

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Bravo et al.
Methodological considerations
in the study of Perceived
Discrimination at Work: A
Scoping Review Protocol.
Inplasy protocol 202280009.
doi:
10.37766/inplasy2022.8.0009

Received: 02 August 2022

Published: 02 August 2022

Corresponding author:
Gonzalo Bravo

gbravorojas@gmail.com

Author Affiliation:
Facultad de Salud y Ciencias
Sociales, Universidad de las
Américas, Viña del Mar, Chile.

Support: None.

**Review Stage at time of this
submission:** Preliminary
searches.

Conflicts of interest:
None declared.

Methodological considerations in the study of Perceived Discrimination at Work: A Scoping Review Protocol

Bravo, G¹; Arriagada, MF²; Fuentes, A³; Castellucci, HI⁴.

Review question / Objective: How has perceived discrimination been studied in a work context?

Eligibility criteria: Participants: This review will consider those articles that have investigated perceived discrimination by workers and its association with health or occupational outcomes. Concept: The concept that guides this review is "perceived work discrimination". Therefore, those studies where the term "perceived discrimination" is explicitly declared will be included, as well as those studies that do not explicitly declare the term, but through reading the methodology it is possible to verify that the workers were consulted if they felt discriminated against. Context: Only studies in occupational contexts will be included. Therefore, those studies in patients, students or in the general population will be excluded. Included studies will not be limited by sample location. In addition, those studies that are not original articles (reviews, congress presentations, books, etc.) and in languages other than English or Spanish will be excluded.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 02 August 2022 and was last updated on 02 August 2022 (registration number INPLASY202280009).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: How has perceived discrimination been studied in a work context?

Background: Discrimination is a complex concept to address when investigating, due to the multiple characteristics that can be considered during its exploration. It can occur in different domains of life (school, work, etc), it can be perpetrated by

different perpetrators (individuals and institutions), it can involve different ways of expression (verbal, mental and physical) and it can occur at different levels (individual, institutional, regional, national, etc) (1). In addition, discrimination can vary according to its intensity (mild to severe), frequency (chronic, acute or sporadic) and duration (time interval in which discrimination is experienced) (1). When reviewing some definitions of perceived discrimination by different authors, the common minimum is unfair treatment. Ensher et al. use as a definition "the perception of an individual that he receives different or unfair treatment due to his membership in a group" (2). Similarly, Pascoe and Richman consider perceived discrimination as "a behavioral manifestation of a negative attitude, judgment or unfair treatment towards members of a group" (3) and Eric Allen in his review on perceived discrimination and health also highlights which is generally defined as unfair treatment based on the person's social status, which can occur from institutional structures and policies or individual behavior (4). In the workplace, one of the most used definitions in the scientific literature corresponds to that provided by Chung (2001), who defines it as unfair and negative treatment of employees based on individual characteristics that are not related to job performance. (5). Regarding the effects of perceived employment discrimination on workers' health and occupational outcomes, the literature is consistent. This can be seen in the meta-analysis developed by Dhanani and Beus (2018), which confirms that the higher the perceived job discrimination, the higher the job stress, the lower the perceived justice, the lower the job satisfaction, the lower the physical health and the lower the psychological health (6). These authors also indicate that perceived employment discrimination also has the ability to influence the health of workers who observe discrimination (6). One of the great difficulties when investigating perceived discrimination is the way in which discrimination is measured or asked about, since there is no single or objective way to measure it. It will also depend on

whether it is studied as a dependent or independent variable. In the latter case, from an epidemiological perspective, there are two types of measurement to quantify the effects of discrimination on health at the individual level (7). The first corresponds to an indirect measurement. This is the case of those studies that compare a traditionally discriminated group versus a non-discriminated group and then analyze the differences in a certain result. The second corresponds to a direct measurement, in which if people are "measured" or consulted about discrimination through a self-report questionnaire (7). Of these two types of measurement, only the second case allows estimating perceived discrimination. However, the use of self-report questionnaires is associated with a series of difficulties given that there is no consensus on the use of a specific questionnaire or the way in which the query about perceived discrimination should be approached. Some of the challenges imposed by the measurement of perceived discrimination are (4), aspects such as biases attributable to self-reporting (minimization and surveillance), few studies and inconclusive results about the psychometric properties, uncertainty about the number of questions to a more adequate approach and the forms of questions prevent comparison between studies. Added to this is the difference in approaches from the social sciences (emphasis on discrimination based on belonging to a social group) or health sciences (emphasis on unfair treatment based on individual characteristics).

