

Title: How can Organisations Support and Maximise the Contributions of Neurodiverse Employees?: A Conceptual Model

ABSTRACT

Neurodiversity is envisaged to benefit organizations by contributing to outcomes such as quality and innovation. However, existing organisational efforts to manage diversity, otherwise successful, may not be fungible within the context of neurodiversity. Drawing on climate theory for inclusion, this conceptual paper aims to develop a dynamic, multilevel model that enables organizations to effectively manage and optimize the performance of both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees using more discerning practices. In doing so, we unpack and finesse the implications of neurodiversity at micro, dyadic, meso and macro levels. We further provide new insights and create a new trajectory of research in organisational justice literature by exploring and integrating the perception of fairness by neurodiverse and neurotypical employees, and how these have affective and cognitive consequences. Our conceptual model serves as an initial framework to inform and guide future research.

Keywords: Neurodiversity, Diversity management practices, Strategic diversity leader, organisational justice

INTRODUCTION

Neurodiversity refers to the differences in the way the human brain functions, i.e. 'neurocognitive functioning' (Walker, 2014), and has been shown to benefit organisations by contributing to outcomes such as quality (e.g. reduced rework: Austin & Pisano, 2017), and innovation and entrepreneurship (Moore, McIntyre, & Lanivich, 2019). As a form of *hidden inequality*, neurodiversity is increasingly becoming important for all organisations (c.f. Roberson, Quigley, Vickers & Bruck, 2021). Despite this, little is known about how the consideration of neurodiverse employees introduces challenges and hence requires modifications to existing organisational diversity and inclusion efforts. We argue that prevailing human resource management (HRM) and diversity management (DM) practices are not fungible in the context of neurodiversity, and are not adequately designed to promote the unique capabilities and skills that neurodiverse employees bring to their organisations (cf. Martín-Alcazar, Romero-Fernandez & Sanchez-Gardey, 2012). For example, while many best practices of DM that emphasise integration through teamwork, unitary cultural values and equality amongst employees are pivotal and morally appropriate, these practices may not be as effective for neurodiverse individuals as they are for diversity based on visible characteristics such as gender and race, and other invisible characteristics such as religion and sexual orientation (Muskat, 2017). We argue that managing neurodiversity requires questioning many taken-for-granted principles of DM practices.

First, neurodiverse individuals on the autistic spectrum disorder, for example, may prefer and work better when they are alone. The notion of working in teams, though useful in other contexts, may be counterproductive for some neurodiverse individuals. Neurodiverse employees may work better in loose groups rather than close-knit teams (Sumner & Brown, 2015). Second, while organisational cultures (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011) may typically underlie how effectively an organisation operates, neurodiversity means that such unitary

views of organisational cultures may not be effectual. This can be in conflict with organisational initiatives to increase neurodiversity. Rather than organisational culture, a priority may be focusing on cultivating an organisational climate for inclusion (Li, Perera, Kulik & Metz, 2019) which allows neurodiverse employees to feel that they are being enabled and empowered. Finally, equality is clearly fundamental, ethically, morally and legally. Nonetheless, many neurodiverse individuals have unique needs, and there are many circumstances in which they have to be supported differently, which may be to the chagrin of their neurotypical colleagues (Richards, Sang, Marks, & Gill, 2019). Therefore, equitability becomes as crucial as equality, but such tensions are not easy to address, and organisations may be ill-equipped to deal with this if they use existing DM practices (Stewart & Harte, 2010).

Consequently, this paper proposes a new conceptual model (Cropanzano, 2009) involving DM practices that enable organisations to effectively manage and optimise the performance of both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. We argue that for organisational scholarship to move forward, we need to first understand which HRM/DM practices promote neurodiversity within organisations. There is also an imperative to explore the unique role played by strategic leaders in framing and symbolising these practices. Finally, we highlight the relevance of organisational justice as an important boundary condition wherein both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees can thrive. We therefore seek to address the following overarching research question: *how can organisations maximise the contribution of neurodiverse employees?* More specifically, we address the following research questions:

1. What are the key factors that organisations need to consider in their DM practices to more effectively manage neurodiversity?
2. What role can strategic diversity leaders play to effectively integrate neurodiverse employees and enable them to better perform their jobs?

3. How can organisations address ethical tensions that could arise in managing the needs of neurodiverse and neurotypical employees simultaneously?

Overall, our conceptual paper proposes new theoretical relationships and contributes to the literature in the following ways. First, we explore a dimension of diversity (i.e., neurodiversity) which has received very little attention in management research. We respond to recent calls by scholars such as Kollen (2021); Nkomo, Bell, Roberts, Joshi and Thatcher (2019) for new, more sophisticated theorising within the diversity field. Interestingly, a recent review by Triana, Gu, Chapa, Richard and Colella (2021) of diversity research does not mention neurodiversity as a specific focus of diversity research. Thus, this study is timely in suggesting a conceptual model with a specific focus on neurodiversity.

Second, through the lens of climate for inclusion, we develop a dynamic, multi-level conceptual model (see Figure 1) with a primary goal to enrich our theoretical understanding of boundary conditions and mechanisms through which organisations can achieve positive outcomes for and from both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. Specifically, we explicate the concept of strategic diversity leadership as a key moderating variable that influences how equitable and inclusive DM practices are developed and implemented (Shore & Chung, 2021). We extend DM theorising by proposing how strategic diversity leaders tasked with the responsibility of framing, symbolising and implementing DM practices can champion and foster inclusion and fairness (Ng & Sears, 2020). We further extend existing understanding by proffering organisational justice (fairness) and affective and cognitive consequences, as pivotal intervening constructs through which positive, long-term outcomes can be achieved. We highlight the beneficial effects a focus on ethical and social justice discourse in exploring DM practices can have for neurodiverse and neurotypical employees.

Finally, DM practice research has mainly focused on examining how organisations can implement practices that are beneficial for demographically diverse individuals within

categories such as race/ ethnicity, gender, age and religion, e.g. Guillaume, Dawson, Otaye-Ebede, Woods, and West (2017); Nishii, Khattab, Shemla and Paluch (2018); Otaye-Ebede (2018). While this line of research is substantively relevant, and has set a parameter for the effective management of diverse employees, there has been limited focus on how these DM practices are effective in managing neurodiverse employees who may experience hidden inequalities. Neurodivergent employees are unique in their thinking and approach to work, and as such, traditional DM practices might not be entirely suitable to ensure inclusivity of this sub-category of diversity. Through our research, we, therefore, explore existing HR/DM practices to understand if and in what conditions they aid or deter the effectiveness and efficiency of neurodivergent employees. Previous research, e.g., Loon, Otaye-Ebede and Stewart (2019), has noted the paradoxical nature of human resource (HR) practices that complement or compete with practices that enhance wellbeing. Similarly, our review and conceptual model provides new insight into DM practices that are relevant to enhancing the performance of neurodiverse and neurotypical employees.

THEORY, LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL MODEL

DEVELOPMENT

Climate for Inclusion Theory

Drawing on climate for inclusion theory (Nishii, 2013), we offer a novel evaluation of the existing HR/DM practices to understand if and in what conditions they aid or deter the effectiveness and efficiency of neurodivergent employees. Shore, Randel, Chung, Dean, Holcombe Ehrhart and Singh (2011) define inclusion as “the degree to which an employee perceives that he or she is an esteemed member of the work group through experiencing treatment that satisfies his or her needs for belongingness and uniqueness” (p. 1265). Therefore, inclusion is a critical component in creating an organisational climate where employees’ need for belongingness and uniqueness are satisfied. Concurrently, inclusion climate refers to “the

extent to which employees collectively perceive that their organisation values diversity, gives employees from all identity groups equal access to organisational resources, and creates opportunities to establish networks within a diverse workforce” (Li et al., 2019. p. 356). We therefore argue that the climate within an organisation has a strong influence on employees’ perception and behaviour and how they perceive organisations policies, procedures and practices (Reichers & Schneider, 1990). Where employees perceive their work environments as fair and inclusive, this signifies organisations support a climate for inclusion (Mor Barak et al., 2016; Nishii, 2013).

We thus develop a conceptual model utilising climate for inclusion as a lens through which we can better understand what key factors organisations need to consider to effectively manage neurodiversity. First, we make a distinction between DM practices that actively support inclusion and those practices with less emphasis on promoting an inclusive climate. We proffer that an inclusive climate will play a positive role in encouraging organisation-wide DM practices, which is critical for both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. Second, the model explains the processes through which focusing on an inclusive climate can lead to perception of fairness (O’Connor & Crowley-Henry, 2019), and in turn to lasting positive outcomes. Finally, we argue that espousing inclusion in an organisation requires clear indications of how this will be translated into practice (Mor Barak, Luria & Brimhall, 2021) and requires the support and input of senior leadership. In our model, we propose that as organisational practices are mostly developed and enacted by senior leadership, employees’ perception of an organisation climate for inclusion will require strategic diversity leadership to frame and symbolise these practices. Hence, moderating the relationship between DM practices for neurodiverse and neurotypical employees’ and their perceptions of fairness is crucial in leading to substantive improvements in the workplace.

