The Pedagogical Seminary

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/vzps20>

The College Woman's Code of Honor. (A report prepared by the Child-Study Class of Wilson College in 1905.)

Amy E. Tanner

Published online: 13 Jul 2010.

To cite this article: Amy E. Tanner (1906) The College Woman's Code of Honor. (A report prepared by the Child-Study Class of Wilson College in 1905.), The Pedagogical Seminary, 13:1, 104-116, DOI: [10.1080/08919402.1906.9943597](https://doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1906.9943597)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08919402.1906.9943597>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

THE COLLEGE WOMAN'S CODE OF HONOR.

(A report prepared by the Child-Study Class of Wilson College in 1905.)

By AMY E. TANNER.

First of all we wish to express our thanks to the college instructors and students by whose aid this report has been made possible. The courtesy and promptness in the responses of the instructors to our letters of inquiry, and the carefulness of the students in answering the questions submitted to them, have put us under deep obligations.

The instructor also wishes especially to acknowledge her indebtedness to the class for the questions and the tables. Any suggestiveness or value that the questions have is due to the fact that they reflect problems which were actually confronting the students at the time and which an instructor usually finds difficulty in viewing from the same standpoint.

In order to get a set of questions which should appeal to the average college woman, each member of the class made out a set bearing upon moral situations with which she herself had been confronted. All the questions were then discussed by the class, and those were selected which bore upon the most common situations and to which the answer was the most doubtful.

The set, as finally issued, was as follows:

THE COLLEGE CODE OF HONOR.

1. Age in years and months.
2. If the conductor neglected to take your fare, would you keep the money? Why?
3. Would you tell your teacher beforehand that your lesson was not prepared or run the risk of being called on? Why?
If partially prepared, would you bluff if called on? Why?
- 4.¹ Would you purposely avoid in class or in examination a girl whom you thought would cheat, in order not to have to report her? Why?
5. Would you exaggerate to add interest to conversation, or tell white lies to save people's feelings? Why?
6. Would you take another's plot in developing a supposedly original story? Why?
7. Is it wrong to tell a credulous girl harmless but outlandish and untrue stories? Why?
8. Is it honorable to use a pony, *i. e.*, an interlinear translation, in preparing a lesson? Why?

¹ This question is to be omitted in the colleges where the honor system is not in operation.

9. If you accidentally saw on your neighbor's examination paper one point which would enable you to solve a whole problem, would you use it? Why?

10. Would you allow a person to have an ungrounded favorable opinion of you? Why?

11. Which is more honorable, to cheat openly or secretly? Why?

Returns were received from the following colleges and universities: Bryn Mawr, Vassar, Smith, Holyoke, Woman's College of Baltimore, Swarthmore, Oberlin, Northwestern, Chicago, Butler, Wisconsin and Wilson. The totals were, from Wilson, 114 papers, from all other women's colleges, 163; from coeducational institutions, 163, making a total of 440 papers. This gave us a basis for comparing the large women's colleges with a small one and the women's colleges with the coeducational institutions. The ages varied from 16 to 24 years, with most of them between 18 and 22 years.

Before taking up the returns a few statements as to the character of the questions will not be out of place. We would say first that we were not aiming to discover whether the average college woman is honest in the more common ways. We took it for granted that she does not steal nor does she often lie about important matters. What we attempted to find out was, rather, what she does in cases when a somewhat finer point of morality is involved, and especially when conflicting motives meet. We were trying to find what may be called the growing point of the moral sense, the point where there is considerable difference of opinion as to the right thing.

We would also forestall some possible objections as to the sincerity of the answers. In one or two cases when a request for assistance was made of another college, the instructor wrote that he feared that the returns would not be valuable, because the students would consider the questions too personal to be willing to answer them sincerely. But our experience in Wilson and the internal evidence of the papers from other colleges do not seem to justify this fear. The members of the class, students themselves and mingling with the other students constantly, are convinced that in the majority of cases the students answered the questions with care and sincerity. We feel sure that a few insincere answers crept in and a few careless ones, but so few that they do not invalidate the totals and are not more numerous than in any Child-Study investigation.

