



## BIROn - Birkbeck Institutional Research Online

Doyle, Nancy and McDowall, Almuth (2021) Diamond in the rough? An 'empty review' of research into 'neurodiversity' and a road map for developing the inclusion agenda. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal , ISSN 2040-7149. (In Press)

Downloaded from: <http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/id/eprint/43682/>

*Usage Guidelines:*

Please refer to usage guidelines at <https://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/policies.html>

or alternatively

contact [lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:lib-eprints@bbk.ac.uk).



**Diamond in the rough? An 'empty review' of research into 'neurodiversity' and a road map for developing the inclusion agenda**

Journal:	<i>Equality, diversity and inclusion: An international journal</i>
Manuscript ID	EDI-06-2020-0172.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Empty review, Employment, Neurodiversity, Neurominority, Autism, Workplace Inclusion

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3 March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2021  
4

5 Letter to the reviewers.  
6

7 Firstly, thank you again for your attention to detail and thorough consideration of our work.  
8 We appreciate your comments. We have made comments in response to your edits, italicized  
9 below.  
10

11  
12 1) There are several grammatical errors throughout the document (e.g., "there" instead of  
13 "their", missing punctuation). Please correct these in your next submission.  
14

15 *We have sent the document to a copy editor as well as our own thorough review and hope that*  
16 *these are much improved.*  
17

18  
19 2) Both reviewers noted that the practice implications section could use more explicit and  
20 tangible advice. After this revision we still feel that more can still be added here. Specifically,  
21 the practice implications section of the paper remains primarily focused on what not to do,  
22 issues with research, and the difficulties of inclusion. These points are important, but why not  
23 highlight more clearly the practical ideas noted in Table 5, sharing some concrete examples  
24 of what practitioners can do? Your contributions on neurodiversity and HR universal design  
25 will be extremely informative for practitioners (you have done great work with Table 5). I  
26 believe that this table should be summarized/specific points should be mentioned in the  
27 practice implications section as well. Otherwise, your practical implications are too heavily  
28 weighted towards caveats, with too little emphasis on concrete actions that practitioners can  
29 start engaging in today.  
30  
31

32 *We agree and we felt broadly that the issue was one of flow, and that our tables were*  
33 *presented in the wrong sections. We hope that by moving these around, and by including some*  
34 *additional reflexive practice questions in addition to some clarity in the text, that we have*  
35 *addressed this point.*  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Further you note in the practice implications section that "Employment inclusion  
42 practitioners could learn from more mature research bodies such as mental health, race,  
43 gender and sexual orientation inclusion in order to mitigate the impact of marginalization."  
44 Yet, you do not identify clearly what can be learnt from these literatures. If you wish to keep  
45 this point, identify how these literatures can guide practice in the context of your manuscript.  
46  
47

48 *We note that this suggested occurs in a number of places in the article. We have included some*  
49 *examples and signposted to what could be possible from such an endeavour, however a review*  
50 *of learning from these fields is a much bigger job than this single article can contain. We are in*  
51 *fact at the moment applying for research funding to conduct a rapid evidence review of how*  
52 *race and gender research could inform neurodiversity practice.*  
53  
54  
55

56  
57 3) As you noted in your response, Table 6 will help the reader understand the critical  
58 realism perspective. Please add reference to critical realism in the title of Table 6, or within  
59 Table 6, to add clarity for the reader.  
60

1  
2  
3 *We have added the reference for the CIMO structure to the table.*  
4

5 Many thanks again!  
6

7 Authors 1 and 2 😊  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**Diamond in the rough? An ‘empty review’ of research into ‘neurodiversity’ and a road map for developing the inclusion agenda.**

**Introduction**

‘Neurodiversity’ broadly refers to naturally occurring diversity in human cognition (Singer, 1999). It is frequently has been used as an umbrella term for a range of neurocognitive developmental disorders (Doyle, 2020; Kapp, Gillespie-Lynch, Sherman, & Hutman, 2013) including Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder or Dyslexia. Recent public dialogue has shifted to the term ‘neurominority’ to sign post that relevant individuals are disadvantaged regarding a range of life outcomes, including systemic social exclusion in education and inferior employment outcomes (Carter, Austin, & Trainor, 2012; Snowling, Adams, Bowyer-Crane, & Tobin, 2000). Subsequent restriction of opportunities for a fulfilled working life and career (Holliday et al., 1999; Taylor & Walter, 2003) is in contrast to emerging popular narratives about the talent potential of neurodiversity for modern workplaces (Austin & Pisano, 2017; Sniderman, 2014): the ‘diamond in the rough’ (Doyle, Patton, Fung, Bruk-Lee, & Bruyere, 2020).

In this paper, we highlight the inadequate scope and focus of academic attention on neurodiversity and employment to date across the fields of applied psychology and management studies. We contextualize the neurodiversity paradigm from a medical, social and legal perspective in the wider workplace equality, diversity and inclusion agenda. Through a series of ‘Empty Reviews’ defined as a targeted analysis of literature gaps through systematic literature review principles (Schlosser & Sigafos, 2009; Yaffe et al., 2012), we illustrate the dearth of tangible evidence. Through due diligence in our conceptualization, including definition of gaps in knowledge, we outline a future research and practice agenda to facilitate informed inclusion for a marginalized minority. In other words, it is our aim to

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

support evidence-based practice in this emerging field guiding Human Resources (HR) and employment policy to mitigate labor force exclusion