{Insert Figure 1 here}

Human Resource Management (HRM)/Diversity Management (DM) Practices

Diversity management practices are formalised organisational-level HR practices targeted towards the effective management of a diverse workforce (Yang & Konrad, 2011), and are directly associated with HRM and with the role of HR professionals. This is evident in the work of Bhave, Teo and Dalal (2020) on privacy at work, and that of Marescaux, De Winne, and Brebels (2021) in their examination of HR differentiation that focussed on how HRM supports diverse workforces. Thus, there are clear connections between HRM and DM because HR practices are implicated in DM practices, with the latter being derived from the former practices and led by HRM professionals (Triana et al., 2021).

As noted in a later section, strategic leadership is a requirement of effective DM. Nonetheless, according to the analysis of Krzeminska, Austin, Bruyère and Hedley (2019), current and dominant approaches to Strategic HRM (SHRM) may not be well placed to provide the type of leadership required. This is because SHRM continues to be predicated on a model of organising and managing derived from Taylorist principles, and models of SHRM underpinned by Chandler's principle that structure follows strategy (Krzeminska et al., 2019, p. 460). This approach assumes fungible employees and focuses on managing roles and not individuals, unlike the approach needed to realise the benefits of DM which requires responding to individuals and their differences, as we discuss below (see also Rao & Polepeddi, 2019).

Krzeminska et al. (2019) note some changes in approaches to SHRM to focus more on individuals rather than roles, driven in part by DM and in particular by the need to manage neurodiverse employees differently. Such changes may be inhibited by disconnects between intended HRM practices at the organisational level, actual practices at the unit level and perceived practices at the level of the individual. As Marescaux et al. (2021) identify, these disconnects arise because of the role of line managers at the unit level (see also Steffensen,

Ellen, Wang & Ferris, 2019), and the work experiences and perceptions of individual employees. In attempting to account for varied findings in extant research, Marescaux et al. (2021) utilise the conceptualisation of inclusion developed by Shore et al. (2011) to explain this variability. In doing so, they argue that maximising inclusion at all three levels has cross spillover effects that enables optimum outcomes to be achieved at each level (see also Randel, Galvin, Shore, Ehrhart, Chung, Dean & Kedharnath, 2018; Shore, Cleveland & Sanchez, 2018). This argument suggests that making inclusion central to HRM practices may contribute to alternative approaches to the Taylor/Chandler derived models of SHRM (Krzeminska et al, 2019).

The differential effect of HRM Practices on Neurodiverse and Neurotypical Employees

Recruitment and Selection Practices

HRM practices have impact on neurodiverse individuals as both prospective and actual employees. It is certainly the case that the employment of neurodiverse individuals is at proportionally lower levels than the general population, and also lower than those with visible disabilities (Remington & Pellicano, 2019). Inherent in this is a failure to recognise the diversity of conditions encompassed in the term neurodiverse, the diverse ways in which specific individuals are affected by their condition, and the skills and abilities that neurodiverse individuals can bring to employment (Austin & Pisano, 2017). A specific HRM practice that directly contributes to low levels of employment is that of recruitment and selection. As noted by Sarratt (2017), neurodiverse individuals in general do not respond well to dominant approaches to selection methods adopted by organisations. This is true of selection methods applied to meet equality and diversity policies which may, in some cases, actually worsen the interview experience for neurodiverse individuals. For example, one element of such methods is a panel interview. This can increase the anxiety in social situations experienced by many

neurodiverse individuals and so negatively affect their interview performance, or actually deter those individuals from making job applications in the first place (Sarratt, 2017; Martin, 2020). These negative consequences, specific to neurodiverse individuals, are in addition to the role and impact of bias which affects all hiring decisions (Hardy, Tey, Cyrus-Lai, Martell, Olstad & Uhlmann, 2021).

Reasonable Adjustment: Job/Task Design and Communication Practices

Other implications arise once a neurodiverse individual is employed. These include the physical environment and associated sensory stimuli. There can also be overlap with social space; that is the levels of interaction with co-workers. Social spaces also provide sensory stimuli; e.g., noise levels; as well as psychological stimuli; e.g., social interactions (Bhave et al., 2020). The latter are particularly significant because neurodiverse employees often communicate differently to neurotypical employees (Sarratt, 2017; Remington & Pellicano, 2019). Each of these sets of stimuli can have negative impact on neurodiverse employees and so negative impact on their productivity. In relation to social interactions and interpersonal communication, additional negative consequences may arise because of ‘linguistic ostracism’, especially as mediated by ‘social self-efficacy’ (Fiset & Bhave, 2021). While members of both social groups can be native language speakers, neurodiverse and neurotypical employees can experience their interpersonal communications akin to each speaking a foreign language because of the communication patterns of some neurodiverse employees. As Fiset and Bhave (2021) identify, this can lead to additional negative impact on the work behaviours of individuals, in this case, neurodiverse employees. HRM practice here is associated with the application of reasonable adjustments to the workplace to reduce or eliminate barriers to employment of people with disabilities, as required by legislation in most countries (Waisman-Nitzan, Gal & Schreuer, 2019). HRM practice concerned with building a culture which is

supportive of diversity and an inclusive climate is arguably of more significance (Holmes, Jiang, Avery, McKay, Oh & Tillman, 2020).

Performance Management and Other HRM Practices

Additional examples of HRM practices which impact neurodiverse employees in particular ways include performance management systems. These systems commonly include appraisal interviews. As with selection interviews, these interviews can present challenges for neurodiverse employees and such systems need amendments to cater fairly for diverse workforces (Noon & Ogbonna, 2020). Career development (Sarratt, 2017), training and development (Krzeminska et al., 2019), succession planning (Triana et al., 2021) and talent management (Marescaux et al., 2021) are other HRM practices with implications for diverse and so neurodiverse employees. The experience of these HRM practices by neurodiverse employees will be influenced by a number of factors affecting their implementation. These factors include the level of stigma and associated negative stereotypes held by line managers and co-workers linked to neurodiversity (Johnson & Joshi, 2016), and the emotional burden experienced by line managers managing neurodiverse employees (Richards et al., 2019). Examples of the latter can include dealing with incivility in the workplace and its consequences (Penney & Spector, 2005) and relatedly, applying HRM anti-bullying policies (Mellifont, 2019) (see Table 1). In summary, this analysis leads to the following proposition.

Proposition 1: HRM practices have differential effects on neurodiverse and neurotypical employees

There are positive reasons of performance benefits (Shore et al., 2011; Randel et al., 2018) to adapt HRM practices to meet the needs of prospective and actual neurodiverse employees. Such adaptations are becoming increasingly common, especially on the part of large employers (Krzeminska et al., 2019). The possibilities include education and training for

managers and neurotypical employees to aid integration of neurodiverse individuals. However, as noted by Noon and Ogbonna, (2020) diversity training does not guarantee continuing success in negating the discriminatory attitudes and behaviours of managers and others. There are though examples of success, reported in an issue of the *Journal of Management and Organisation*, of adapting HRM practices to overcome hidden inequality by responding to the needs of neurodiverse individuals. Carrero, Krzeminska and Härtel (2019) describe the initiative of the technology company DCX who designed an extended recruitment and selection process specifically aimed at neurodiverse potential employees. The process acknowledged the particular needs of these individuals in order to provide a less challenging experience. Remington and Pellicano (2019) provide an account and assessment of an internship programme at Deutsche Bank UK specifically designed to accommodate the needs of neurodiverse graduates. This particular programme could be judged a success as five of eight participants gained full-time employment.

These examples and a growing focus by employers on the neurodiverse population as a source of talented employees notwithstanding, there is a dearth of research examining the organising and management implications of neurodiversity. The available research highlights two related aspects of particular importance. The first is leadership and the problems of implementing strategic decisions made by top managers (Noon & Ogbanna, 2020). The second is the role and impact of what Waisman-Nitzan et al. (2019) refer to as organisational justice climate. As Waisman-Nitzan and colleagues note, this is particularly significant for neurodiversity since it has implications for reasonable adjustments, among other aspects of employment and HRM practices. The invisible nature of neurodiverse conditions raises questions of what might be considered 'reasonable' by managers and co-workers. Hence, leadership and organisational justice are key concepts when examining neurodiversity in organisations.

{Insert Table 1 here}

Strategic Diversity Leadership

Leadership theories on DM have focused on the behavioural aspects of leaders who are tasked with the management of diverse individuals within organisations and the implementation of DM practices (i.e., supervisory diversity leadership: Homan, Gündemir, Buengeler, & van Kleef, 2020; Randel et al., 2018). However, when dealing with neurodiverse employees who experience hidden inequalities, the role of leaders goes beyond implementing DM practices to developing inclusive practices. These inclusive practices, though difficult to implement (Winters, 2014), stand a better chance of generating positive outcomes for both neurotypical and neurodiverse employees (Mor Barak, Lizano, Kim, Duann, Rhee, Hsiao & Brimhall, 2016; Shore et al., 2018). Hence, active involvement in developing inclusive diversity practices is required on the part of leaders of organisations (Nishii, 2013; Randel et al., 2018).