On the other hand, it is altogether probable that careless students and students who knew that their standards were lower than those of the average would not fill out the blanks, and so we should not be surprised if these answers gave a slightly higher standard than would be shown if honest answers could be obtained from every member of all the colleges concerned. But even if we grant this, the papers do not lose their

value, because they show the trend of the college ideal and the dominating note of the college.

Finally, no one could read the papers for any length of time without becoming convinced of the undertone of earnestness and sincerity, the attempt to distinguish the idea of the right from the probable yielding to the wrong under temptation, in short, of the genuine endeavor to give a just valuation of the moral self.

In making out the questions we usually stated them in terms of what the student would do rather than in terms of what she thought right, hoping thus to get a record of facts rather than of theories. In making out the tables, we altered Question 7 to read "Is it right to tell a credulous girl harmless but outlandish and untrue stories?" We did this in order to make the answer parallel those of the other questions, since it thus brings the "right" and "wrong" answers into the same columns as they occupy in the other tables.

We also found that Question 11 should have been worded "less dishonorable" instead of "more honorable." Otherwise there was no difficulty in understanding the answers.

Let us now consider the returns themselves.

Question 2. If the conductor neglected to take your fare would you keep the money?

Of the total answers to this question 46% were affirmative, 51% negative and in 3% of the papers the question remained unanswered. The reasons given for affirmative answers were: conductor's business to collect fare, 17%; if returned might cause conductor's discharge, 10%; might embarrass conductor, 7%; need it more than company, 4%; too much trouble to find conductor, 4%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 4%.

Reasons for negative answers were:—Dishonest, 24%; due to the company, 14%; would hurt conscience, 3%; wrong, 2%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 1%.

About the same number would keep the money as would return it. Of those who would keep it, 17% would do so because it is the business of the conductor to collect and, presumably, not theirs to remind him of his duty. But 17% more would keep it because returning it would injure the conductor in some way. In this class, pity for the conductor takes precedence of the company's right to recompense. An impecunious few think that they need the money more than the company, and a few others, who have evidently been embittered by many experiences, say that it is one chance to get even for poor services or inability to get transfers.

Question 3 (a). If unprepared would you tell the teacher beforehand or run the risk of being called on?

The answers to this question fall into three classes.)1.)

Those who would run the risk, 50%; (2) those who would state beforehand that they were unprepared, 15%; and (3) conditional answers, 32%. 3% of the papers left the question unanswered.

Under the first class the reasons given were: for sake of the mark, 12%; hate to ask teacher, 8%; no question of honor, 5%; chances good, 5%; teacher's duty to find out, 4%; save making up lesson, 3%; foolish to tell, 2%; preparation not expected of all, 2%; miscellaneous, 4%; no reason, 5%.

Under the second class reasons given were: it would be honest, 5%; it would be a comfort, 4%; mark, 2%; better opinion of the professor, 2%; miscellaneous, 2%.

Those who would tell conditionally give the following limitations: depends on excuse, 11%; depends on teacher, 10%; depends on the subject, 3%; depends on amount of preparation, 2%; depends on the chance to escape, 1%; miscellaneous, 4%; unanswered, 3%.

Question 3 (b). If partially prepared, would you bluff if called on?

67% of the answers to this question were affirmative, 22% negative and 4% conditional. 6% left the question unanswered. Reasons given for the affirmative answers were: make effort and run chances of getting it right, 14%; to get credit, 10%; trains the reason, 10%; tests general knowledge, 4%; teacher is able to judge lesson, 4%; not dishonorable to recite one's own thought, 3%; make good impression, 3%; tests general knowledge and trains reason, 3%; shows cleverness, 1%; deserve credit for some work, 1%; miscellaneous, 6%; indefinite, 8%.

