

What did you mean in this connection by appropriateness?

Mr. CROWDER. Let me make a general answer and then, if it is desirable, Mr. Modlin, who happened to work on that one, may expand.

There were a great many questions in the CAUSE II application, and they appeared, a number of them, to us to have a very questionable value. We looked at the multiple-choice alternatives, and it was not at all clear what a good answer or a bad answer would be. We were not persuaded that the answer would be discriminating with respect to any legitimate purpose of the question. We debated with the sponsors and in a number of cases they withdrew the questions.

Mr. MODLIN. Let me be specific in an illustration.

One of the questions that was eliminated asked for the definition of the word "pressed" that would be given by "a poor city boy." This was essentially the way the question was asked. One of the major objectives of the entire questionnaire is to identify persons who are familiar with or who came from disadvantaged backgrounds, and the "poor city boy" is at least one way of getting at this.

Three of us were discussing the question and two of us were very dogmatic that we knew the answer, and the third one was dogmatic that he knew the answer, too, except that it was not from his own experience. It was from what experts in the field had told him. We all three had different definitions of the word. So in that case it did not seem appropriate to retain the question, because there could be varying appropriate or correct answers depending on the background, in a geographic sense, of the persons answering the question.

It so happened that one of us was from the South, and another was from the North. Our dogmatic, different answers reflected our different geographic origins. The third one, speaking as the expert in this case, said that "pressed" has an entirely different meaning to a poor city boy.

Mr. ROMNEY. Would this not also fit under the question of clarity of usefulness?

Mr. MODLIN. The question was perfectly clear to all three of us. It would not serve the intended purpose adequately, and therefore one could say that it was deleted because it was not useful, as well as not appropriate.

Mr. ROMNEY. In your discussion I have not yet seen how the element of invasion of a person's privacy becomes a part of the general issue of appropriateness.

Could you comment on whether it is a part of this factor of appropriateness?

Mr. CROWDER. Let me comment on that, Mr. Romney. I think it could be put this way: that the issue of privacy is implicit in very many questions that go beyond impersonal facts that are completely devoid of any such implications of intimacy.

When we identify a question which does have a certain degree of intimacy, we give it a particularly hard look, and the issue then is, is it warranted in this case to ask this intimate question? So that the actual review proceeds in terms of the justification for it, and we end up with a judgment as to whether it is legitimate under these circumstances to pry this deeply into the respondent's affairs; and we may decide that it is or that it is not.

This is somewhat parallel to another issue that is also implicit in a questionnaire, namely, the burden of filling it out. There is some