The responsibility of developing and implementing inclusive DM practices, we argue is strategic and requires the involvement of strategic diversity leaders who exercise powerful influence on individuals, teams and the organisation. Strategic diversity leadership (SDL) is defined as “*shaping of the meaning of diversity within an organisation by the organisations senior leaders*” (Martins, 2020, p.1194). The role of a strategic leader (e.g., CEO’s, senior management team, division heads etc.) differs from that of a supervisory leader as they are mainly tasked with the overall responsibility of managing the organisation. As noted by Boal and Schultz (2007), supervisory leadership focuses on “*task and person-oriented behaviours of leaders . . . while strategic leadership focuses on the creation of meaning and purpose for the organisation*” (p.412). We therefore propose that strategic diversity leadership will foster neurodiversity and inclusion through complementing and influencing supervisory diversity leadership and inclusive DM practices, which will in turn create a climate of justice. This we purport will be achieved through ‘meaning-making’, which is the key focus of strategic

diversity leadership (see Rindova & Srinivas, 2017 for a review). Meaning making involves *'framing a vision for diversity and symbolizing the value of diversity in words and actions'* (Martins, 2020, p.1195).

Framing a vision for neurodiversity involves strategic diversity leaders conceptualising diversity in an inclusive manner and attaching a very high significance to DM practices that promote and support neurodiverse employees. Hence the way and manner in which these leaders envision, conceptualise and communicate these practices will determine the resulting outcome for both neurotypical and neurodiverse employees. Research has noted varying conceptualisations of diversity (e.g., Ely & Thomas, 2001; Nkomo et al., 2019). These have mainly been framed narrowly around the legal requirements that mandates consideration of only a few characteristics (e.g., race, sex), without careful attention to how different conceptualisations might lead to different results (cf. Otake-Ebede, 2018; Harrison & Klein, 2007). Scholars have noted that problems stemming from the ambiguous nature of the diversity construct include on one hand, those narrow definitions of diversity that have the potential to undermine the intent of diversity initiatives, as excluded groups may become alienated. On the other hand, broad, inclusive definitions of diversity have been shown to have a positive influence on perceptions of diversity programmes (Rynes & Rosen, 1995; Robinson & Dechant, 1997). Hence, including neurodiversity into the way diversity is conceptualised within the organisation has the potential to promote positive outcomes.

In framing an inclusive vision, strategic diversity leaders have considerable autonomy in the characteristics they include in their conceptualisation of diversity. If neurodiversity is included as an important characteristic and championed, it portrays a positive diversity vision that supports individual differences. This in turn demonstrates to both neurotypical and neurodiverse employees the significance and valence held by senior management about DM practices such as; an inclusive climate, supportive job design, transparent recruitment practices

etc., that support neurodiverse employees, and consequently, will result in heightened perception of justice. Supporting evidence exists demonstrating how the values of strategic leaders play an important role in shaping strategic action (Rindova & Martins, 2018a). However, little is known of how strategic leaders' visions could act as a buffer to employees' perceptions of justice and resulting consequences. We therefore propose that:

Proposition 2: The extent to which the strategic diversity leaders' vision incorporates belief in neurodiverse-specific DM practices, will establish the perceived value of diversity in the organisation, which in turn will lead to heightened justice perceptions.

Another important component of 'meaning making' in strategic diversity leadership is 'symbolising the value of diversity in words and actions.' Symbolisation involves "*culturally contextualised meaning creation via the prospective use of objects, words, and actions.*" (Hatch, 1993, p.673). The performance implications of the value placed on diversity and how it is championed in organisations has been demonstrated in previous studies (e.g., Otake-Ebede, 2019; Olsen & Martins, 2012). However, little is known of the vital role senior leaders play in communicating that value through their words and actions. Some exceptions in research (e.g. Pfeffer, 1981; Rindova & Srinivas, 2017), have noted that the words and actions of senior leaders have the potential to communicate important signals to employees about what is valued by the organisation. Thus, strategic diversity leaders can communicate through various forums the value the organisation places on creating an inclusive workplace where neurodiverse employees are nurtured. Indeed, the degree of managing diversity effectively relies on how leaders establish and filter communication in the workplace (Nishii & Mayer, 2009). Prior research has noted the 'power in words', particularly those of senior leaders (Kornberger & Clegg, 2011). Hence, when strategic diversity leaders use their words carefully in demonstrating the value placed on inclusive practices that support neurodiverse employees, it has the potential to be taken more seriously by supervisory leaders and employees. Conversely,

when trivialised, this could have a detrimental outcome on diversity attention and attribution (Martins, 2020).

Additionally, neurodiverse employees possess unique attributes and characteristics, which have the potential to positively influence work outcomes. For example, critical disability theorists have argued that sensory hypersensitivity found in some neurodiverse individuals such as those with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD), rather than being seen as a form of distraction enables them to be more sensitive and attentive to detail (Tomczak, 2020). This increases their performance of attention to detail in work tasks and subsequent work quality (Scott, Jacob, Hendrie, Parsons, Girdlier, Falkmer & Falkmer, 2017). Hence, in communicating information relating to neurodiverse employees, SDLs can focus on these strengths and the added benefits these individuals bring to the team and organisation. Furthermore, creating opportunities for neurodiverse employees to utilise their cognitive capabilities (such as visual thinking, need for structure and routine, sensitivity and attention to detail: Roberson et al., 2021; Mumford, Todd, Higgs & McIntosh, 2017), in achieving organisational goals, is one way in which SDLs can symbolise value for diversity in their actions. Other actions in which these can be demonstrated include; their participation in organisational activities and programmes designed to promote neurodiversity (cf. Mor Barak, 2014) as well as support for employees' participation in those and other activities.

Therefore, as symbolic leaders who have the power to influence how diversity is perceived, practiced and valued, we argue that SDL should use every means possible through their communication and actions to promote the inclusion of neurodiverse employees within their organisation. This will create a climate where all employees feel included and feel a sense of justice and fairness, and so address invisible inequalities in the workplace. We therefore propose that:

Proposition 3: The extent to which the strategic diversity leaders communicate through their words and actions value for neurodiversity will signal the value of diversity and inclusion in the organisation, which in turn will lead to heightened justice perceptions.

The Intervening Role of Organisational Justice

While DM practices for all play a direct role in creating positive neurodiversity consequences, we argue that this relationship's strength is mediated by perceived organisational justice. Cropanzano, Bowen and Gilliland (2007) define organisational justice as “*members’ sense of the moral propriety of how they are treated—is the ‘glue’ that allows people to work together effectively. Justice defines the very essence of individuals’ relationship with employers*” (p.34). Organisational justice plays a vital and intervening, albeit latent, role because the effectiveness of DM practices is dependent on the workforce’s recognition and acceptance of those practices to be fair, reasonable and proportionate. However, organisational justice is a complex construct and both neurodiverse and neurotypical workforce perceptions are equally important (Colella, 2001). The four main types of organisational justice are distributive, procedural, interactional and informational justice (Rodell & Colquitt, 2009). Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of outcomes involving the allocation of rewards based on the ratio of one’s input and output compared to others (Carter, Mossholder & Harris, 2018). Procedural justice refers to the fairness in the process in which decisions are made in terms of consistency, impartiality and propriety (van Dijke, De Cremer, Brebels & Van Quaquebeke, 2015). Interactional justice is the degree to which people are treated with dignity and respect (Collins & Mossholder, 2017), while informational justice is the extent to which organisations, through managers, are truthful, adequate and timely in sharing information with their workforce (Patient & Skarlicki, 2010).

Organisational justice is a complex construct not just because it has multiple constituents, but also because the nature of the construct is context-dependent. Rupp, Shapiro,

Folger, Skarlicki & Shao (2017) posit that much of the rich research undertaken on the construct predates the 21st-century workplace before the increasing awareness of social justice in the present day and its implications in the workplace. Therefore, today's workforce perception of organisational justice may not be entirely similar to the past (Weiss & Rupp, 2011). Neurodiverse and neurotypical employees' perceptions are vital as each may place varying levels of significance to different types of organisational justice as each is likely to have different experiences with an organisation's DM and leadership practices (Rupp et al., 2017). The following propositions provide an argument of the mediating role of organisational justice, as a composite construct, and the formative constituent of the four types of organisational justice. The argument also highlights the subtle effects of neurodiverse and neurotypical groups on the two types of consequences; cognitive and affective at the micro-level.