Negative reasons were: cannot bluff, 8%; dishonorable, 5%; wastes time, 2%; foolish, gains nothing, 1%; miscellaneous, 1%; indefinite, 5%.

Conditional reasons were: depends on how much I know, 2%; circumstances, 1%; miscellaneous, 1%; indefinite, 0%. unanswered, 6%.

One-half of these students would take their chances of being called on if they were unprepared, while 67% would "bluff" if partially prepared. In the first case, 31% would tell the instructor, if they had a good excuse, or if the instructor expected such explanations or was, shall we say, "easy?" Only 14% would tell under any conditions, and of that number only 5% would do so because it is honest. The rest wish to make sure of not failing in recitation, or to save themselves the worry of the suspense. Most of those who would not "bluff," confess frankly that they lack ability, not inclination.

Those who would take their chances of failing and "bluffing" seem, on the whole, to look upon the recitation as a contest of

wits in which it is the teacher's business to find out the student's ignorance and the student's to conceal it. The student is justified in making a good show, and the instructor, presumably, in piercing below this show to the reality. It is not dishonorable, they say, to give one's own thoughts. It trains the reason to think out an original answer, it shows cleverness to make up an acceptable answer, and in all cases the student ought to get credit. Furthermore there is the idea that it is silly to tell, that it is making a fuss over nothing and being conscientious to the point of foolishness. There is also an element of excitement in the other that appeals to the adventurous mind.

Question 4. Would you purposely avoid in class or in examinations a girl whom you thought would cheat, in order not to have to report her?

64% of the total number answered this question in the affirmative and 32% in the negative. Unanswered, 4%.

Affirmative reasons were: dishonorable or hard, 29%; hurts the girl and gets her ill will, 13%; keeps self from chance of helping her, 5%; moral cowardice, 2%; miscellaneous, 11%; no reasons, 5%.

Negative reasons were: supports the honor system, 17%; right to report her, 7%; miscellaneous, 5%; no reasons, 3%.

This question needs some especial explanation. By the honor system is meant such a method of conducting recitations and examinations that the students are made responsible for preventing cheating. As conducted at Princeton and as introduced here, this is done through the medium of a Students' Committee, consisting of students from the different classes. All the students agree that if they see any cheating done they will report it to this committee, which then will examine into the case and, if necessary, recommend a penalty to the faculty. In conducting examinations, then, the instructor gives out the questions and leaves the class to itself.

When it was first proposed to introduce the system here, there was much discussion on whether the students would appreciate the necessity of reporting enough to do so if necessary. It was known that cheating had gone on somewhat in the past—nobody knew just how much—and it was felt that unless some students realized that the others would expose them in their wrong doing, they would only cheat more under the honor system than before. The point was therefore made repeatedly that it was a social obligation for a girl not only to refrain from cheating herself but to prevent others by all possible means and, if necessary, by reporting cheating.

The principal argument brought against such reporting was that it is contemptible to tell tales. The answer made to this

repeatedly was that under Faculty government, when the reporter assumes more or less the profession of a spy, tattling deserves all the contempt that it gets, but that under a democracy, such as student government is, each member of the college must be responsible for preventing wrong doing, if the government itself is to stand. Of course the comparison was constantly made between this and the duty of a good citizen to prevent a crime.

The table shows the result of this discussion very plainly. Of the 114 Wilson students, 52% would not avoid the suspicious character, as against 16% of the 75 Bryn Mawr students and none from other institutions. We should say, at this point, that the honor system is not in operation in these institutions and the answers are scattering ones given by students who did not understand that the answer was not called for. They have proved interesting, however, as showing the different conceptions of the student's duty to others when he governs himself and when he is governed by others.

Of the Wilson students, then, 52% stood ready to support the honor system to the extent of reporting a girl if they saw her cheating. Most of the 47% who would evade their responsibility are still giving the old reason that it is contemptible to tell tales, even if it is the only way to prevent wrong doing.

Question 5 (a). Would you exaggerate to add interest to conversation?

To this question there were 50% affirmative answers, 42% negative and 8% of the papers left the question unanswered.