### Defining Neurodiversity

The term 'Neurodiversity' was coined by the sociological researcher Judy Singer (Singer, 1999) in the context of rights activism during the 1990s (Mcgee, 2012; Runswick-Cole, 2014). The neurodiversity movement highlights the life-long and positive aspects of naturally-occurring cognitive 'differences', such as creativity and 'special interest' skills (Meilleur et al., 2015; Von Károlyi et al., 2003; White & Shah, 2006), as opposed to the focus on developmental 'deficits' such as language or processing speed (Armstrong, 2010; Grant, 2009; Jurecic, 2017; Kapp, Gillespie-Lynch, Sherman, & Hutman, 2012). ~~The term~~ Neurodiversity has been considered a progression from previous umbrella terms such as specific learning difficulties, neurodevelopmental disorders or hidden / invisible impairments. However, Ms Singer herself, alongside other researchers and advocates, prefers ~~the~~ term 'neurodiversity' to refer to the cognitive diversity in all humans (Chapman, 2020; Monzee et al., 2019; Singer, 1998; Walker, 2012) rather than appropriated as a synonym for disability. Relevant terminology continues to evolve and be hotly debated: ~~Current practice is to refer to neurodiversity as a species-level phenomenon~~ we briefly define alternatives that denote equivalence to the outdated deficit model language. Those who fall in a statistical norm, based on relevant cognitive tests or behavioral assessments, are referred to as "neurotypical" and those who would previously have been termed disordered are referred to as "neurodivergent," "neurodiverse" or part of a "neurominority" (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020; ~~N-~~Doyle, 2020; Singer, 1998; Walker, 2012). ~~Armstrong~~ Some authors includes general learning disabilities and/or mental health needs in his ~~definitions~~ (Armstrong, 2010; Chapman & Veit, 2020). Typically, though, the following conditions are considered

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 neurominorities: Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD); Autism; Dyslexia;  
5  
6 Dyspraxia/Developmental Coordination Disorder (DCD); Tourette Syndrome (TS);  
7  
8 Dyscalculia and Dysgraphia (Bewley & George, 2016; Grant, 2009; Jurecic, 2007; Kapp et  
9  
10 al., 2013; Snowling, 2005). Definitions of each condition have evolved over time and  
11  
12 diagnostic criteria, as well as treatment approaches, continue to vary considerably (Elliot &  
13  
14 Grigorenko, 2014; Kirby et al., 2011; Shelley-Tremblay & Rosen, 1996). For a historical  
15  
16 review of neurodiversity/neurodivergence since the industrialisation, see Doyle (2020).  
17  
18 Below we present a brief summary of some of the educo-medical models and  
19  
20 conceptualizations and prevalence; see Doyle (2017) for a working summary of the  
21  
22 occupational strengths and weaknesses of each condition.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **The medical model of neurodiversity.** This model defines neurominorities  
28  
29 linguistically through pseudo-medical deficits. The Diagnostics and Statistical Manual of  
30  
31 Psychiatric Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), known as the 'DSM-5', is  
32  
33 used by relevant professionals to categorize and determine individual cases. These  
34  
35 conditions are developmental as they emerge in childhood and/or adolescence but not in  
36  
37 response to trauma or ill health, and confer specific difficulties rather than indication of  
38  
39 global developmental delay (Snowling, 2005). Psychological diagnostic criteria define the  
40  
41 hallmark of a neurominority as a statistically significant within-person difference, showing a  
42  
43 disparity between cognitive strengths and weaknesses (e.g. verbal/visual reasoning, memory).  
44  
45 This is in contrast to a 'neurotypical' presentation where an individual's ability scores are  
46  
47 within a standard deviation or two of each other (either below average, average or above  
48  
49 average) (Grant, 2009; Ihori & Olvera, 2015). There are two sub-types of developmental  
50  
51 neurominorities (Doyle, 2017). Population prevalence is shown in parentheses, based on best  
52  
53 available data, noting that these vary across nations and depending on which diagnostic  
54  
55 criteria are applied:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

(1) Clinical conditions, which are assessed by behaviour / communication and typically diagnosed by Psychology, Neuropsychology and Psychiatry Clinicians working in health services:

- a) ADHD (around 5% worldwide (Catalá-López et al., 2017; Shelley-Tremblay & Rosen, 1996) but higher in USA (Danielson et al., 2018).
- b) Autism (between <1 and 1.6% globally, significantly affected by diagnostic criteria and access to services (Elsabbagh et al., 2012).
- c) TS (1% (CDC, 2009; Robertson, 2006)

(2) Applied conditions, which are assessed by functional difficulties, either educational or occupational, and typically diagnosed by Applied Psychologists, Educators and Occupational Therapists in school or work settings:

- a. Dyslexia (up to 10% (M. J. Snowling, 2010).
- b. DCD (up to 6% (R. Blank et al., 2019).
- c. Dyscalculia (up to 6% (Margaret J Snowling, 2005).
- d. Dysgraphia (n/k) (Adams, 2019).

For the purpose of this paper, we focus on the main developmental neurominorities, namely ADHD, autism, dyslexia, DCD and Tourette Syndrome, to gauge the quality of research regarding practical support and inclusion of these conditions in the workplace.

**The emerging social model of neurodiversity.** Given the high prevalence of neurominorities reported in advanced economies, there is an obvious evolutionary critique: that neurodiversity has evolved within a typical spectrum of human experience (Blank, Peters, Pickvance, Wilford, & MacDonald, 2008; Boycott, Schneider, & Osborne, 2014; Doyle, 2020; Shelley-Tremblay & Rosen, 1996). As it may be natural and useful to have a small percentage of the population with specialist rather than generalist abilities (T