Every type of justice is essential to every individual, and organisations need to strive to ensure that their workforce is indeed treated fairly in terms of all forms of organisational justice (Wiesenfeld, Wurthmann & Hambrick, 2008). However, while organisations must ensure that employees are treated fairly, what constitutes fairness can be subjective and contested. Such situations emerge because neurodiverse and neurotypical staff are unlikely to be in equal receipt of an organisation's support because organisations are likely to provide targeted positive action for neurodiverse staff. Neurotypical staff may accept the 'unequal treatment' but only under conditions of proportionality, and that positive action for neurodiverse staff does not inadvertently discriminate against neurotypical staff. Neurodiverse staff are likely to judge the positive action based on similar heuristics such as the appropriateness of the action (e.g., that it genuinely enables them to do their jobs) and that the action does not unintentionally single them out from their neurotypical colleagues. Consequently, an organisation's

management of neurodiverse staff must also consider the latent perceptions of organisational justice as a whole of both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. We therefore propose:

Proposition 4. Employees' (neurodiverse and neurotypical) perception of organisational justice as a whole will mediate the relationship between neurodiverse and neurotypical DM practices and consequences.

Nonetheless, perceptions of organisational justice are nuanced between neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. While targeted DM practices for neurodiverse employees will naturally have specific, and potentially positive, consequence for this group, this relationship is mediated by perceptions of specific types of justice. The perception of specific types of justice is likely to have varied and disproportionate consequences i.e., cognitive and affective. For example, Colella (2001) found that judgement about fairness become salient to co-workers of colleagues with disabilities when they have an interest, e.g., allocation of reward is derived from the same budget. When co-workers make fairness judgements, they do so by comparing equity and perceived warranty. As such, the mediating effects of distributive justice may have cognition-orientated consequences given that distributive justice is premised on calculus-based evaluations of fairness. In addition, affect-based consequence is likely to follow as perception of fairness (and unfairness) is likely to have an emotional impact.

Colella's (2001) research also suggests that distributive justice becomes more significant when co-workers compete for the same rewards, for example, when co-workers report to the same leader, thereby emphasising the important role of leadership in moderating the relationship between DM practices (in general and specifically for neurodiverse staff) and distributive justice. Indeed, research, e.g., Carter et al. (2018), has shown the effects of leadership practices and distributive justice in producing positive team outcomes. SDLs who can demonstrate distributive justice through their neurodiverse and neurotypical DM practices

are likely to provide their followers with a sense of organisational support (Biswas, Varma & Ramaswami, 2013). Leaders who manage both groups in the same team play a crucial role as the comparison of equity by both groups of employees is likely to be heightened and be problematic as both groups have different needs. Distributive justice is vital as its impact cannot be mitigated by any other forms of justice (Skitka, 2002). We therefore propose:

Proposition 5: Distributive justice will mediate the relationship between the DM practices, and cognitive and affective consequences.

Procedural justice is held important to all staff as it is vital for organisational functioning, perhaps even more so than distributive justice (Viswesvaran & Ones, 2002). Although distributive justice predicts outcomes at the individual level such as staff's pay satisfaction, procedural justice tends to be a more robust predictor of meso-level outcomes such as organisational trust (Folger & Konovsky, 1989) and commitment (McFarlin & Sweeney, 1992). Perceived procedural justice can elicit high performance from employees (Wu & Chaturvedi, 2009), and soften unfavourable outcomes while retaining employees' support (Brockner, 2002). Procedural justice also has overt organisational artefacts that can be accessed for public scrutiny. Therefore, procedural justice has direct symbolic effects on the organisation as a whole.

Nonetheless, there are granular differences when perceived procedural justice is between varying social groups of employees. The context of our model, through DM practices, assumes that adjustments for neurodiverse staff are in addition to existing procedures for neurotypical staff. Therefore, the new adjustments naturally attract scrutiny due to their novelty. Colella, Paetzold and Belliveau (2004) argue that co-workers without disability tend to make inferences about procedural justice for accommodating co-workers with disabilities at the individual-level. These inferences are heuristics given that non-disabled co-workers may

not identify with the challenges of disabled co-workers, and that non-disabled co-workers do not have access to information about their colleagues' disability and special needs. We argue such a situation is relevant in the neurodiversity practices in organisations.

Building upon Rupp et al.'s (2017) reservation that procedural justice is universally valued, we contend that perceptions of procedural justice is more heightened for neurodiverse staff given neurotypical staff tend to adopt a satisficing heuristic, i.e., 'good enough', in appraising procedural justice to accommodate neurodiverse colleagues. The needs of individual neurodiverse employees are likely to be varied as it is unlikely they have the same talents. Therefore, the procedures that set out how their individual needs are appraised and how resources are allocated need to be fairly differentiated, and will have particular resonance with neurodiverse employees. We therefore propose:

Proposition 6: Procedural justice will mediate the relationship between DM practices for neurodiverse staff, and symbolic and affect-based consequences.

Interactional justice concerns respect and human dignity (Bies, 2001) and its perceptions result from everyday encounters amongst co-workers, and their respective supervisors and colleagues (Rupp et al., 2017). Perceived interactional justice includes explanations that legitimise and justify an outcome (Rupp et al., 2017). As a result, interactional justice directly shapes cognitive and affect-based consequences. Explanations that justify DM practices can be approached rationally and/or emotionally. Perceptions of interactional justice strengthen the relationship between emotional reactions and outcomes favourability (Skarlicki, Barclay & Pugh, 2008). Sensemaking, augmented by emotions, plays a significant role in guiding the appraisal of fairness in social exchanges.

Unlike distributive and procedural justice, interactional justice is considered a non-comparative organisational justice theory as it does not draw parallels of employees'

experience with others. Interactional justice involves perceptions of universal rights determining rewards irrespective of others experience (Bies, 2001). Given the growing awareness of social justice and invisible inequalities, interactional justice will grow to be more significant, especially within the context of organisational diversity and inclusivity. While important to all employees in the management of neurodiversity, we argue that interactional justice will be of special importance to neurodiverse staff.

In addition to the prevailing foundations of interactional justice respecting human dignity, neurodiverse staff's lack of mobility in labour markets, compared to their neurotypical co-workers, compels them to focus on the reasons for staying rather than motives to leave. Collins and Mossholder (2017) found that interactional justice has a more substantial meaning to employees who are more embedded in their jobs than colleagues who may be less attached. Within the setting of our theoretical model, we argue that leaders' DM practices have more significance to neurodiverse staff as these practices impact them directly. We propose:

Proposition 7: Interactional justice will mediate the relationship between DM practices for neurodiverse staff, and cognitive and affect-based consequences.

Informational justice, which concerns the truthfulness and timeliness of information, is perhaps the simplest form of justice (Patient & Skarlicki, 2010). This form of justice may also be argued to be an antecedent to distributive, procedural and interactional justice as individuals are given the opportunity to make sense of information, which helps them to evaluate if an outcome is fair. Indeed, informational justice enhances anticipatory justice because the transparency in providing adequate and timely information signals intent to be fair (Melkonian, Soenen & Ambrose, 2016)

While informational justice is essential to all staff, we argue that given their particular needs, information, even in its basic form, may have modest value to neurodiverse employees.

For information to have significant, it needs to be communicated using appropriate channels and thoughtfully (concerning the individual's circumstances), consistent with the attributes of interactional justice. Conversely, we suggest that informational justice may be more in line with the expectations of neurotypical groups even if the information is in primary forms, e.g., organisational notices, so long as the information is truthful and timely (Skarlicki et al., 2008). Delays, even if well-intended for reasons involving interactional justice, may unintentionally impact employees' perception of justice negatively as it violates employees' trust and in turn cause distrust of future information (Zapata, Olsen & Martins, 2013).

Proposition 8: Informational justice will mediate the relationship DM practices (in general and for neurodiverse staff) and cognitive-based consequences.

Affective and Cognitive Consequences as Mechanisms through which Organisational Justice leads to Neurodiversity Outcomes

Extant research suggests that perceived organisational justice leads to positive outcomes such as increased job performance, team and organisational integration (e.g. Cropanzano et al., 2007). Failure to recognise the intervening role of organisational justice could lead to negative long-term performance issues and harm social integration amongst employees, thus leading to poor attitudes and behaviours (Hurley-Hanson & Giannantonio, 2017). However, in the context of hidden inequalities there are a number of affective and cognitive consequences that may directly emerge from perceived organisational justice and which impact on neurodiversity outcomes. Affective consequences involve diminishing workplace frictions and removing bias and perceived discrimination generated through inferences of emotions and feelings. Cognitive consequences on the other hand include positive established assumptions involving effort and reward and generative ideas about work practices. Recognising and understanding the mediating role of the affective and cognitive consequences are essential to address any hidden

inequalities and to maximise neurodiversity outcomes through organisational justice (e.g., Milliken & Martins, 1996).

