secondary schools in the United States. 5 cts.
- *No. 5. A study of expenses of city school systems. Harlan Updegraff. 10 cts.
- *No. 6. Agricultural education in secondary schools. 10 cts.
- *No. 7. Educational status of nursing. M. Adelaide Nutting. 10 cts.
- *No. 8. Peace day. Fannie Fern Andrews. 5 cts. [Later publication, 1913, No. 12. 10 cts.]
- *No. 9. Country schools for city boys. William S. Myers. 10 cts.
- †No. 10. Bibliography of education in agriculture and home economics.
- †No. 11. Current educational topics, No. I.
- †No. 12. Dutch schools of New Netherland and colonial New York. William B. Kilpatrick.
- *No. 13. Influences tending to improve the work of the teacher of mathematics. 5 cts.
- *No. 14. Report of the American commissioners of the international commission on the teaching of mathematics. 10 cts.
- †No. 15. Current educational topics, No. II.
- †No. 16. The reorganized school playground. Henry S. Curtis.
- *No. 17. The Montessori system of education. Anna T. Smith. 5 cts.
- *No. 18. Teaching language through agriculture and domestic science. M. A. Leiper. 5 cts.
- *No. 19. Professional distribution of college and university graduates. Bailey B. Burritt. 10 cts.
- †No. 20. Readjustment of a rural high school to the needs of the community. H. A. Brown.
- †No. 21. Urban and rural common-school statistics. Harlan Updegraff and William R. Hood.
- No. 22. Public and private high schools.
- *No. 23. Special collections in libraries in the United States. W. D. Johnston and I. G. Mudge. 10 cts.
- †No. 24. Current educational topics, No. III.
- †No. 25. List of publications of the United States Bureau of Education, 1912.
- †No. 26. Bibliography of child study for the years 1910-11.
- No. 27. History of public-school education in Arkansas. Stephen B. Weeks.
- *No. 28. Cultivating school grounds in Wake County, N. C. Zebulon Judd. 5 cts.
- No. 29. Bibliography of the teaching of mathematics, 1900-1912. D. E. Smith and C. Goldsfer.
- No. 30. Latin-American universities and special schools. Edgar E. Brandon.
- *No. 31. Educational directory, 1912. 10 cts.
- *No. 32. Bibliography of exceptional children and their education. Arthur MacDonald. 5 cts.
- †No. 33. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State, 1912.

1913.

- No. 1. Monthly record of current educational publications, January, 1913.
- *No. 2. Training courses for rural teachers. A. C. Monahan and R. H. Wright. 5 cts.
- *No. 3. The teaching of modern languages in the United States. Charles H. Handachin. 15 cts.
- *No. 4. Present standards of higher education in the United States. George E. MacLean. 20 cts.
- †No. 5. Monthly record of current educational publications. February, 1913.

- *No. 6. Agricultural instruction in high schools. C. H. Robison and F. B. Jenks. 10 cts.
- *No. 7. College entrance requirements. Clarence D. Kingsley. 15 cts.
- *No. 8. The status of rural education in the United States. A. C. Monahan. 15 cts.
- †No. 9. Consular reports on continuation schools in Prussia.
- †No. 10. Monthly record of current educational publications, March, 1913.
- †No. 11. Monthly record of current educational publications, April, 1913.
- *No. 12. The promotion of peace. Fannie Fern Andrews. 10 cts.
- *No. 13. Standards and tests for measuring the efficiency of schools or systems of schools. 5 cts.
- *No. 14. Agricultural instruction in secondary schools. 10 cts.
- †No. 15. Monthly record of current educational publications, May, 1913.
- *No. 16. Bibliography of medical inspection and health supervision. 15 cts.
- *No. 17. A trade school for girls. A preliminary investigation in a typical manufacturing city, Worcester, Mass. 10 cts.
- *No. 18. The fifteenth international congress on hygiene and demography. Fletcher B. Dresslar. 10 cts.
- *No. 19. German industrial education and its lessons for the United States. Holmes Beckwith. 15 cts.
- *No. 20. Illiteracy in the United States. 10 cts.
- †No. 21. Monthly record of current educational publications, June, 1913.
- *No. 22. Bibliography of industrial, vocational, and trade education. 10 cts.
- *No. 23. The Georgia club at the State Normal School, Athens, Ga., for the study of rural sociology. E. C. Branson. 10 cts.
- *No. 24. A comparison of public education in Germany and in the United States. Georg Karschensteiner. 5 cts.
- *No. 25. Industrial education in Columbus, Ga. Roland B. Daniel. 5 cts.
- †No. 26. Good roads arbor day. Susan B. Sipe.
- †No. 27. Prison schools. A. C. Hill.
- *No. 28. Expressions on education by American statesmen and publicists. 5 cts.
- *No. 29. Accredited secondary schools in the United States. Kendrick C. Babcock. 10 cts.
- *No. 30. Education in the South. 10 cts.
- *No. 31. Special features in city school systems. 10 cts.
- No. 32. Educational survey of Montgomery County, Md.
- †No. 33. Monthly record of current educational publications, September, 1913.
- *No. 34. Pension systems in Great Britain. Raymond W. Sikes. 10 cts.
- *No. 35. A list of books suited to a high-school library. 15 cts.
- *No. 36. Report on the work of the Bureau of Education for the natives of Alaska, 1911-12. 10 cts.
- No. 37. Monthly record of current educational publications, October, 1913.
- *No. 38. Economy of time in education. 10 cts.
- No. 39. Elementary industrial school of Cleveland, Ohio. W. N. Hallmann.
- *No. 40. The reorganized school playground. Henry S. Curtis. 10 cts.
- *No. 41. The reorganization of secondary education. 10 cts.
- No. 42. An experimental rural school at Whitthrop College. H. S. Browne.
- *No. 43. Agriculture and rural-life day; material for its observance. Eugene C. Brooks. 10 cts.
- *No. 44. Organized health work in schools. E. B. Hoag. 10 cts.
- No. 45. Monthly record of current educational publications, November, 1913.
- *No. 46. Educational directory, 1913. 15 cts.
- *No. 47. Teaching material in Government publications. F. K. Noyes. 10 cts.
- *No. 48. School hygiene. W. Carson Ryan, Jr. 15 cts.
- No. 49. The Farragut School, a Tennessee country-life high school. A. C. Monahan and A. Phillips.
- No. 50. The Fitchburg plan of cooperative industrial education. M. R. McCann.
- *No. 51. Education of the immigrant. 10 cts.
- *No. 52. Sanitary schoolhouses. Legal requirements in Indiana and Ohio. 5 cts.
- No. 53. Monthly record of current educational publications, December, 1913.
- No. 54. Consular reports on industrial education in Germany.
- No. 55. Legislation and judicial decisions relating to education, October 1, 1909, to October 1, 1912. James C. Boykin and William R. Hood.
- †No. 56. Some suggestive features of the Swiss school system. William Knox Tate.
- *No. 57. Elementary education in England, with special reference to London, Liverpool, and Manchester. I. L. Kandel. 15 cts.
- No. 58. Educational system of rural Denmark. Harold W. Foght.
- No. 59. Bibliography of education for 1910-11.
- No. 60. Statistics of State universities and other institutions of higher education partially supported by the State, 1912-13.