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Armstrong, 2010), stakeholders argue that we need to develop neutral inclusion practices  
5 that do not insinuate ill health. It is worth noting that during the past 100 years both left-  
6 handedness and homosexuality were considered psychiatric disorders, ~~which~~  
7 ~~demonstrates~~ ing that any conception of 'normal' is culturally bound and subject to historical  
8 changes in line with Ecological Systems Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). We cannot be sure  
9 at this stage that a disorder based on quantifying the degree of adherence to a social norm,  
10 such as literacy, activity levels or social interactions, is truly a biological deficit. The social  
11 model of neurodiversity contends that the world is polarized and lacks in flexibility to  
12 accommodate all natural variations in human cognition and functioning (Shakespeare &  
13 Watson, 1997). Individuals who fall outside the norm represent a minority group, whose  
14 rights must be protected, and whose ways of functioning should be recognized, valued and  
15 harnessed (Runswick-Cole, 2014; Singer, 1998).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The social model has influenced public awareness of neurodiversity in recent years;  
33 the narrative of the 'diamond in the rough' is voiced in popular press and media world-wide  
34 (Adams, 2019; Philipson, 2014; Sniderman, 2014; Wollaston, 2016). Neurodiversity is also  
35 attracting the attention of the business press who describe a 'talent advantage' for employers  
36 through targeted recruitment of neurodiverse applicants (Austin & Pisano, 2017; Comaford,  
37 2017). This approach chimes with broader initiatives to promote diversity and inclusion of  
38 gender, ethnic minorities and sexual orientation (Cucina et al., 2013) and disability more  
39 generally (Murfitt et al., 2018) to broaden the talent pool, known as the 'business case' for  
40 inclusion (Saleh & Bruyère, 2018).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53 **Socio-legal barriers and protections.** There is a conflict between aspiration and  
54 reality in occupational practice. Despite sparse yet consistent evidence in support of specific  
55 talents (~~Thomas~~-Armstrong, 2015; Logan, 2009; Meilleur et al., 2015; Von Károlyi et al.,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 2003; White & Shah, 2006).  
5 neurominorities are currently not well accommodated by  
6 contemporary social structures based on neurotypical profiles. To illustrate, in the UK,  
7 modern apprenticeships require (high) literacy levels of grade 10 or above to access basic  
8 vocational training in fields that rely on specialist visual reasoning, such as hairdressing and  
9 plumbing (SFA, 2016). Interviews remain popular as a hiring technique globally, despite  
10 evidence that these unfairly disadvantage neurominorities, particularly autistic people  
11 (Cooper et al., 2018; Hayes et al., 2015). Such barriers matter. Only 10-16% of autistic  
12 people have a job (NAS, 2016) and ADHD has been shown to significantly increase the  
13 likelihood of incarceration in the UK and USA (Halmøy et al., 2009; Young et al., 2018).  
14 20% of UK and 35% of US entrepreneurs are dyslexic compared to only 1% of corporate  
15 managers (Logan, 2009) and a third of long-term unemployed people are disproportionately  
16 more likely to be dyslexic (Jensen et al., 2000). Such systemic exclusion has moral, social  
17 and economic consequences.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 To counter any extant structural barriers in education and work, neurominorities are  
35 considered recognised disabilities in most developed nations, which theoretically affords  
36 protection from discrimination by law. In the UK Equality Act (Equality Act, 2010), for  
37 example, reference is made to long-term (chronic) difficulties in memory, learning and  
38 communication which may be affected by all the above-named conditions. In the USA,  
39 Canada, Australia and throughout Europe, similar legislation provides disability protections  
40 (Australian Government, 1992; Canada, 1995; U.S. Department of Education's Office of  
41 Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), 2006; U.S. Equal Employment  
42 Opportunities Commission, 2008) all broadly aligned to the United Nations Convention on  
43 the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) (United Nations, 2006). Such legislative  
44 innovations are yet to translate into occupational success. The 'disability-employment gap'  
45 remains of concern worldwide (WHO, 2011). There is a pressing need to understand 'what  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 works' and move to an evidence-based practice model for applied practitioners to implement,  
5  
6 yet this 'push' for interventions based on diagnosis somewhat undermines the 'pull' of the  
7  
8 untapped talent model. Although applied research is sorely needed, ~~the~~ ontological positions  
9  
10 to date has have been dominated by the medical model. Yet individuals with lived experience  
11  
12 advocate a more critical and realist approach to inclusion which takes account of their  
13  
14 priorities through inclusive research design (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020; Rios et al., 2016;  
15  
16 Walker, 2012). We return to this point in our discussion.  
17  
18  
19

20 **A science-practitioner gap.** Activities that constitute disability 'support' vary  
21  
22 geographically, with advanced economies applying a range of active labor market  
23  
24 interventions supporting both the individual (pre- and during employment, 'supply side') as  
25  
26 well as the employer through incentivization and best practice guidance ('demand side')  
27  
28 (Murfitt et al., 2018; Saleh & Bruyère, 2018). However, the extent to which such programs  
29  
30 are effective for neurominorities is less documented (Gerber et al., 2012). In the UK for  
31  
32 example, there is a statutory government-body facilitating the provision of 'reasonable  
33  
34 adjustments' or accommodations to thousands of employees with invisible disabilities per  
35  
36 year; the third most common disability group after muscular-skeletal and sensory impairment  
37  
38 (Gifford, 2011). The program, known as 'Access to Work', offers one-to-one coaching and  
39  
40 assistive technology to individuals (at approx. \$1000 per person) and is broadly well-  
41  
42 regarded, as evidenced by user survey data (Adams, Tindle, Downing, & Morrice, 2018;  
43  
44 Melvill, Stevens, & Vaid, 2015). Similar programs such as 'Jobs in Jeopardy', part of the  
45  
46 Australian Disability Employment Service, are also seen ~~value-added~~ to add good value for  
47  
48 the tax-payer, yet do not specifically focus on the experience of neurominorities, with the  
49  
50 exception of autistic people (DEEWR, 2013). The provision of such interventions has  
51  
52 received minimal attention in research evidenced by high level summaries yet insufficient  
53  
54 high-quality studies. We are unaware of any process evaluations of relevant interventions  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 most frequently recommended for neurominorities by these programs, such as coaching,  
5 mentoring and assistive technology (N-Doyle, 2019; Kulow & Thomas, 2019; Lindstedt &  
6 Umb-Carlsson, 2013; Sundar, 2017; Work and Pensions Committee, 2018) that could  
7 elucidate psychological mechanisms of change or evidence career advancement outcomes.  
8 We are witnessing increasing practitioner advice from business advisor groups (ACAS, 2016;  
9 ODEP, 2020; Spargo-Mabbs et al., 2020; TUC, 2011) including coaching, assistive  
10 technology, provision of extra time, flexible hours policies and use of acoustic barriers to  
11 mitigate background noise distractions. There is a lack of reliable experimental work  
12 evaluating the effectiveness of relevant support structures for neurodivergent individuals  
13 (Patton, 2019; Sundar, 2017; Whitby, 2017) meaning that it is difficult to demarcate  
14 evidence-based practice (Briner & Rousseau, 2011).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Globally, disability programmes tend to be led by healthcare provision, vocational  
31 rehabilitation and occupational therapy tending towards those with more medicalized needs  
32 (N-Doyle, 2021). It is unclear the extent to which ~~applied~~ neurominorities such as ADHD,  
33 TS, dyslexic and dyspraxic employees might be covered by such programs, though autism  
34 has received increased attention (Lawer et al., 2009). For example, ~~individualized supported~~  
35 ~~employment plans~~ Individual Placement Support (IPS) are-is sometimes provided for autistic  
36 people, which ~~are-is~~ well-regarded and reasonably well-evaluated (Lounds-Taylor et al.,  
37 2012; Wehman et al., 2016). The principles and practices of such relevant interventions  
38 could provide a rich resource for expansion to accommodate other neurominorities. Yet they  
39 are based on a medical model, which implies that the workplace environment is fixed and the  
40 individual is impaired and therefore needs to adapt. This is at odds with the social model  
41 ambitions of the neurodiversity movement and the UNCRPD (United Nations ~~Convention on~~  
42 ~~the Rights of Persons with Disabilities~~, 2006). ~~At Further, at~~ an average cost of tens of  
43 thousands of dollars per person, which is an investment that an employer or employee alone  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

