

Organizational Uses of the PAQ

The PAQ provides a method for making disciplined inquiry into work activities that are required to make job-related decisions.

“The terms ‘selection procedure,’ ‘test,’ ‘predictor’ and ‘assessment’ are used interchangeably throughout this document...The essential principle in the evaluation of any selection procedure is that evidence be accumulated to support an inference of job-relatedness. Selection procedures are demonstrated to be job-related when evidence supports the accuracy of inferences made from scores on, or evaluations derived from, those procedures with regard to some important aspect of work behavior (e.g., quality or quantity of job performance, performance in training, advancement, tenure, termination or other organizationally pertinent behavior)” (*Principles*, Society for Industrial-Organizational Psychology, pp.3-4).

The *Principles* make it clear that the quality of test validation evidence is of primary importance. The American Psychological Association defines validity as “the degree to which accumulated evidence and theory support interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed users of a test” (AERA et al., 1999, p.194).

The PAQ produces the quality of evidence necessary to calculate compensation rates (Robinson, Wahlstrom & Mecham, 1974; Fiorito, Greer & Dauffenbach, 1986; Madigan, 1985), establish cutoff scores on employment tests (e.g., McCormick, DeNisi, & Shaw, 1979; Shannon, Krause, & Irons, 1982), develop job performance evaluation measures (Ronan, Talbert & Mullet, 1977), identify clusters of jobs that have similar human resource requirements (Taylor, 1978; Taylor & Colbert, 1978), and for a number of other purposes in human resource management. Whenever the PAQ has been tested in court, the side using it has prevailed. Jette & Badley (2002) have made it clear that direct job information is needed to support the contention that a degree of impairment translates directly to work disability. The PAQ produces information required to evaluate work disability, so it has roles in workers’ compensation and other aspects of disability management, including forensic applications (Robinson & Mecham, 1990; Robinson, 2000; Robinson & Jeanneret, 2001; Robinson, 2002).

References

- (AERA) American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association and National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Fiorito, J., Greer C.R. & Dauffenbach, R.C. (1986). Uniformity and variation in occupational earnings determination: Potential sources of incomparable worth. *Journal of Management*, 12, 61-74.

- Jette, A. M. & Badley, E. (2000). Conceptual issues in the measurement of work disability. In N. Mathiowetz & G.S. Wunderlich (Eds.), *Survey Measurement of Work Disability: Summary of a Workshop* (pp. 4-27). Institute of Medicine and National Research Council, Washington DC: National Academy Press. Retrieved February 10, 2004 from http://books.nap.edu/html/work_disability/ch2.html.
- Madigan, R.M. (1985). Comparable worth judgments: A measurement properties analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 70*, 137-147.
- Robinson, D. D. (2000, December). Use of the PAQ to evaluate workers and jobs for control of work disability associated with musculoskeletal disorders. Invited address. In T. J. Armstrong, D. Rempel & R. Rouborn (Program Directors) *Musculoskeletal Disorders and Disabilities in the Workplace: Ergonomic Prevention and Accommodation*. Symposium sponsored by the University of Michigan and University of California Berkeley and San Francisco, San Francisco, CA.
- Robinson, D.D. (2002). Assessing occupational impacts of medical impairment. *The Forensic Examiner, 11*, 23-30.
- Robinson, D. D. & Jeanneret, P. R. (2001, April). Using the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) to Control Work Disability. System demonstration presented at Technology Sunday, Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc., San Diego, CA.
- Robinson, D. D. & Mecham, R. C. (1990). *Occupations potentially appropriate for persons with low back pain*. Poster session presented at the Sixth World Congress on Pain of the International Association for the Study of Pain, Adelaide, S. Australia.
- Robinson, D. D., Wahlstrom, O. W. & Mecham, R. C. (1974). Comparison of job evaluation methods: A "policy capturing" approach using the *Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ)*. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 59*, 633-637.
- Ronan, W.W., Talbert, T.L., & Mullet, G.M. (1977). Prediction of job performance dimensions: Police officers. *Public Personnel Management, 6*, 173-180.
- Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (2003). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (4th ed.). Bowling Green, OH (Author).
- Shannon, R.H., Krause, M., & Irons, R.C. (1982). Attribute requirements for a simulated flight scenario micro-computer test. U.S. Naval Biodynamics Laboratory Report, Jan.; NBDL 82R004.

Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Inc. (2003). *Principles for the Validation and Use of Personnel Selection Procedures* (4th ed.). Bowling Green, OH (Author).

Taylor, L.R. (1978). Empirically derived job families as a foundation for the study of validity generalization: Study I. The construction of job families based on the component and overall dimensions of the PAQ. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 325-340.

Taylor, L.R. & Colbert, G.A. (1978) Empirically derived job families as a foundation for the study of validity generalization: Study II. The construction of job families as a foundation for the study of validity generalization. *Personnel Psychology*, 31, 341–353.