1914.

- *No. 1. Monthly record of current educational publications, January, 1914. 5 cts.
- No. 2. Compulsory school attendance.
- *No. 3. Monthly record of current educational publications, February, 1914. 5 cts.
- No. 4. The school and the start in life. Meyer Bloomfield.

IV

BULLETIN OF THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

- No. 5. The folk high schools of Denmark. L. I. Friend.
 No. 6. Kindergartens in the United States.
 No. 7. Monthly record of current educational publications, March, 1914.
 No. 8. The Massachusetts home-project plan of vocational agricultural education. R. W. Stimson.
 No. 9. Monthly record of current educational publications, April, 1914.
 *No. 10. Physical growth and school progress. B. T. Baldwin. 25 cts.
 *No. 11. Monthly record of current educational publications, May, 1914.
 *No. 12. Rural schoolhouses and grounds. F. B. Dresslar. 80 cts.
 No. 13. Present status of drawing and art in the elementary and secondary schools of the United States. Royal B. Farnum.
 No. 14. Vocational guidance.
 No. 15. Monthly record of current educational publications. Index.
 *No. 16. The tangible rewards of teaching. James C. Boykin and Roberta King. 50 cts.
 No. 17. Sanitary survey of the schools of Orange County, Va. Roy K. Flanagan.
 No. 18. The public school system of Gary, Ind. William P. Durra.
 No. 19. University extension in the United States. Louis E. Reber.
 No. 20. The rural school and hookworm disease. J. A. Ferrell.
 No. 21. Monthly record of current educational publications, September, 1914.
 No. 22. The Danish folk high schools. H. W. Foght.
 No. 23. Some trade schools in Europe. Frank L. Glynn.
 No. 24. Danish elementary rural schools. H. W. Foght.
 No. 25. Important features in rural school improvement. W. T. Hodges.
 No. 26. Monthly report of current educational publications, October, 1914.
 No. 27. Agricultural teaching.
 No. 28. The Montessori method and the kindergarten. Elizabeth Harrison.
 No. 29. The kindergarten in benevolent institutions.
 No. 30. Consolidation of rural schools and transportation of pupils at public expense. A. C. Monahan.
 No. 31. Report on the work of the Bureau of Education for the natives of Alaska.
 No. 32. Bibliography of the relation of secondary schools to higher education. R. L. Walkley.
 No. 33. Music in the public schools. Will Eachart.
 No. 34. Library instruction in universities, colleges, and normal schools. Henry R. Evans.
 No. 35. The training of teachers in England, Scotland, and Germany. Charles H. Judd.
 No. 36. Education for the home—Part I. General statement. B. R. Andrews.
 No. 37. Education for the home—Part II. State action, schools, agencies. B. R. Andrews.
 No. 38. Education for the home—Part III. Colleges and universities. B. R. Andrews.
 No. 39. Education for the home—Part IV. Bibliography, list of schools. B. R. Andrews.
 No. 40. Care of the health of boys in Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 No. 41. Monthly record of current educational publications, November, 1914.
 No. 42. Monthly record of current educational publications, December, 1914.
 No. 43. Educational directory, 1914-15.
 No. 44. County-unit organization for the administration of rural schools. A. C. Monahan.
 No. 45. Curricula in mathematics. J. C. Brown.
 No. 46. School savings banks. Mrs. Sara L. Oberholzer.
 No. 47. City training schools for teachers. Frank A. Manny.
 No. 48. The educational museum of the St. Louis public schools. C. G. Rathman.
 No. 49. Efficiency and preparation of rural school teachers. H. W. Foght.
 No. 50. Statistics of State universities and State colleges.

1915.

- No. 1. Cooking in the vocational school. Iris P. O'Leary.
 No. 2. Monthly record of current educational publications, January, 1915.
 No. 3. Monthly record of current educational publications, February, 1915.
 No. 4. The health of school children. W. H. Heck.
 No. 5. Organization of State departments of education. A. C. Monahan.
 No. 6. Study of colleges and high schools.
 No. 7. Accredited secondary schools in the United States. Samuel P. Capen.