cannot justify, ~~these-IPS~~ interventions only break even when reductions in public spending are included (Jacob et al., 2015; Knapp et al., 2013). Employee Assistance Programs are also relevant in this context as a potential source of specific support. However, such programs tend to accommodate mental health specifically, they are potentially oblivious to cognitive strengths and impairment, ~~and-as well as being~~ somewhat vague about any benefit for individual work performance (Joseph et al., 2018). While it may be essential to address acute mental distress at source, it is possible that support for stress and anxiety when the cause is cognitive (not emotional or social) could create more long-term harm than good if support activities are not informed by a more holistic perspective on neurominorities. More specifically, ~~any~~the presupposition that the cause is individual failure to adapt rather than structural exclusion could be detrimental for self-worth, employment and other outcomes, leading to a spiral of negativity. Therefore, any academic enquiry must take a holistic perspective on interventions to address socially-constructed marginalization and individual need to inform evidence-based professional practice.

In summary, evidence regarding any activities to support improving job performance and subsequent occupational inclusion through disability accommodation for neurominorities is lacking (Adamou et al., 2013; Kirby et al., 2011; Palmer & Stern, 2015; Rice & Brooks, 2004). We consider the development of a research agenda an essential and urgent task for the neurodiversity inclusion movement.

### **Review questions**

Against a context of overlapping and potentially conflicting societal, legal and conceptual developments, we aimed to map any existing evidence and scrutinisze robustness as well as disciplinary origin. Although we endeavoured to keep an open mind, it was our assumption from the outset that our research would draw from the principles of 'Empty

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Reviews'. Empty reviews are becoming common in health and medical fields to establish  
5 lack of evidence for any interventions (Yaffe, Montgomery, Hopewell, & Shepard, 2012).  
6  
7

8 Guided by a systematic review methodology, we (1) formulated specific a priori questions,  
9  
10 (2) devised a search protocol, (3) applied a predefined relevance inclusion criteria and  
11  
12 process for achieving consensus and (4) applied a predefined quality inclusion criteria. Our  
13  
14 protocol was based on best practice guidance from the management/ business field, given the  
15  
16 work context for any relevant evidence (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2008).  
17  
18

19 Our research questions were:  
20  
21

- 22 1. How many papers are published in mainstream empirical organizational and  
23 management psychology publications related to the inclusion of neurodiversity (or  
24 related conditions) in work contexts?  
25  
26
- 27 2. How many papers exist in general psychological domains regarding  
28 neurodiversity?  
29  
30
- 31 3. How much research exists in any academic domain concerning the occupational  
32 presentation of neurodiversity?  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 From the third search, we were able to formulate a fourth question:  
40  
41

- 42 4. In which academic disciplines is relevant academic research currently located?  
43  
44  
45

46 From these structured searches, our synthesis will consider:  
47  
48

- 49 1. What, if anything, can we infer from the current literature about 'what works' in  
50 practice to improve the inclusion of neurodivergent individuals at work?  
51  
52
- 53 2. How should the prospective research agenda be epistemologically framed?  
54  
55  
56

### 57 **Systematic Empty Review Protocol**

58  
59

#### 60 **Search terms**

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Our review focused on developmental neurominorities using search terms which  
5 reflected differences in labels over time. We excluded mental health needs, chronic health  
6 conditions, acquired brain injury and general learning disabilities since they are already  
7 addressed in ~~a~~ more advanced research fields (Corbière et al., 2014; McGonagle et al., 2014;  
8 Tyerman, 2012). Some mental health research was extracted as a point of reference to  
9 compare volume of returns. Dyscalculia and dysgraphia *are* included in the taxonomy of  
10 developmental conditions but not considered in the extraction given the previously noted  
11 absence of research (Doyle, 2017). Table 1 summarizes all search terms.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 1 about here\*\***  
23  
24  
25

26 **Extraction protocol.** There were three iterative searches, conducted in January 2017  
27 and repeated in August 2018; these are ~~and~~ summarized in Figure 1.  
28  
29  
30

31 Search one: How many papers are published in mainstream empirical organizational  
32 psychology publications related to neurodiversity (or related conditions) in work  
33 contexts?  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The first search represented a systematic check that this field was indeed under-  
40 researched, by focusing on what ought to be ideal publications for considering the  
41 intersection of neurodiversity (a psychological phenomenon) and workplace inclusion: *The*  
42 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Industrial and Organizational*  
43 *Psychology* and the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. We  
44 commenced by hand-searching the four journal websites specifically for the five conditions  
45 and the term ‘neurodiversity’ to understand the extent to which they featured in key applied  
46 psychology research.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

~~Search one: How many papers are published in mainstream empirical organizational psychology publications related to neurodiversity (or related conditions) in work contexts?~~

No time limits were applied. The primary aim of this search was to extract the number of references to neurominorities and the term ‘neurodiversity’ itself, and we did not initially subject papers to a second stage rigorous relevance and quality criteria check. However, the small number of returns enabled a qualitative review of the extent to which conditions were merely ‘mentioned’ as opposed to explored conceptually or evaluated. Table 2 shows the number of returns compared to the number mentioning mild-to-moderate mental health needs in two of the journals.

