

Mr. REUSS. I will stipulate your intentions were of the best. What we are concerned with, however, is what methods you did use and what was the quality of elbow grease and brainpower you put into it.

Mr. HORTON. The question I wanted to ask, I thought I understood you to say that this test in 1964, that process was especially designed to favor minority groups. Is this the policy of the Department? And is this—

Mr. WERTS. I don't believe I said favor.

Mr. HORTON. What is the policy?

Mr. WERTS. The policy is to insure that the minority groups, the ethnic groups, have equal opportunities, and we eliminate the kinds of points, which I think the committee has made very effectively, which may tend to stand in the way of equal opportunity.

I would just like to make one final point, if I might.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. WERTS. I made reference to this earlier. I think the policy is clear and the intent is clear, but I am willing to admit, in terms of my own knowledge and experience here today with the committee, that the points of view expressed by the various members have proven very helpful in my education, and I can assure you that the privilege I have had of learning with you this morning will be used to advantage in the proper application of the Secretary's policy.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Werts.

The witness is excused.

(Mr. Werts later submitted the following answers to questions which the special inquiry had posed during the preceding hearing:)

1. *Question.*—Why were personality tests given to applicants for CAUSE I and what benefits or problems came from the use of such a screening device?

*Answer.*—With the expected large number of applicants to CAUSE I, it was thought necessary to use some procedure which would permit selection from the pool of those who passed the cognitive test, since the number of training spaces available was smaller than the expected number who would pass the test. The selection procedures for CAUSE I included a civil service-type cognitive test with a passing point set at the 50th percentile of college graduated Employment Service interviewers. This assured that everyone above that point had sufficient abilities to successfully complete training and to perform well in a Youth Opportunity Center. It was thought that further selection should be geared toward identifying those applicants who would be able to use their intelligence and knowledge appropriately and effectively in work with disadvantaged youth. How people use their abilities and knowledge is an aspect of personality. Therefore, scales were selected which were designed to measure the specific parts of personality which were considered to be relevant to the job.

As it turned out, there was no need for this additional selection device. Everyone who passed the cutoff score on the cognitive test received an invitation to accept training. Furthermore, the specific test was not successful in refining the selection of trainees from among those who had demonstrated sufficient intellectual ability.

2. *Question.*—Describe all tests and questionnaires that will be administered to CAUSE II applicants and trainees, and explain their use, purpose, and by whom they will be administered and evaluated.

*Answer.*—The CAUSE II selection procedures include a 110-item civil service-type cognitive test drafted by the Division of State Merit Systems of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a 124-item application questionnaire. A cutoff score has been established on the cognitive-type test. It is expected that all those who score above the cutoff level will have sufficient intelligence and knowledge to absorb the training successfully so as to perform in the youth opportunity program. Selection from among those who have passed this examination was on the basis of responses to an application questionnaire containing 124 items. These items are the result of an effort to convert a