We argue that observable differences such as ethnicity and gender allow perceived organisational justice to be not just experienced by individuals, but also to be ‘seen’ to be accomplished, which enables justice to have a direct effect on outcomes such as performance. However, working in a neurodiverse environment can be an abstract notion given its hidden positive qualities and abilities. Thus, perceived organisational justice requires time to be understood and embedded in the workplace, manifesting in the form of latent affective and cognitive consequences. Failure to recognise the mediating role of these consequences could impact on an organisation’s ability to translate organisational justice into improved performance leading to durable outcomes. Hidden differences on the other hand trigger strong emotional reactions. Therefore, perceived organisational justice should generate emotions and feelings that enable any positive outcomes to be more stable and enduring by removing discriminatory behaviours. We know that diverse groups experience more perceived discrimination and work-related friction than homogeneous groups due to visible and invisible differences (Shore et al., 2018). Organisational justice can help to erode prejudice and perceived discrimination amongst individuals, and ultimately, entrenched stereotypical beliefs. However, it is a symbolic process as the effectiveness of organisational justice depends on how people perceive justice and fairness and how they respond emotionally to these perceptions. To establish positive perceptions, organisations need to understand the processes’ affective consequences and the sense of equality and fairness amongst employees needs to be a long-term commitment in managing hidden inequalities. Organisational justice relies on people’s perceptions and thus is much more difficult to control. The alignment of employees’ feelings and perceptions with organisational justice is therefore paramount to ensuring that

organisations are able to achieve effective and stable neurodiverse outcomes. We therefore propose that:

Proposition 9: The relationship between perceived organisational justice and positive neurodiversity outcomes is directly influenced by affective consequences.

The effectiveness of perceived organisational justice is also directly related to cognitive function, in particular, the processing of information. We argue that cognitive consequences are a crucial link between perceived organisational justice and outcomes as it involves the evaluation and interpretation of reality, which form assumptions of the workplace which are then acted upon. More specifically, organisational justice could enable individuals from a variety of backgrounds to reach their full potential through positive cognitive effort. Effective organisational justice will create a sense of belonging amongst employees and this feeling of ‘belongingness’ reflects a sense of acceptance, respect and openness for all employees (e.g., Shore et al., 2011). We therefore argue that perceived organisational justice promotes positive evaluations of equality and equitability, which supports the sustained effort from employees to ensure that positive outcomes derive from a neurodiverse environment. Hence, we propose that:

Proposition 10: The relationship between perceived organisational justice and positive neurodiversity outcomes is directly influenced by cognitive consequences.

DISCUSSION

Extant theorising of DM practices omits the paradoxical complexities that these practices have on employees who experience hidden inequalities, such as neurodiverse individuals. This in turn has created a situation where neurodiverse employees experience low levels of employment, and in cases where they are represented, they oftentimes feel less understood and discriminated against. To address this limitation, underpinned by the climate for inclusion theory, we develop and propose a dynamic multi-level model. We argue for a separation

between practices that support neurodiverse employees and those that support neurotypical employees in future DM theorising. Our model further highlights the key role strategic diversity leaders play in framing and symbolising DM practices which would be beneficial for both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees. Finally, we propose that positive outcomes for neurotypical employees is dynamic and hence only achievable and sustainable through cognitive and affective channels. Our study makes a number of contributions, which have implications for both theory and practice.

Contributions

The first contribution involves the development of a synoptic model of DM practices that lead to positive neurodiversity outcomes, specifically, highlighting the multilevel and dynamic perspectives. The proposed model emerges from the non-fungibility of extant DM theories and models that are limited in addressing hidden inequalities experienced by neurodiverse individuals. In addressing our first research question from a multilevel perspective, our first contribution redirects the nascent research trajectory of neurodiversity from a primary focus at the micro-level to group and meso levels (e.g. Moore et al., 2019; Richards et al., 2019). In doing so, the proposed model helps to address the current ‘knowledge gap’ and expand the neurodiversity research agenda by offering a critical assessment of HRM practices (Otake-Ebede, 2019), strategic leaders (Martins, 2020), DM outcomes and organisational justice (Cropanzano, Massaro & Becker, 2017) towards neurodiversity.

The model also highlights a dynamic perspective of neurodiversity management as reflected in the latent mediating constructs of organisational justice and employee consequences, and the potential feedback loop. The temporal dynamism of the model shows the chain of events that reveals the emergent but pivotal intervening constructs, without which the consequent outcomes would not materialise in practice (Lei, Naveh & Novikov, 2016). The

feedback loop indicates how organisational DM practices and strategic diversity leadership need to be continuously informed by their effects on employees and the organisation as a whole (Martins, 2020). The feedback loops are essential because diversity and justice are evolving constructs that require organisational leaders to continuously be involved in sensemaking (Schildt, Mantere & Cornelissen, 2020), understanding relationships in the workplace (King, 2007) and by adapting organisational systems (Roberson, Holmes & Perry, 2017). They act as a prevention strategy to inform desired behaviours in the workplace, specifically amongst neurodiverse employees.

Our first contribution addresses calls from scholars such as Nkomo et al. (2019) who advocate the need for new, more sophisticated theorising, as our phenomenon-based model addresses problems that are highly relevant to practice, but yet are not addressed in the scope of present theories (Von Krogh, Rossi-Lamastra & Haefliger, 2012). Our multi-level, dynamic conceptual model enriches scholars' theoretical understanding of key mechanisms through which organisations can achieve positive and effective outcomes for and from all employees. The inherent complexity of neurodiversity in organisations, from its multiplicity to its relative covertness (i.e., resulting in hidden inequalities) and its impact on all employees, means that theories need to be multifaceted to address the challenges arising from the phenomenon.

Our second contribution highlights the impact of strategic diversity leadership, in particular, the significance of leaders' narrative concerning diversity and the behaviours that they need to exemplify (Boal & Schultz, 2007). As highlighted, neurodiverse employees are unique in their thinking and approach to work, and as such, traditional DM practices and leadership behaviours might not be entirely suitable to ensure the inclusion of this form of diversity. An underlying implication of the model involves the broad outlook that leaders must adopt rather than have a silo focus on a particular group at a time (Homan et al., 2020). Such an outlook enables SDL to appreciate the interpretation and understanding of DM practices by

specific groups in the workforce. This expansive view is crucial as it allows SDL to balance equality for all employees and yet be equitable to the unique circumstances of minority groups (Nishii et al., 2018). Our model redirects HRM practices to embrace heterogeneity to more effectively manage differences in the workplace, which underscores the need for organisational leaders to equally and explicitly consider inclusivity in DM practices.

Our scope builds on the research of scholars like Farndale, Biron, Briscoe and Raghuram (2015) and Otake-Ebede (2018) who highlight the urgent need for researchers to make more prominent the examination of inclusion and inclusivity in diversity research, in particular, SDL. Their contention extends beyond investigating the inclusion of marginalised groups and to adopt a broader perspective that considers how the inclusion of one group does not disadvantage others (or reinforce such perceptions) (Pless & Maak, 2004) and the instrumental role of leadership (Ng & Sears, 2020). Our research is timely as it encourages diversity scholars to return to the ethical and social justice discourse in the workplace (Pless & Appel, 2012), specifically, in exploring the central role of strategic diversity leadership in framing and symbolising diversity and inclusivity in a way that is coherent with prevailing social and organisational values.

The propositions in this study shift focus to examine the value of diversity and workforce inclusion (Nishii, 2013) and to deepen our understanding of how SDL can foster the formation of work processes, tasks and strategies that enable all employees to utilise their differences. In addressing our second research question, our conceptual model enables scholars to gain unique insights into the interplay between organisational DM practices and SDL in enhancing the long-term performance of neurodiverse employees. More importantly, the model provides a much-needed strategic direction to not only support organisations in changing the way neurodiversity is managed, but to engage leaders in creating a supportive vision of an inclusive workplace (Wasserman, Gallegos & Ferdman, 2008).

Our third contribution lies in the model's emphasis on both neurodiverse and neurotypical groups of employees to ensure a balanced approach in the design of DM practices. Specifically, the model offers a prescient view (Corley & Gioia, 2011) in anticipating the tensions and paradoxes that are likely to emerge as organisations balance the needs of each social group. This contribution addresses our third research question and answers the calls of scholars like Loon et al. (2019) who have noted the paradoxical nature of HRM practices that complement or compete with practices that enhance wellbeing.

Our model therefore informs the sustainability of DM practices and diversity leadership to ensure that no parties feel 'left out' by virtue of the implementation of the practices aimed at particular groups (Nishii et al., 2018). While the breadth of diversity practices growth to reflect the advancement in the field is encouraging, organisational attention on minority groups may result in unintended consequences in other groups of individuals being marginalised, real or perceived (Eberlin & Tatum, 2005). Indeed, a substantial body of DM research has focused on the business case for diversity and less on the justice and fairness aspects (e.g., Peretz, Levi & Fried, 2015; Otaye-Ebede, 2019).