**Search two:** how many papers refer to neurodiverse-neurominority conditions in general psychology domains?

A second search of the broader psychological domains was conducted across the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (repeated); *British Journal of Psychology*; *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*; *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*; *British Journal of Educational Psychology*; *British Journal of Health Psychology* and *British Journal of Social Psychology* in order to sample—check whether or not consideration of neurodiversity was better represented in relevant psychological sub-disciplines. The second search was not intended to be definitive, but indicative of the spread of individual condition representation in research relevant to the neurodiversity. We did not apply time limits but categorized the returns into papers published before 1995, 1995-2005 and 2005+ to consider if the developing social movement was in any way linked to number or foci of publications. As with search one, the extracted papers were not subjected to relevance and quality review and may only ‘mention’ the condition rather than explore



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 thoroughly. We compared the relative percentages of each condition's prevalence rates with  
5 the relative volume of research, to observe any over- or underrepresentation.  
6  
7

8  
9 **Search three:** How many papers address the occupational presentation of  
10 neurodiversity to a high academic standard of evidence in any discipline?  
11  
12

13  
14 **Question four:** In which academic disciplines is relevant academic research  
15 currently located?  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 We undertook a wider, more international review of the literature on occupational  
21 presentation of neurodiversity in EBSCO-hosted journals to ascertain if there was a tranche  
22 of yielding principles (Cucina et al., 2013) that could be appropriated for inclusion practice  
23 from related disciplines, for example such as vocational rehabilitation. We limited the search  
24 to the English language and included grey literature using all terms in Table 1. We took a  
25 systematic approach, with an initial 1439 returns creating a bespoke extraction form in Excel.  
26  
27 We then filtered results by abstract screening, removing any papers without reference to  
28 occupational issues. The second author undertook spot checks and a discursive review of  
29 ambiguous cases until we achieved full consensus for inclusion, leaving us with 111 papers.  
30  
31 We did not explicitly seek to apply a rigorous quality check at this stage, mainly because the  
32 aim of the review was not meta-analysis of an intervention success, simply exploration of the  
33 extent of research. Instead, we considered the hierarchy of evidence principles (Rousseau et  
34 al., 2008) and used quality guidance from related systematic reviews (Doyle & McDowall,  
35 2019; Rojon, McDowall, & Saunders, 2011) to rate papers as strong evidence (systematic  
36 review and meta-analysis), medium evidence (well-constructed primary papers) or weak  
37 evidence (poorly-constructed papers, case studies, practitioner opinion and anecdotal  
38 evidence). The primary author performed these ratings, the second author cross-checked and  
39 discussion was held to resolve conflicts until full consensus was reached. Papers scoring  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 medium or above were retained: 48 papers in total. Finally, the papers were categorized by  
5  
6 academic discipline using journal titles (or full paper review if not clear) to consider where, if  
7  
8 not in organizational psychology or management, knowledge regarding the occupational  
9  
10 presentation of neurodiversity is currently located. Figure 1 depicts the number of included  
11  
12 papers at each stage.  
13

14  
15  
16 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Figure 1 about here\*\***  
17

## 18 **Results and Synthesis**

19

20  
21  
22 Below we present the number of returns in each extraction, categorized as described  
23  
24 above, and a brief narrative summary of the findings for each search according to the first  
25  
26 three review questions:  
27

28  
29  
30 **Search 1: Organizational psychology journals.** Table 2 shows the number of  
31  
32 papers mentioning neurominority conditions and an absence of the phrase neurodiversity to  
33  
34 date in the contemporary organizational psychology that we selected. Only 32 papers  
35  
36 mentioned ~~neurodiverse-neurominority~~ conditions at all; 22 of these were in SIOP's  
37  
38 *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* journal, three in the *Journal of Applied Psychology*  
39  
40 and two in *Personnel Psychology*. The *Journal of Occupational and Organizational*  
41  
42 *Psychology* (JOOP) mentions neurodiverse conditions on only five occasions compared with  
43  
44 413 mentions of mental health conditions.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 2 about here\*\***  
50

51  
52 Full paper review of the returns did not provide evidence of the intervention  
53  
54 evaluations required to support disability inclusion practice, protect employers/employees or  
55  
56 justify current policy. For example, the two dyslexia returns within *JOOP* pertain to (1) the  
57  
58 use of handwriting as a recruitment technique (Klimoski & Rafaeli, 1983) and (2) a broader  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 article about employer responses to disability inclusion (Jackson et al., 2000). Similarly, the  
5  
6 other neurominorities listed above are mentioned in references related to a broader theme,  
7  
8 rather than examined as to how they relate to occupational psychology per se (for example,  
9  
10 both ADHD and autism are within the reference list for the coaching review conducted by  
11  
12 Jones et al. 2016). While SIOP's *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* journal marks a  
13  
14 significant improvement in volume compared with others in the discipline, there are two  
15  
16 points of note: (1) mental health papers were still disproportionately better represented and (2)  
17  
18 papers were cross-sectional and/or conceptual reviews offering descriptions of problems  
19  
20 rather than experimental work regarding potential solutions (Ashworth, 2014; Bono et al.,  
21  
22 2009; Gabbard et al., 2014; Hyland & Rutigliano, 2013; Saal et al., 2014; Santuzzi et al.,  
23  
24 2014).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 **Search 2: broader psychological research.** The results presented in table 3 show  
31  
32 the number of papers mentioning neurominorities and mental health conditions in a sample of  
33  
34 UK-based psychology journals.  
35

36  
37 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 3 about here\*\*\***  
38  
39

40 The UK-based psychology journal search revealed an increasingly disproportionate  
41  
42 body of research focusing on mental health needs and autism, relative to their prevalence.  
43  
44 Closer inspection of two journals revealed consistent cross-disciplinary research between  
45  
46 mental health and occupational psychology: 1686 studies referenced 'work' in the *British*  
47  
48 *Journal of Clinical Psychology* and 413 studies on mental health were published in the  
49  
50 *JOOP*, which suggests a more mature research field concerning the impact of mental health  
51  
52 in the workplace, though we concede that this has not been quality checked. Conversely,  
53  
54 dyslexia studies appear to be decreasing in number and mainly focused on the diagnosis of  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 children to the exclusion of occupational contexts. ADHD, Dyslexia, DCD and TS are all  
5 under-researched compared to their population prevalence.  
6  
7  
8

9 **Search 3 and Question 4: Multi-disciplinary studies on neurodiversity and work.**

10 Of the 48 extracted papers, the following conditions were represented: ADHD, 13 papers;  
11 Autism, 19 papers (including four with strong evidence supporting inclusion activities);  
12 DCD, five papers; Dyslexia, six papers and TS, five papers. Table 4 shows the professional  
13 discipline sources (indicated by journal title) of the 48 papers. We note that, while  
14 neuroscientific research has proliferated in recent years and accounts for much of the extant  
15 condition-specific literature, only one neuroscience paper met the criterion of referring to  
16 occupational issues. A full list of the journal titles for extracted studies is presented in  
17 appendix 1.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 4 about here\*\*\***

