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The analysis of the methodologies used by scholars focuses on the subject of workplace bias. Workplace bias can be defined as the attribute of treating employees differently because of their racial, age, gender, religious, and socioeconomic differences. Scholarly research studies have been conducted on the topic of workplace bias with the objectives of determining the causes of bias and strategies that can be used to mitigate workplace bias. The victims of workplace bias suffer both psychological and physical impacts which have been portrayed by different scholars. The analysis of methodology focuses on the type of methodology used and the similarities and differences between the methodology of the research studies.

Andrews (2015) conducted a research study that was published at the 60th Annual Conference of the American Association for Public Opinion Research. The research study incorporated a quantitative research design to collect data about workplace bias among government employees. The methodology used surveys and questionnaires as the method of data collection. Open-ended questionnaires were administered to a sample population of 1300 respondents who were selected randomly. The use of a large sample size allowed the researcher to incorporate the different demographics who are exposed to workplace bias. The different demographics included gender, age, ethnicity, race, political and religious affiliations.

The Journal of Organizational Research Methods also conducted a similar research study as that conducted by Andrew (2015). The research study conducted by Poncheri et al. (2018) focuses on determining how negative bias is portrayed during employee surveys. A significant similarity between this research study and the one conducted by Andrews (2015) is that both studies incorporated the use of quantitative research design. Quantitative research is critical in conducting research that presents the findings in numerical format. The research study focuses on collecting quantitative data on employees who provide survey comments in the organization. The researchers of the study used a sample population of about 660 respondents. The sample used in this research is relatively smaller than the one used by Andrews (2015) who used 1300 respondents. The size of the sample population is, therefore, a key difference portrayed by the two research methodologies. Andrews (2015) uses a sample size of 1300 respondents which is almost double the size of the sample population used by Poncheri et al. (2018). The research study conducted by Andrews (2015) therefore has a higher probability of depicting the actual characteristics of workplace bias in business organizations.

Claus and Briscoe (2019) conducted a research study on workplace bias that was published by the International Journal of Management Reviews. The research study focuses on the attributes of employee performance management in multinational organizations. According to the researchers, workplace bias affects how employees perform in a business organization. The research study incorporates the use of a qualitative research study. Unlike the quantitative research study which collects numerical data, the qualitative study analyzes the opinions and thoughts of different individuals. The research methodology collected data from secondary sources of literature. The researchers focused on academic and scholarly sources of literature to collect information. The research study used 64 scholarly articles published between 1985 to 2005 to analyze how the scope and attributes of workplace bias have changed from historic perspectives. The research study conducted by Claus and Briscoe (2019) portrays various differences in the research methodologies used by Andrews (2015) and Poncheti et al. (2018). The primary difference is the use of a quantitative research methodology. Unlike the other research studies, Claus and Briscoe did not collect primary data about the topic of workplace bias but relied on the opinions and findings presented by previous scholars.

The Journal of Group Dynamics conducted a research study that focused on the in-group bias. The research study conducted by Terry and Callan (1998) incorporated a qualitative methodology to collect data from the sample population. The sample population was randomly selected from two hospitals that were intended to merge. The sample population comprised about 1,100 respondents in the study including a mixture of high-status employees and relatively low-status employees. The research study collected data through observation and recording the attributes of bias among the employees. The use of observation as a method of data collection portrays a difference in data collection methods used by the other researchers of quantitative research studies. The previous scholars of quantitative research studies used open-ended questionnaires as the method of data collection. However, Terry and Callan (1998) used the attributes of observation to collect data. The use of observation is more valid because it allows the participants to portray their actual character because they do not know that they are being observed. However, there are ethical concerns which are associated with the use of observation. Observation raises the ethical concerns of research because the participants in the study are not asked for their consent to participate in the research. However, the study managed to achieve the research objectives of identifying how bias is manifested in workplace environments.

The study, *Managing environmental challenges: Training as a solution to improve employee green performance* by Pham et al. (2020) used quantitative research methodology. According to Pham et al. 2020, the existing literature has paid little or no attention to the cultural perspective impacts on interrelationships between workers, employee in-role green performance and environment training, and the mediating role of worker end environmental commitment. The researchers carried out a survey and collected data from 301 respondents at hotels in Vietnam. Just like the study carried out by Poncher et al. (2018) and Andrew (2015) this research used quantitative research Pham et al. (2020) used a sample size of 301 respondents which is fewer than the sample size used by Andrew (2015). Consequently, its research methodology differs from the one used by Claus and Briscoe (2019) and the Journal of Group Dynamics. Their research incorporated the qualitative research method which collected data from secondary sources of literature. Also, Terry and Callan (1998) used a sample population size of 1,100 respondents which differs from the one by Pham et al. (2020).
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