In addition to recognising the need for neurodiverse-specific practices, we acknowledge the nuanced complexities of DM practices perceived by non-targeted groups i.e., neurotypical employees, who may influence the sustained success of the practices (Colella, 2001). Highlighting the needs of both neurodiverse and neurotypical employees is essential for future research as existing DM practice research has mainly focused on examining how organisations implement practices that are beneficial for demographically diverse individuals within categories such as race/ ethnicity, gender, age and religion (e.g., Guillaume et al., 2017; Nishii et al., 2018; Otaye-Ebede, 2018; D'Netto et al., 2014). While this line of research is substantively relevant, engaging, and has set key parameters for the effective management of diverse employees and removal of discrimination in the workplace, such focus limits how these

DM practices are effective in managing neurodiverse employees as a social group. Understanding the perceptions of neurotypical staff, as well, is pivotal in the sustainability of neurodiversity management practices given neurotypical staff are whom the inequalities arising from neurodiversity are ‘hidden’.

Research and Practical Implications

The conceptual model offers several research and practical implications to scholars, practitioners and policy makers (Corley & Gioia, 2011). It enables the assessment of the effects of organisational DM on neurodiversity outcomes in a systematic manner from the micro level (affective and cognitive consequences) to the group (team integration) and meso levels (organisational cohesion). Such levels of analyses offer a much-needed clarity of constructs and principles that affect directly and indirectly the effectiveness of DM practices towards neurodiverse employees, the applicability of leadership behaviours (i.e., framing and symbolising) and the type of organisational justice needed to cultivate a fair working environment (i.e., distributive, procedural, interactional and informational justice). Given the nature of neurodiversity in DM practice, we speculate that the validity of the model, and its key constructs is dependent on the boundary conditions such as organisations’ age, size and sector. Neurodiversity can be considered a progressive form of DM and an organisation’s experience and maturity in addressing more tangible diversity and inclusive matters may serve as an indicator of the utility of the model to the firm in managing intangible and hidden inequalities arising from neurodiversity.

Additionally, we posit that the conceptual model offers utility as it contains propositions that show the nuanced nature of the relationships between DM practices, strategic diversity leadership, organisational justice and organisational outcomes that are contingent on neurodiverse and neurotypical perspectives. Such utility is needed to manage expectations,

attract, retain and develop individuals and produce value that is aligned with organisational culture. This is essential to address long-standing inequalities experienced by neurodiverse employees. Given that the study of neurodiversity is a nascent discipline, the model gives clarity and the confidence for organisations on what they can do at organisational, group and individual levels. By ‘exposing’ current gaps in understanding, we are able to question the effectiveness of current organisational practices and inform future leadership behaviours. This validates the important role of leadership actions and attitude towards diversity. The model offers confidence to adopt DM practices that have a meaningful and positive impact on organisational performance as the success of any practice is driven by the organisation’s desire and capacity to utilise diversity in its workforce. In addition, the model highlights the complexity in DM, which explains why currently applied blunt tools and practices may have limited effectiveness. Any attempt to address neurodiversity requires more refined and effectual DM practices. Recent events (e.g. Covid-19) have shown the severe and disproportionate impact such disruptions can have on neurodiverse populations and other disadvantaged social groups. Therefore, this study is timely as we need to break current ‘silos’ of hidden inequality to manage ‘different’ differences in the workplace. Further, by offering insights into the unique experiences of neurodiverse employees, we suggest that it is essential that diversity training and learning initiatives be implemented involving managers and leaders tasked with the responsibility of framing, symbolizing and implementing DM practices (Milliken & Martins, 1996). Regardless of the approach to DM, strategic leadership is key to unlock the potentials of neurodiverse individuals in any modern organisation.

Limitation and Suggestions for Future Research

An evident area to address is that the conceptual model remains to be tested. The propositions formulated in this study offer a clear direction for future research. We suggest prospective research adopt and/or develop measures to test the model by adopting a covariance-based

structural equation modelling approach. Such an examination will utilise the model in its current form to test the proposed structural relationships. Alternatively, scholars may adopt partial least squares-structural equation modelling to explore latent constructs and experiment with the configurations of the model. Such an examination may investigate the interactional effects of the constructs with other marginalised/ minority groups.

Another limitation is that the conceptual model does not stipulate the type and degree of neurodiverse conditions of individuals. Future research may be more specific as this may influence the DM practices required. In addition, boundary conditions may be specified as these may alter the predictive validity and utility of the model. Boundary conditions, which may include organisation's experience and maturity in developing and utilising DM practices as mentioned, can alter the nature of the constructs and their relationships in the model. Finally, the proposed conceptual model and key relations may be influenced by the external environment and the nature of labour markets, including social and economic uncertainty, and so those relationships could also be usefully investigated.

CONCLUSION

Hidden inequalities, given their complex and potentially emergent nature, requires a more active organisation-wide approach. Organisations need to ensure that there are effective policies and procedures that cover the needs of a diverse workforce with diverse skills. The conceptual model emphasises the need to develop more sophisticated and context-sensitive practices that are appropriate for the minority groups in question and the organisation as a whole. Such an approach can enable outcomes to be more effective and sustainable in the long-term, given the inclusiveness of the DM practices that suits the entire workforce of the organisation. The behaviour and agency of leadership in ensuring fairness increases the likelihood of successful outcomes for both neurodiverse and neurotypical groups, and for the

organisation. This study is the first step to shed light on key issues experienced by neurodiverse individuals in the workplace. Our research offers a new direction to further understanding of individual differences in the workplace and addresses hidden inequalities that many individuals face on a daily basis across all different spectrum of our society. Most importantly, it enables managers to approach neurodiversity as an organisational advantage rather than as a source of complexity in decision-making.

REFERENCES

- Austin, R.D. & Pisano, G.P. (2017). Neurodiversity as a competitive advantage. *Harvard Business Review*, 95(3), pp.96-103.
- Bhave, D.P., Teo, L.H. & Dalal, R.S. (2020). Privacy at Work: A Review and a Research Agenda for a Contested Terrain, *Journal of Management*, 46 (1), 127–164
- Bies, R. J. 2001. Interactional (in)justice: The sacred and the profane. *Advances in Organisational Justice*, 89-118.
- Biswas, S., Varma, A., & Ramaswami, A. (2013). Linking distributive and procedural justice to employee engagement through social exchange: A field study in India [Article]. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(8), 1570-1587. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2012.725072>
- Boal, K. B., & Schultz, P. L. (2007). Storytelling, time, and evolution: The role of strategic leadership in complex adaptive systems. *Leadership Quarterly*, 18: 411-428.
- Brockner, J. (2002). Making sense of procedural fairness: How high procedural fairness can reduce or heighten the influence of outcome favorability [Review]. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(1), 58-76. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2002.5922363>
- Carrero, J., Krzeminska, A. & Härtel, C.E.J. (2019). The DXC technology work experience program: disability-inclusive recruitment and selection in action, *Journal of Management & Organisation*, 25, 535–542.
- Carter, M. Z., Mossholder, K. W., & Harris, J. N. (2018). Congruence effects of contingent reward leadership intended and experienced on team effectiveness: The mediating role of distributive justice climate [Article]. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 91(3), 465-485. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12210>
- Colella, A. (2001). Co-worker distributive fairness judgments of the workplace accommodation of employees with disabilities [Article]. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1), 100-116. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2001.4011984>
- Colella, A., Paetzold, R. L., & Belliveau, M. A. (2004). Factors affecting co-workers' procedural justice inferences of the workplace accommodations of employees with disabilities [Review]. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.tb02482.x>
- Collins, B. J., & Mossholder, K. W. (2017). Fairness means more to some than others: Interactional fairness, job embeddedness, and discretionary work behaviors [Article]. *Journal of Management*, 43(2), 293-318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314527132>
- Corley, K. G., & Gioia, D. A. (2011). Building theory about theory building: What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*, 36(1), 12-32.
- Cropanzano, R. S. (2009). Writing nonempirical articles for Journal of Management: General thoughts and suggestions. *Journal of Management*, 35(6), 1304-1311.

- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D. E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organisational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 21(4), 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMP.2007.27895338>
- Cropanzano, R. S., Massaro, S., & Becker, W. J. (2017). Deontic justice and organisational neuroscience [Article]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(4), 733-754. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3056-3>.
- D'Netto, B., Shen, J., Chelliah, J., & Monga, M. (2014). Human resource diversity management practices in the Australian manufacturing sector [Article]. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 25(9), 1243-12/doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2013.826714
- Eberlin, R., & Tatum, B. C. (2005). Organisational justice and decision making: When good intentions are not enough [Review]. *Management Decision*, 43(7-8), 1040-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740510610035>
- Ely, R. J., & Thomas, D. A. (2001). Cultural diversity at work: The moderating effects of work group perspectives on diversity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46: 229-273.
- Farndale, E., Biron, M., Briscoe, D., & Raghuram, S. (2015). A global perspective on diversity and inclusion in work organisations. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(6), 677-687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2014.991511>.
- Fiset, J. & Bhave, D.P. (2021). Mind Your Language: The Effects of Linguistic Ostracism on Interpersonal Work Behaviors, *Journal of Management*, 47 (2), 430–455.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(1), 115-130.
- Guillaume, Y. R. F., Dawson, J. F., Otake-Ebede, L., Woods, S. A., & West, M. A. (2017). Harnessing demographic differences in organisations: What moderates the effects of workplace diversity? [Article]. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 38(2), 276-303. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2040>.
- Hardy, J.H., Tey, K.S., Cyrus-Lai, W., Martell, R.F., Olstad, A. & Uhlmann, E.L. (2021). Bias in Context: Small Biases in Hiring Evaluations Have Big Consequences, *Journal of Management*, Published Online First, DOI: 10.1177/0149206320982654.
- Harrison, D. A., & Klein, K. J. (2007). What's the difference? Diversity constructs as separation, variety, or disparity in organisations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1199-1228.
- Hartnell, C. A., Ou, A. Y., & Kinicki, A. (2011). Organisational culture and organisational effectiveness: a meta-analytic investigation of the competing values framework's theoretical suppositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 677-694.
- Hatch, M. J. (1993). The dynamics of organisational culture. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 657-693.
- Holmes, O., Jiang, K., Avery, D., McKay, P., Oh, I., & Tillman, C. (2020). A meta-analysis integrating 25 years of diversity climate research, *Journal of Management*, DOI: 10.1177/0149206320934547.
- Homan, A. C., Gündemir, S., Buengeler, C., & van Kleef, G. A. (2020). Leading diversity: Towards a theory of functional leadership in diverse teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. <https://doi.org/Advance> online publication. doi:10.1037/apl0000482.
- Hurrley-Hanson, A.E. & Giannantonio, C.M. (2017). *LMX and autism: effective working relationships*, in Scandura, T.A and Mourino-Ruiz, E. (Eds), *Leading Diversity in the 21st Century*, IAP Information Age Publishing, Charlotte, NC, PP.281-302.
- Johnson, T.D. & Joshi, A. (2016). Dark Clouds or Silver Linings? A Stigma Threat Perspective on the Implications of an Autism Diagnosis for Workplace Well-Being, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 101 (3), 430–449.

- King, A. W. (2007). Disentangling interfirm and intrafirm causal ambiguity: A conceptual model of causal ambiguity and sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1), 156-178.
- Koellen, T. (2021). Diversity management: A critical review and agenda for the future. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 30(3), 259-272.
- Kornberger, M., & Clegg, S. (2011). Strategy as performative practice: The case of Sydney 2030. *Strategic Organisation*, 9: 136-162.
- Krzeminska, A., Austin, R.D., Bruyère, S.M. & Hedley, D. (2019). The advantages and challenges of neurodiversity employment in organisations, *Journal of Management & Organisation*, 25, 453–463.
- Lee, N., Senior, C., & Butler, M. J. R. (2012). The domain of organisational cognitive neuroscience: Theoretical and empirical challenges [Editorial]. *Journal of Management*, 38(4), 921-931. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312439471>.
- Lei, Z., Naveh, E., & Novikov, Z. (2016). Errors in organisations: An integrative review via level of analysis, temporal dynamism, and priority lenses. *Journal of Management*, 42(5), 1315-1343.
- Li, Y., Perera, S., Kulik, C.T. and Metz, I., (2019). Inclusion climate: A multilevel investigation of its antecedents and consequences. *Human Resource Management*, 58(4), pp.353-369.
- Loon, M., Otaye-Ebede, L., & Stewart, J. (2019). The paradox of employee psychological well-being practices: an integrative literature review and new directions for research [Article]. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(1), 156-187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2018.1479877>.
- Martins, L. L. (2020). Strategic Diversity Leadership: The Role of Senior Leaders in Delivering the Diversity Dividend. *Journal of Management*, 46(7), 1191-1204.
- Martin, N. (2020). Perspectives on UK university employment from autistic researchers and lecturers, *Disability & Society*, Published Online First, DOI: 10.1080/09687599.2020.1802579
- Marescaux, E., De Winne, S. & Brebels, L. (2021). Putting the Pieces Together: A Review of HR Differentiation Literature and a Multilevel Model, *Journal of Management*, Published Online First, DOI: 10.1177/0149206320987286.
- Martín-Alcázar, F., Romero-Fernández, P.M. and Sánchez-Gardey, G., (2012). Transforming human resource management systems to cope with diversity. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 107(4), pp.511-531.
- McFarlin, D. B., & Sweeney, P. D. (1992). Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organisational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3), 626–637. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/256489>
- Melkonian, T., Soenen, G., & Ambrose, M. (2016). Will I cooperate? The moderating role of informational distance on justice reasoning [Article]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 137(4), 663-675. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2744-8>
- Mellifont, D. (2019). Taming the raging bully! A case study critically exploring anti-bullying measures to support neurodiverse employees. *South Asian Journal of Business and Management Cases*. 9(1), 54-67.
- Milliken, F.J. & Martins, L.L. (1996). Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organisational groups. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(2), 402-433.
- Moore, C. B., McIntyre, N. H., & Lanivich, S. E. (2019). ADHD-related neurodiversity and the entrepreneurial Mindset [Article]. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719890986>.
- Mor Barak, M. E. (2014). *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Mor Barak, M. E., Lizano, E. L., Kim, A., Duan, L., Rhee, M. K., Hsiao, H. Y., & Brimhall, K. C. (2016). The promise of diversity management for climate of inclusion: A state-of-the-art review and meta-analysis. *Human Service Organisations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 40: 305-333.
- Mor Barak, M.E., Luria, G. and Brimhall, K.C., (2021). What leaders say versus what they do: Inclusive leadership, policy-practice decoupling, and the anomaly of climate for inclusion. *Group & Organization Management*, p.10596011211005916.
- Mumford, M., Todd, E., Higgs, C., & McIntosh, Tr. (2017). Cognitive skills and leadership performance: The nine critical skills. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 28, 24–39. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2016.10.012
- Muskat, B. (2017). Celebrating neurodiversity: An often-overlooked difference in group work. *Social Work with Groups*, 40(1-2), 81-84. doi:10.1080/01609513.2015.1067131
- Ng, E.S. & Sears, G.J., (2020). Walking the talk on diversity: CEO beliefs, moral values, and the implementation of workplace diversity practices. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 164(3), pp.437-450.
- Nishii, L. H. (2013). The benefits of climate for inclusion for gender-diverse groups. *Academy of Management Journal*, 56: 1754-1774.
- Nishii, L. H., Khattab, J., Shemla, M., & Paluch, R. M. (2018). A multi-level process model for understanding diversity practice effectiveness [Article]. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 37-82. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2016.0044>.
- Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(6), 1412.
- Nkomo, S. M., Bell, M. P., Roberts, L. M., Joshi, A., & Thatcher, S. M. (2019). Diversity at a critical juncture: New theories for a complex phenomenon. *Academy of Management Review*, 44: 498-517.
- Noon, M. & Ogbonna, E. (2020). Controlling management to deliver diversity and inclusion: Prospects and limits, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Published Online First, DOI: 10.1111/1748-8583.12332.
- O'Connor, E.P. & Crowley-Henry, M., (2019). Exploring the relationship between exclusive talent management, perceived organizational justice and employee engagement: Bridging the literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 156(4), pp.903-917.
- Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2012). Understanding organisational diversity management programs: A theoretical framework and directions for future research. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 33: 1168-1187.
- Otaye-Ebede, L. (2018). Employees' perception of diversity management practices: Scale development and validation [Article]. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 27(4), 462-476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2018.1477130>.
- Otaye-Ebede, L. (2019). Antecedents and outcomes of managing diversity in a UK context: test of a mediation model [Article]. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(18), 2605-2627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1253031>.
- Patient, D. L., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2010). Increasing interpersonal and informational justice when communicating negative news: The role of the manager's empathic concern and moral development [Article]. *Journal of Management*, 36(2), 555-578. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308328509>
- Penney, L. M. & Spector, P.E. (2005). Job stress, incivility, and counterproductive work behavior (CWB): The moderating role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 26(7), 777-796.