Reasons for affirmative answers were: causes amusement, 23%; tends to social comfort, 4%; natural to do so, 6%; justifiable, 1%; allowances always made, 2%; approved by rhetoric, 2%; miscellaneous, 4%; no reason, 8%.

Reasons given for negative answers were: leads to lying, 16%; unnecessary, 5%; truth always best, $\frac{2}{3}$ %; miscellaneous, 4%; no reason, 16%.

Question 5 (b). Would you tell white lies to save people's feelings?

To this question there were 65% affirmative and 21% negative answers. Unanswered, 15%.

Affirmative reasons were: causes happiness, 21%; increases social comfort, 8%; sense of pity, 11%; harmless, 5%; natural, 3%; justifiable, 4%; duty, 5%; desire for popularity, 1%; miscellaneous, 6%.

Negative reasons were: tends to lying, 8%; unnecessary, 4%; truth always best, $\frac{1}{10}$ %; a lie is a LIE, 3%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 3%.

One of the interesting things about this question is the dif-

ference in the answers to the two parts of it. Whereas 42% would not intentionally exaggerate, only 21% would not tell white lies. That is, only one-half as many would try not to lie as would try not to exaggerate.

The difference is explained by the reasons given. The lie is excused because it leads to greater happiness while the exaggeration is condemned because it leads to lying pure and simple. When excused, the reason is much the same as for the white lie, that is, that it leads to greater social comfort in the way of amusement or happiness. The reason for telling the white lie is, almost without exception, a social one.

Some of the miscellaneous answers throw interesting side lights on the workings of the college woman's mind. Some say that the white lie is Christlike, that love is of more value than truth. Others assert that the truth should be treated in a broad minded way, or that there is a tacit social understanding that some deception is allowable. Others condone it on the ground that bluntness is stupid, while still others lament that they cannot lie without being discovered.

Altogether, it is interesting to know that 65% of the students with whom we deal are sufficiently solicitous of our feelings to tell us white lies, while 50% appreciate a good story enough to invent telling points as they narrate.

Question 6. Would you take another's plot in developing a supposedly original story?

11% of the answers were affirmative, 87% negative, and 3% left the question unanswered.

Those answering in the affirmative gave as reasons: there is no original plot though it may have original treatment, 9%; great writers do, 2%.

Reasons for negative were: It is dishonorable, 77%; prefer own plot, 7%; miscellaneous, 1%; no reason, 1%.

This question calls for little comment, as the answers are nearly all agreed. The interesting thing in it is the attempt of those who would use the plot to line themselves up with Shakespeare. To them a closer study of his characters and the way in which he used the material of others are recommended.

Question 7. Is it right to tell a credulous girl harmless but outlandish and untrue stories?

37% would and 53% would not do this, while 10% did not answer the question.

The reasons for telling such stories were: teaches the girl to be less credulous, 18%; not wrong if she is told afterward, 10%; not wrong if done merely for amusement, 3%; does no harm, 4%; miscellaneous, 3%; no reason, 1%.

Reasons against telling such stories were: dishonest, 25%;

makes girl ridiculous or hurts her, 5%; effect on credulous girl unfair to her, 5%; wrong principle to follow, 2%; amusing but wrong, $\frac{3}{4}$ %; teaches the girl falsity, $\frac{3}{4}$ %; makes her more credulous, 3%; harms her, 6%; miscellaneous, 3%; no reason, 3%.

The credulous girl does not fare so badly as we had thought that she would. Only 36% think it right to "jolly" her as against 52% who think it wrong. Even with this 36%, the real motive in half of the cases, that is with 18%, is solicitude for the girl. They are only trying to teach her to be less credulous and so better able to fight the world. They are almost as solicitous for her welfare as the girls who would not tell her stories, for of the latter class only 19% consider the effect on the girl, while 27% are thinking of their own soul's salvation. From this point of view, the girls who would "do" the credulous one appear as in truth self-sacrificing individuals who would run the risk of becoming dishonest in order to serve a fellow mortal. It sets them beside those who tell white lies to save people's feelings and exaggerate to contribute to the gayety of society.