31  
32  
33 **Synthesis Question 1: What, if anything, can we infer from the current literature**  
34 **about ‘what works’ to improve the inclusion of neurodivergent individuals at**  
35 **work?**  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Given the absence of relevant intervention evaluation (either randomized control trial,  
43 cross-sectional research, process analysis or qualitative) in mainstream organizational and  
44 management psychology, we consider our first search an ‘empty review’ (Yaffe et al., 2012).  
45  
46 ~~The limited number of primary papers across broader applied psychological domains describe~~  
47 ~~issues and call for further research, yet do not culminate in a clear research agenda congruent~~  
48 ~~with evidence-based practice (Schlosser & Sigafos, 2009).~~ Further, search two indicated  
49 that the investigation of individual neurodiverse-neurominority conditions per se is  
50 unrepresentative of population prevalence and seems instead to be led by media fashion;  
51 ~~(e.g. for example,~~ the dominance of autism within current popular narratives (Bernick,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

2019)). -The limited number of primary papers across broader applied psychological domains describe issues and call for further research, yet do not culminate in a clear research agenda congruent with evidence-based practice (Schlosser & Sigafoos, 2009).

Regarding our third review question concerning quality of evidence for determining ‘what works’, we note limited research that could contribute to an evidence-based agenda which is dispersed across disciplines lacking relevance to the socio-legal, economic and occupational context; for example, neuroscience, child development and social work, which leaves crucial epistemological and applied knowledge gaps in our understanding. While we commend the neuroscience paradigm for advancing our etiological understanding of symptomatology, it does not reference functional, workplace-contextualized outcomes and is thus lacking ecological validity (Chaytor et al., 2006; D’Souza & Karmiloff-Smith, 2017). Vocational rehabilitation and Occupational Health are the closest represented disciplines in terms of purpose, specifically exploring conditions, their impact on the workplace and intervention evaluation. However, these fields are more closely aligned to the medical paradigm which implicates a disability inclusion model for practice, rather than an organizational-level talent management approach such as the mentoring and peer support programs favoured by gender and race inclusion initiatives (Roberson, 2018).

We conclude that there is insufficient academic enquiry into neurodiversity at work and highlight a need for broadening the epistemological frameworks of neurodiversity research to offer theoretical support to the developing agenda.

**Synthesis Question 2: How should the prospective research agenda be epistemologically framed?**

To address the disparity between research to date and the emerging social movement arguing for marginalized lived experience at the heart of research (Bottema-Beutel et al.,

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 2020; Rios et al., 2016), a constructivist investigation of experience and power dynamics  
5 appears crucial. Alongside, we recognize the need for positivist evaluation of interventions;  
6 the limited extant studies indicate an immature evidence base to underpin practice and policy.  
7  
8 Controlled trials must be broadened from the individual to the organizational level of  
9  
10 analysis. Minded that qualitative and quantitative research are complementary, not  
11  
12 conflicted, we propose Critical Realism (Houston, 2014) as an appropriate epistemology for a  
13  
14 developing research agenda. Critical Realism facilitates inductive, hypothetic-deductive and  
15  
16 abductive reasoning, required to iteratively blend theory and method (Van Maanen et al.,  
17  
18 2007) for the development of a nascent research field in a Pragmatic Paradigm (Simpson,  
19  
20 2018). Our proposed ecological framework is outlined in Figure 2, ~~with~~deploying multiple  
21  
22 levels of analysis (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) ~~focusing in which we focus~~ on two intersecting  
23  
24 points for intervention and analysis: the micro/meso and the meso/macro. ~~T~~This is congruent  
25  
26 with Critical Realist research and incorporates the ecological approach that has been more  
27  
28 thoroughly explored in general disability employment (Szymanski, ~~E.~~ et al., 2012).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Figure 2 about here\*\***  
37  
38

39 We now briefly explore the issues within each level of analysis before outlining a  
40 research and practice agenda in more detail in the next section. The micro level refers to the  
41 neurodivergent employee, their individual work performance, and the current perceived need  
42 to attain levels of literacy, sedentary concentration and/or social communication norms akin  
43 to their neurotypical co-workers, in order to retain their employment. Critical Realism  
44 ~~facilitates evaluative studies regarding individual level accommodations as described above,~~  
45 ~~as well as exploring specific influences on career inclusion such as the cognitive ability, self-~~  
46 ~~efficacy and career awareness (Leather et al., 2011; Nalavany et al., 2017; Test et al., 2009).~~  
47  
48 Individual level effects will be additionally influenced by marginalization  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

~~and intersectionality, such as marginalization resulting from internalized stereo-type threat to career ambition, such as~~ gender, gender identity, ethnicity and race, sexual orientation, age and socio-economic status (Crenshaw, 1991; Cucina et al., 2013; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Ozbilgin et al., 2011; Szymanski, ~~E.~~ et al., 2012; Young et al., 2020). Critical Realism facilitates evaluative studies regarding individual level accommodations as described above, as well as exploring specific the influences on career inclusion caused by the power dynamics; such as the cognitive ability for example, self-efficacy and career awareness (Leather et al., 2011; Nalavany et al., 2017; Test et al., 2009).

The meso level refers to the immediate context of the neurodivergent employee, including design of their job, workstation and environment, but also the communication norms of their team and organization. The meso level is influenced heavily by the socio-historical context of said norms including the prioritization of literacy and fine motor control as the major form of communication, and sedentary, hyper-social education and work (N- Doyle, 2020). We also note current occupational constructions drawn from the macro-historical level of analysis which create meso-level norms. For example such as office work, which made sense when staff needed access to paper files and ledgers in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, but makes less sense now that our work is stored electronically and remotely. Such norms have creating-created exclusion and segregation; for example, ~~for~~ the illiterate dyslexic who should be avoided or the autistic technologist who might be desirable but only in a limited role. Thus, as well as alongside a 'Realist' evaluation of direct support effectiveness for employers such as toolkits and inclusion best practice guidance, a 'Critical' challenge of common / absent narratives and role models in business is encouraged.