Rationale: Based on our knowledge to date, there is no scoping review that addresses the research question: How has perceived discrimination been studied in a work context? The development of this review is necessary, since it will allow knowing the state of the art from a methodological point of view and guide researchers in future research associated with perceived work discrimination. Also, it will favor the increase in the understanding of this phenomenon, which will translate

into better research in the area and better working conditions for people.

METHODS

Strategy of data synthesis: ("employment Discrimination" OR "workplace perceived discrimination" OR "perceived discrimination" OR "workplace discrimination" OR "Work discrimination" OR "discrimination at work").

Eligibility criteria: Participants: This review will consider those articles that have investigated perceived discrimination by workers and its association with health or occupational outcomes. Concept: The concept that guides this review is "perceived work discrimination". Therefore, those studies where the term "perceived discrimination" is explicitly declared will be included, as well as those studies that do not explicitly declare the term, but through reading the methodology it is possible to verify that the workers were consulted if they felt discriminated against. Context: Only studies in occupational contexts will be included. Therefore, those studies in patients, students or in the general population will be excluded. Included studies will not be limited by sample location. In addition, those studies that are not original articles (reviews, congress presentations, books, etc.) and in languages other than English or Spanish will be excluded.

Source of evidence screening and selection: Information sources - The identification of the primary studies will be carried out by searching the PUBMED, SCOPUS and PSYCINFO databases published between the years 2000 and 2022. Selection of Evidence Sources After the search in each of the databases, all the identified records will be uploaded to the Rayyan web application, where the elimination of duplicate articles and the review of titles and abstracts will be carried out. Before the two researchers begin to review the titles and abstracts, the proposed eligibility criteria will be pilot tested with 3 articles with the aim of resolving any disagreements before

selection. After this, the two researchers will independently review the titles and abstracts, evaluating the eligibility criteria, determining which article will enter the review. If there is any disagreement between the reviewers during title and abstract review or full text review, it will be resolved by discussion with a third reviewer. Search results and exclusion reasons for full-text articles that do not meet the eligibility criteria will be recorded and reported in a PRISMA-ScR flowchart

Data management: Two independent reviewers will extract the data of the articles selected for the panoramic review in a predefined spreadsheet. The predefined template considers the registry based on the recommendation of the Joanna Briggs Institute: author, year of publication, country of origin, objectives, study population and sample size, methods, results and details of these and those related key findings. with the question of this review. However, before data extraction, an extraction trial will be performed, in which two researchers will extract data from the first three articles. Then the extracted results will be compared and changes will be made to the data extraction template, if necessary. Once the data extraction form is obtained, two researchers will proceed to extract the corresponding records of all the articles and they will be compared once they are complete, in case of discrepancies a third researcher will participate.

Reporting results / Analysis of the evidence: Two researchers will independently review the methodological quality of each article using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool.

Presentation of the results: The results will be presented in tables.

Language restriction: Yes, spanish and english.

Country(ies) involved: Chile.

Keywords: perceived discrimination; perceived work discrimination; work discrimination.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Gonzalo Bravo.

Email: gbravorojas@gmail.com

Author 2 - María Fernanda Arriagada.

Email: arriagada.fernanda@gmail.com

Author 3 - Alejandra Fuentes.

Email: alefuentes@uchile.cl

Author 4 - Hector Ignacio Castellucci.

Email: hector.castellucci@uv.cl