Question 8. Is it honorable to use a pony, *i. e.*, an inter-linear translation, in preparing a lesson?

21% of the students answering this question said yes, 48% no, and 28% gave a conditional answer. 3% did not answer.

The reasons given for the affirmative were: if used after preparation gives careful translation, 8%; saves time and work, 3%; gives run of story, 2%; harms no one but self, 1%; same as notes in book, 4%; miscellaneous, 1%; indefinite, 2%.

Reasons for negative answers: deception in some form, 15%; weakens one's ability, 12%; gets credit for work not done, 10%; unfair to rest of class, 8%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 1%.

Conditional answers: depends on attitude of teacher, 20%; depends on way translation is used, 4%; depends on advancement of pupil, 2%; miscellaneous, 2%.

Only 48% condemn the use of a pony unconditionally, 28% would use it under certain conditions, and 20% justify its use generally. Most of those who condemn it do so because it involves some sort of deception or unfairness, while only 12% realize the weakening effect upon the student. Most of the conditional answers vary with the attitude of the instructor, thus implying again that the harm in the use lies in its dishonesty or unfairness.

Question 9. If you accidentally saw on your neighbor's examination paper one point which would enable you to solve a whole problem would you use it?

There were 25% who answered this question in the affirma-

tive, 56% in the negative and 14% gave indefinite answers. Unanswered 5%. Reasons for affirmative answer: would have thought of point later, 9%; not truly ignorant, 6%; fear failure, or low mark, 4%; seen unintentionally and no dishonesty involved, 1%; would use it and tell instructor of the predicament, 2%; could not resist temptation, 1%; miscellaneous, 8%.

Reasons for negative answer: dishonest, 30%; dishonorable, 16%; hurt conscience, 3%; respect for honor system, 1%; resistance strengthens self, 1%; no possibility of seeing a point accidentally, 1%; miscellaneous, 3%; no reason, 3%.

Indefinite answers: would probably use it, 3%; would probably not use it, 2%; would avoid seeing the paper, 2%; never in such a position, 2%; uncertain, 1%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 1%.

One-fourth of the students confess frankly that they would use a point seen accidentally, and 14% give indefinite answers. The reasons given are especially interesting, because they involve some psychological subtleties. Out of this 25%, 14% consider themselves really entitled to the point either because it is not fair that they should get zero on the question when they know most of it, or because they are sure that they would have thought of it later, or because they had once known it and are failing only in memory, not in application or in reasoning power.

Some admit frankly that they are afraid of failure or cannot resist temptation, but on the whole those who would use the point seem to be somewhat given over to questions of casuistry.

The great majority of those who condemn the point, on the other hand, do it simply on the ground that it is dishonest, without going into any subtleties of analysis.

It would be interesting to know how many of the answers to this question refer to actual experiences. In the cases that have come under observation, the temptation has usually been too strong.

Question 10. Would you allow a person to have an ungrounded favorable opinion of you?

Of the answers to this question, 54% were affirmative, 33% negative and 12% conditional. Only 1% left the question unanswered.

Reasons for affirmative answer: it is an incentive, 13%; vanity, 9%; not responsible, 7%; difficulty in explaining, 5%; truth will out later, 4%; balance the unfavorable opinions, 2%; not harmful, 3%; miscellaneous, 4%; no reason, 7%.

Reasons for negative answer: deception, 11%; truth will be discovered and a still worse opinion formed, 6%; desire to be

known as true self, 4%; would feel uncomfortable, 5%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 6%.

Reasons for conditional answer: depends on the person, 3%; depends on the importance of the opinion, 3%; uncertain, 3%; miscellaneous, 11%.

The fact that 54% would not remove an ungrounded favorable opinion, as against 33% who would, shows once more the essentially social nature of the college woman. The good opinion would serve as an ideal to strive for, for 12%, and would gratify the vanity of 9% while it would make 5% uncomfortable, who yet could not remove it without creating a most embarrassing position.