The macro level of analysis influences neurodiversity inclusion through the use of active labor market policies such as those described in the introduction (e.g. Access to Work,



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Jobs in Jeopardy) and the extent to which employers are incentivized to address disability  
5 inclusion in hiring and talent management (Murfitt et al., 2018; Saleh & Bruyère, 2018). As  
6 mentioned in the introduction, such policies are lacking in longitudinal evaluation, which is  
7 an urgent concern considering the persistent disability employment gap more broadly. Yet  
8 such policies also exist in a macro-historical context of wider technological advancement that  
9 facilitates new possibilities for inclusion. Contemporary expectations of normalization and  
10 homogeneity at work, inherited from the industrial revolution as above, are in flux as we  
11 adapt to ubiquitous technology, cloud access to records and indeed even the type of work  
12 available (ONCE, 2019; WEF, 2020), impacting the policies and institutions just as they  
13 affect businesses. For neurominorities who have struggled with tasks typically framed as  
14 necessary for 'good' performance, including literacy and handwriting, hyper-socialization  
15 and sedentary work, such changes require critical appraisal as they offer potential for  
16 increased inclusion across the lifespan. For instance, writing tasks are already becoming  
17 more fully supported through adaptive software, which allow more accurate dictation and  
18 transcription; these changes will increasingly be incorporated into education and national  
19 training design. We see opportunity here for the next generation of neurominority workers,  
20 who could be significantly less disabled if policies can catch up with technological trends.  
21 For example, incentivising acceleration of digitization and automation of literacy production  
22 in education and public sector workplaces could have a ripple effect to meso-level workplace  
23 norms more generally.-

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

The next section focuses on specific research activities required to mature the neurodiversity field of practice, building on the Critical Realist epistemology framework to evaluate and challenge both supply and demand approaches.

**Discussion: Mapping a new field of research and practice research agenda**



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**The research agenda.** Given the current dearth of evidence as evidenced through our empty review, our attention must turn to the focus for a new research agenda, a good place to start are primary evaluative studies. One particularly urgent concern is the need for longitudinal evaluation and process analysis of adjustments that are currently routinely deployed at the micro level, such as coaching and assistive technology (Nancy Doyle, 2019), ~~and blanket use of heuristical practices originating in education, selection and assessment, such as 25% 'extra time' (Carpenter & Paetzold, 2013).~~ We need to understand which how accommodations 'work' as interventions for a number of target outcomes, such as, in that they might lead to secure employment and, improved career advancement, for, be valued by individuals ultimately evidenced by a reduced disability employment gap and recipients and added value to anfor employers through enhanced work performance, but ultimately evidenced by a reduced disability employment gap. ~~Cost benefit analysis can be applied and efforts directed to the most productive solutions.~~ We need to understand how pivotal adjustment activities are in improving job performance, and whether improvements lead to increased employment opportunities to reduce the disability employment gap. Generalist disability research includeshas demonstratedproduced some cost benefit analysis of supply side adjustments but alsoas well as how to implement productive demand side interventions, such as networking, best practice sharing, reporting on disability inclusion data and influencing the will of businesses in acting inclusively (Saleh & Bruyère, 2018). The neurodiversity movement needs replicate, in order evaluating against to evidence the business case argument that inclusion equals talent and may improve morale and productivity (ILO, 2010). In this section, encompassing Tables 5 and 6, weWe argue that a perspective is most suited to such aims given the complex interplay of individual needs and business requirements

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

~~Critical Analysis. The iAlone, intervention evaluation of which activities deployed in practice 'work' will only described above all locate focus on change at the micro level, with meso and macro 'success' markers being as an aggregate of individual improvement and achievement. Yet, globally, current legislation requires the employer to make accommodations / adjustments to infrastructure; it does not require the individual employee to change (social model). Without multi-level, critical analysis we risk appropriating medical research agendas that ignore the social model identity of that minority (Huijg, 2020; Riddick, 2001; Shakespeare & Watson, 1997). Such limited perspective may not only fail to recognize individual strength and capabilities, but also resonate, which will play poorly with an increasingly vocal stakeholder movement who ascribe to the 'nothing about us without us' (Charlton, 1998) principle (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020). In Figure 3 we briefly explore the nuances of this conflict as it stands in socio-legal practice.~~

~~**\*\*Note to Editor, insert Figure 3 about here\*\***~~

~~The case study presented in Figure 3 illustrates the limitation of the 'case-by-case' approach. In We argue that we can learn from To apply principles adapted from analogous fields such as on race and gender inclusion, fields which focus es on, research here tends towards identifying unconscious biases in hiring, managing and promoting marginalized workers (Roberson, 2018). Outcomes such as pay disparity and representation at senior levels are considered markers of success, not the effectiveness of programs to improve the performance of individuals who happen to be black, brown-trans or female. Race and gender interventions are thus less medicalized, without the 'diagnosis' and 'treatment' lens favored in supply side interventions for neurominorities, though we acknowledge that even if the Pressure to behave to the social 'norms' of the white male are still implicitly applied and through widespread mentoring arrangements are widespread (Dashper, 2019; Kandola, 2018).~~

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

~~y et race and gender interventions are less medicalized, without ‘diagnosis’ and ‘treatment’ protocols. O~~ To summarize, operating from the social model ~~infers~~ signposts that, like wider equality diversity and inclusion initiatives, it is businesses that ~~who~~ need to change, not individuals. ~~a position~~ There is a clear need for neurodiversity research which incorporates a macro-economic, socio-legal perspective and identifies areas within the employee life cycle where policy change would lead to greater inclusion.

We look to generalist disability inclusion research again for further insight on macro-economic research directions. ~~that~~ Herein, it remains unclear whether demand side intervention policies such as tax breaks, quota targets and penalties stimulate systemic change (Salah and Bruyere 2018) ~~stimulate systemic change~~ long term systemic inclusion change., although it is, however, paradoxically possible that by aligning with disability., neurominorities may benefit from these types of inclusion although there is a moral (and legal) imperative for starting at the system level. ~~Yet, Ce~~ Current organizational practice in neurodiversity inclusion, however, tends more towards the ‘carrot’ than the ‘stick’ ~~however~~. Key stakeholders in business may not respond positively to mandated quotas and this could set the movement back, rather than drive acceptance. Building on piloted affirmative action programs such as Autism at Work initiatives, employers may instead prefer to be guided by clear policy suggestions on how to ~~graduate~~ progress from token inclusion to systemic inclusion. Research activities will again need to replicate this sort of analysis to support the development of policy through evaluation of neurodiversity specific endeavours currently in vogue such as affirmative action.