- Peretz, H., Levi, A., & Fried, Y. (2015). Organisational diversity programs across cultures: Effects on absenteeism, turnover, performance and innovation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 26(6), 875-903.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organisational paradigm. *Research in Organisational Behavior*, 3: 1-52.
- Pless, N. M., & Appel, J. (2012). In pursuit of dignity and social justice: Changing lives through 100 % inclusion: How Gram Vikas fosters sustainable rural development [Article]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 111(3), 389-411. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1415-2>.
- Pless, N. M., & Maak, T. (2004). Building an inclusive diversity culture: Principles, processes and practice [Review]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 54(2), 129-147. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-004-9465-8>.
- Randel, A. E., Galvin, B. M., Shore, L. M., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B., Dean, M., & Kedharnath, U. (2018). Inclusive leadership: Realizing positive outcomes through belongingness and being valued for uniqueness. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28: 190-203.
- Rao, B. & Polepeddi, J. (2019). Neurodiverse workforce: inclusive employment as an HR strategy, *Strategic HR Review*, 18 (5), 204-209.
- Reichers, A. E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 5-39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Remington, A. & Pellicano, E. (2019). ‘Sometimes you just need someone to take a chance on you’: An internship programme for autistic graduates at Deutsche Bank, UK, *Journal of Management & Organisation*, 25, 516–534.
- Richards, J., Sang, K., Marks, A. & Gill, S. (2019). “I’ve found it extremely draining” Emotional labour and the lived experience of line managing neurodiversity, *Personnel Review*, 48 (7), 1903-1923.
- Rindova, V. P., & Martins, L. L. (2018a). From values to value: Value rationality and the creation of great strategies. *Strategy Science*, 3: 323-334.
- Rindova, V. P., & Srinivas, S. B. (2017). *Managing meaning—culture*. In A. Wilkinson, S. J. Armstrong, & M. Lounsbury (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of management*: 256-275. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Roberson, Q., Holmes, O. I., & Perry, J. L. (2017). Transforming research on diversity and firm performance: A dynamic capabilities perspective [Review]. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 189-216. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0019>.
- Roberson, Q., Quigley, N. R., Vickers, K., & Bruck, I. (2021). Reconceptualizing Leadership From a Neurodiverse Perspective. *Group & Organisation Management*, 1059601120987293.
- Robinson, G., & Dechant, K. (1997). Building a business case for diversity. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 11(3), 21-31.
- Rodell, J. B., & Colquitt, J. A. (2009). Looking ahead in times of uncertainty: The role of anticipatory justice in an organisational change context. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4), 989–1002.
- Rupp, D. E., Shapiro, D. L., Folger, R., Skarlicki, D. P., & Shao, R. (2017). A critical analysis of the conceptualisation and measurement of organisational justice: Is it time for reassessment? [Article]. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 919-959. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2014.0051>
- Rynes, S., & Rosen, B. (1995). A field survey of factors affecting the adoption and perceived success of diversity training. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(2), 247-270.
- Sarrett, J., (2017). Interviews, Disclosures, and Misperceptions: Autistic Adults’ Perspectives on Employment Related Challenges, *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 37 (2), <https://dsq-sds.org/article/view/5524> Accessed 13/04/2021

- Schildt, H., Mantere, S., & Cornelissen, J. (2020). Power in sensemaking processes [Article]. *Organisation Studies*, 41(2), 241-265. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840619847718>.
- Scott, M., Jacob, A., Hendrie, D., Parsons, R., Girdler, S., Falkmer, T., & Falkmer, M. (2017). Employers' perception of the costs and the benefits of hiring individuals with autism spectrum disorder in open employment in Australia. *PloS one*, 12(5), e0177607.
- Shore, L.M. & Chung, B.G., (2021). Inclusive leadership: How leaders sustain or discourage work group inclusion. *Group & Organization Management*, p.1059601121999580.
- Shore, L.M., Cleveland, J.N. & Sanchez, D. (2018). Inclusive workplaces: A review and model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 28(2), 176-189.
- Shore, L. M., Randel, A. E., Chung, B. G., Dean, M. A., Holcombe Ehrhart, K., & Singh, G. (2011). Inclusion and diversity in work groups: A review and model for future research, *Journal of Management*, 37, 1262-1289.
- Skarlicki, D. P., Barclay, L. J., & Pugh, S. D. (2008). When explanations for layoffs are not enough: Employer's integrity as a moderator of the relationship between informational justice and retaliation [Article]. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 81(1), 123-146. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317907X206848>
- Skitka, L. J. (2002). Do the means always justify the ends, or do the ends sometimes justify the means? A value model of justice reasoning. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 28, 588-597.
- Steffensen, D.S., Ellen, B.P., Wang, G. & Ferris, G.R. (2019). Putting the “Management” Back in Human Resource Management: A Review and Agenda for Future Research, *Journal of Management*, 45 (6), 2387–2418.
- Stewart, J., & Harte, V. (2010). The implications of talent management for diversity training: An exploratory study. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34(6), 506-518. doi:10.1108/03090591011061194
- Sumner, K. E., & Brown, T. J. (2015). Neurodiversity and human resource management: Employer challenges for applicants and employees with learning disabilities. *Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 18(2), 77-85. doi:10.1037/mgr0000031
- Tekleab, A. G., & Quigley, N. R. (2014). Team deep-level diversity, relationship conflict, and team members' affective reactions: A cross-level investigation [Article]. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(3), 394-402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.022>.
- Tomczak, M. T. (2020). Employees with autism spectrum disorders in the digitized work environment: Perspectives for the future. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*. doi:10.1177/1044207320919945
- Triana, M. del C., Gu, P., Chapa, O., Richard, O & Colella. A. (2021). Sixty years of discrimination and diversity research in human resource management: A review with suggestions for future research directions, *Human Resource Management*, 60 (1), 145-203.
- Trittin, H., & Schoeneborn, D. (2017). Diversity as polyphony: Reconceptualizing diversity management from a communication-centered perspective [Article]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 144(2), 305-322. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2825-8>.
- van Dijke, M., De Cremer, D., Brebels, L., & Van Quaquebeke, N. (2015). Willing and able: Action-state orientation and the relation between procedural justice and employee cooperation [Article]. *Journal of Management*, 41(7), 1982-2003. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206313478187>
- Viswesvaran, C., & Ones, D. S. (2002). Examining the construct of organisational justice: A meta-analytic evaluation of relations with work attitudes and behaviors [Review]. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 38(3), 193-203. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1015820708345>

- Von Krogh, G., Rossi-Lamastra, C., & Haefliger, C. (2012). Phenomenon-based research in management and organisation science: When is it rigorous and does it matter? . *Long Range Planning*, 45(4), 277–298.
- Waisman-Nitzan, M., Gal, E. & Schreuer, N. (2019). Employers' perspectives regarding reasonable accommodations for employees with autism spectrum disorder, *Journal of Management & Organisation*, 25, 481–498.
- Walker, N. (2014). Neurodiversity: Some basic terms and definitions. Retrieved from <http://neurocosmopolitanism.com/neurodiversity-some-basic-terms-definitions/>
- Wasserman, I. C., Gallegos, P. V., & Ferdman, B. M. (2008). *Dancing with resistance: Leadership challenges in fostering a culture of inclusion*. In K. M. Thomas (Ed.), "Diversity resistance in organisations: 175-200. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group/Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Weiss, H. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2011). Experiencing work: An essay on a person-centric work psychology [Article]. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 4(1), 83-97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01302.x>
- Wiesenfeld, B. M., Wurthmann, K. A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2008). The stigmatisation and devaluation of elites associated with corporate failures: A process model [Article]. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 231-251. <Go to ISI>://WOS:000251737800013.
- Winters, M. F. (2014). *From diversity to inclusion: An inclusion equation*. In B. M. Ferdman & B. R. Deane (Eds.), *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*: 205-228. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wu, P. C., & Chaturvedi, S. (2009). The role of procedural justice and power distance in the relationship between high performance work systems and employee attitudes: A multilevel perspective [Article]. *Journal of Management*, 35(5), 1228-1247. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206308331097>
- Zapata, C. P., Olsen, J. E., & Martins, L. L. (2013). Social exchange from the supervisor's perspective: Employee trustworthiness as a predictor of interpersonal and informational justice [Article]. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 121(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2012.11.001>

Table 1. *DM Practices for Neurodiverse and Neurotypical Individuals*

SELECTED GENERAL HR PRACTICES	EXAMPLES	
	DM PRACTICES FOR NEUROTYPICAL INDIVIDUALS	DM PRACTICES FOR NEURODIVERSE INDIVIDUALS
<i>Recruitment and Selection Talent Management</i>	Panel Interview General Screening Tools	One-to-one Interview Inclusive Applicant Screening Tools Targeted Talent Management Initiatives e.g. internships targeted at Neurodiverse individuals
<i>Job and Work Design</i>	Self-managed Work Teams Broad Task Responsibilities General social and interaction spaces	Structured Small Teams Detailed/Precise Task Responsibilities Redesigned social and interaction workspaces Formal Job Analysis
<i>Performance Management and Appraisal</i>	Appraisal based on Strategic or Team Goals Yearly Developmental Performance Appraisal Meetings	Performance Management and Appraisal Appraisal based on Defined Objective Results/Behaviours Frequent Developmental Performance Appraisal Meetings
<i>Compensation and Benefits</i>	Pay for Performance (e.g. team performance) Formal Appraisal for Pay	Recognition/Non-financial Rewards Pay for individual performance
<i>Training and Development</i>	Extensive Training Training for job or firm-specific skills	Targeted Training Training for job or firm specific skills, and focus unique ND abilities
<i>Communication</i>	Formal Information Sharing Programme Meetings with employee	Formal Information Sharing Programme Regular face-to-face (virtual or in-person) meetings with employee

Figure 1. A conceptual model for integrating neurodiverse employees