The miscellaneous opinions here bring out all kinds of views. Some think that this opinion would only balance other unfavorable opinions; others hint that they are never sure what the opinion really is; still others, that their judgment of themselves ought not to be preferred to that of others, that those others have a right to their own opinions, or that it is unkind to enlighten them!

Deception is the leading reason for not allowing the opinion to remain, while fear of discovery and a consequent worse opinion comes second. One student is so ingenious as to observe that if you maintain that you are not worthy of so high an opinion, the person will form a still higher one!

Question 11. Which is more honorable, to cheat openly or secretly?

In replying to this question 67% considered it more honorable to cheat openly, 5% to cheat secretly and 27% considered either form equally bad. There were $\frac{4}{5}$ % ambiguous answers and $\frac{3}{5}$ % left the question unanswered.

Reasons for preference for open cheating: less deceitful, 37%; less dishonest not to attempt concealment, 13%; risk of punishment, 6%; braver, 2%; miscellaneous, 2%; no reason, 5%.

Reasons for preference for secret cheating: does not set bad example, 1%; less bravado, 1%; less deceitful, 1%; miscellaneous, $\frac{1}{10}$ %.

Open and secret cheating are considered equally bad by 27% of the students, and open cheating more honorable than secret by 67%. By far most of the reasons assigned for this view are that it is less deceitful. The girl runs the risk of punishment then and is braver than if she cheats secretly.

Those who prefer secret cheating do so because it does not set a bad example or shows less boldness, but they are in a hopeless minority, amounting in all to only 5%.

This point of view is interesting to the instructor, as he is likely to be especially irritated by the open cheater, whereas

the moral sense of his students would not condemn her as much as it would the secret one. Perhaps this explains to some extent why a girl who seems to have a somewhat obtuse moral sense is sometimes popular even with girls who do not approve her acts. They know that she does wrong, but, since she makes no secret of her sins, they think that she gets even more condemnation than is due her.

COMPARATIVE TABLE OF TOTALS.

Question	AFFIRMATIVE.			NEGATIVE.			CONDITIONAL.		
	Wilson	Other Women's Col'ges	Co-educational	Wilson	Other Women's Col'ges	Co-educational	Wilson	Other Women's Col'ges	Co-educational
No. 2	34%	53%	48%	60%	43%	52%			
* 3A	64"	54"	34"	11"	13"	16"	23%	23%	42%
3B	71"	72"	59"	18"	18"	30"		6"	2"
4	47"	72"	95"	53"	16"	5"			
5A	60"	53"	42"	35"	35"	51"			
5B	68"	70"	56"	16"	14"	30"			
6	6"	6"	18"	94"	91"	77"			
7	25"	40"	41"	56"	59"	45"			
8	31"	21"	13"	54"	44"	46"	10"	32"	37"
9	22"	18"	33"	53"	70"	44"	16"	8"	18"
10	62"	58"	45"	26"	30"	41"	14"	9"	14"
† 11	2"	4"	0	66"	10"	68"	29"	29"	19"

Actual numbers on which the table is based: Wilson College, 114 replies; other Women's Colleges, 163 replies; Co-educational Institutions, 163 replies.

* The affirmative answers indicate those who would run the risk; negative, those who would tell.

† The affirmative answers indicate those who would cheat secretly; negative, openly; conditional, equal condemnation.

Let us now compare the coeducational colleges with the women's, and the larger women's colleges with the smaller.

There are practically no differences between the larger women's colleges and the smaller one except in Questions 2, 4 and 7. In these cases the standard of the small college is higher. In Question 2, the difference is possibly due to the fact that, as there is but one short car line here, the Wilson students have been left with more tender consciences than those from the other colleges, most of which are situated in or

near places of some size. The class, however, has little confidence in this inference. The differences in Questions 4 and 7 are probably due to the fact that previous to the answering of these questions, the subjects had been rather fully discussed throughout the college. Probably on this account all of the returns are somewhat higher in their standard than they would have been if collected four months earlier.

In comparing the coeducational with the women's colleges, we find some noticeable differences. Contrary to the general opinion, a much larger per cent. of women in the women's colleges would run the risk of being called on if unprepared than would in the coeducational institutions, and a noticeably larger per cent. would "bluff."

Questions 5 and 10 should also be grouped with Question 3, as much the same state of mind seems to be involved in all cases. The girl who would run the risk of being called on, who would "bluff" if called on, and who would rest upon an unearned reputation, would probably be the girl who would enjoy exaggerating and who would hardly be troubled by a white lie. At least the per cents for all these points are curiously alike in the women's colleges and are considerably larger than those from the coeducational institutions. In the matter of using a "pony" the women's colleges are also less sensitive than the coeducational, while the reverse is the case in regard to using a point accidentally seen.

There are but two things which are almost universally condemned by all the colleges, that is, using another's plot and cheating secretly.

In the matter of keeping the carfare, using the "pony," using the point accidentally seen and deceiving the credulous girl, unqualified condemnation comes from about 50% of all the colleges, with considerable numbers doubtful as to what they would do under varying conditions.

The things which are the least condemned are "bluffing" in its two forms of exaggerating and telling white lies, and accepting an unduly favorable opinion. In all these cases the social purpose of the deception and the feeling that the person deceived is more or less at fault for believing everything that he hears, play a large factor in the justification.

In conclusion, then, from the comparative table the college girl appears to be a person with a thoroughgoing contempt for sneaking and out and out lying but with sufficient intelligence and sense of humor in most cases to enjoy any sort of contest with wits even though she risks her scholarly reputation thereby.

Socially she is, on the whole, warm hearted enough to sacrifice the truth in small matters to the demands of friendship and

courtesy, but rarely has she sufficient social sense to undertake the punishment of a wrong doer. She has not yet, except in a few cases, come to believe that the social demand and the demand for truth can both be satisfied as a rule by the exercise of her wits, that is by the cultivation of tact.

Contrary to a somewhat widespread impression, she has few moral finickings. Like the rest of mankind, she is likely to use any available means to attain a much desired end.

Still, even in the cases where she is below the average in her standards, the frank, almost naïve admissions and the reasons given for the views, seem to indicate that these girls, at least, are more undeveloped than bad or were trained in surroundings where success was accounted the right.

To the college instructor the investigation is very suggestive. It would seem that there is practically no danger of deliberate cheating if he leaves the class during an examination, with the understanding that the students are upon their honor, but it is rather dismaying to learn that 20% of all the students are likely to use "ponies" under any conditions, and that 25% would use a point seen accidentally.

It is difficult if not impossible to get rid of the use of the "pony" except by raising the whole moral tone of the college, but the temptation to use the point accidentally seen is more easily handled. Students will usually adopt the suggestion to put a seat between them and their neighbors, and the experience here has been that the students do it without suggestion. If there are not seats enough to allow this, the instructor can usually warn the students beforehand of the psychological subtleties that they will fall into if they do see a point accidentally. College girls are quite open to this sort of appeal because they have imagination enough to appreciate the possible situations.

On the other hand, alas for the unwary instructor who assumes that the average girl believes that she is prepared because she attempts to recite! He is, as the girls say, "easy." His lessons will be the first ones to be neglected when a stress of work comes, his references will be the most hastily read, his articles or themes will never be in on time, because he never allows for the element of humor, exaggeration or bluff in the excuses presented.

But he must also avoid the extreme of considering the college girl as a deep dyed villain because she occasionally wriggles the truth somewhat violently in her attempt to get the better of a difficult situation. Truth, to be sure, is not by nature sinuous, but neither is social morality rigid, and only an appreciation of the latter fact, combined with a sense of humor and at least a rudimentary ability to read human nature, will save the situation for the instructor. A college girl