~~Here we propose~~ The Neurodiversity movement may yet aspire to macro-, structural inclusion goals, ~~adapting~~ ‘Universal Design’, a set of principles currently aimed at increasing accessibility of buildings and technology (The Center for Universal Design, 1997) ~~to HR~~

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

processes Universal Design for HR and targeting the subtle implicit normalization executed through recruitment, performance management, appraisal and promotion. Arguably this is more in line with wider diversity and inclusion initiatives seeking to reduce the effect of stereotypes and norms that are baked in to human resource. This might include avoiding unnecessary interview requirements for jobs that hinge on data analytics (where work sample testing would be more appropriate, and tap into the typically autistic talent of accuracy, for example) or over use of cognitive testing, including without assistive technology compatibility, where specialist thinkers are required to demonstrate generalist abilities for specialist roles. Such an approach could be contextualized as unleashing talent rather than adding to manager's to do lists, and would be congruent with the aspirations of the Neurodiversity movement. In short, there are a number of ways in which HR could adapt to maximize the talent potential of this untapped minority, without compromising the integrity of recruitment and organizational performance. Table 5 indicates how Universal Design principles could be manifested across six core areas of HR: job design, hiring, onboarding, training and development, performance management and well-being support. We recommend review, critique and further development of these ideas within industrial/organizational psychology and human resource management research.

**\*\*Note to editor, insert Table 5 about here\*\***

To summarize, mainstream psychology and management research have failed to heed the call for research to support the needs of a significant minority (Beauregard et al., 2018; Ozbilgin et al., 2011) and interventions remain focused at the individual level. We argue that this is short-sighted and incomplete given the Social Model of legislation, the future of work design and the talent principles of the Neurodiversity paradigm. We propose the following a series of research questions, presented below in Table 65, using the 'Context, Intervention.

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Mechanism, Outcome' (CIMO) framework as a guiding structure in pragmatic-Realist research (Denyer et al., 2008). Our but with a Critical lens acknowledges the ontological duality of medical and social models in neurodiversity and enables both inductive and deductive research, in iterations and cycles rather than a beginning and an end. Such an approach is essential due to the socio-historical constructed nature of the disablement. The Critical Realist paradigm epistemologically frames the need for research to simultaneously consider 'what works' with appropriate challenge to the dominant paradigm of what is 'not working.' -

**\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 55 about here\*\*\***

**Practice Implications:** The neurodiversity paradigm is yet to make an evidence-informed impact on organizational practice. WTo advance practice whilst awaiting the development of specific research, we propose applying 'Universal Design'; a set of principles about justice, flexibility and simplicity, currently aimed at increasing accessibility of buildings and technology (The Center for Universal Design, 1997) to Human Resource (HR) processes. TheOur overarching premise is to ensure inclusive practice throughout the employment lifecycle to pre-empt; (rather than remediate); exclusion and bias embedding activities which benefit the entire organisation. Examples might include replacing unnecessary interview requirements for jobs that hinge on data analytics (where work sample testing would be more appropriate, and tap into the typically autistic talent of accuracy, for example) or considering the overuse of cognitive testing, including without assistive technology compatibility, where specialist thinkers are required to demonstrate generalist abilities for specialist roles. Both these activities could improve the predictive validity of recruitment and benefit a wider population. In short, HR could adapt to maximize the talent potential of this untapped minority, without compromising the integrity of recruitment and

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

organizational performance. Table 6 indicates how Universal Design principles could be applied across six core areas of HR: job design, hiring, onboarding, training and development, performance management and well-being support. We recommend the review, critique and further development of these ideas in industrial/organizational psychology and human resource management research.

\*\* Insert Table 6 about here

Additionally to Universal Design, other bodies of work may offer guidance to practitioners. The neurodiversity paradigm is in its infancy, struggling for recognition within diversity and inclusion programs and fighting the legacy of medical pathologization (Doyle, 2020)is yet to make an evidence-informed impact on organizational practice. We therefore frame the implications as set out in Table as a n appropriately caveated set of reflective questions6. Those with a minority diagnosis are unlikely to disclose to employers (Madaus et al., 2002; Santuzzi et al., 2014), for (warranted) fear of prejudice and stigma (Colella et al., 1998). Employment inclusion practitioners must could learn on examples from more mature research bodies investigating minority prejudice such as mental health, race, gender andor ; sexual orientation inclusion in order toto mitigate the impact of marginalization develop protocols for increasing equity (Kessler et al., 2009; Roberson, 2018). TheyPractitioners should, however, , whilst alsosimultaneously balance -appreciatinge the legal obligations for disability support and potential medical treatment that might be in operation at the micro level. In practice, relevant interventions need to include but go beyond this involves not only seeking qualified, professional support for individual employees to ensure that relevant activities do not remain merely compliance--focused. More fundamentally, there is a need to ,but also reviewing for practitioners to intervene when delivering standard HR protocols around job design, hiring, contracting, training, management performance and wellbeing, to



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

consider the impact of the neurotypical norm (as per Table 56). For example, does a role really ~~require high standards of spelling if all communication is electronic, and assistive technology can be applied~~ require influencing skills and teamwork if the focus is on highly accurate output produced alone? Should ~~thea~~ role require full time attendance to a busy, crowded office space which has an additional cognitive burden for those with attention deficits, given the ubiquity of remote access technology? ~~Must we~~ Is it necessary to interview for all roles when a work sample test might be more practical at assessing the required performance, given that autistic people are more likely to underperform at interview? HR, applied psychologists, occupational health and vocational rehabilitation practitioners can deliver systemic change by updating their practice to incorporate neurodiversity themes, consulting with lived experience voices to ensure participation and challenging 'neuronormativity' (Huijg, 2020).

~~Caution is advised with the commissioning of 'experts' to provide human resources advice and guidance. Whilst lived experience voices are essential for empowering participation, we should not expect colleagues to do the work of advising as an unpaid part of their role. wherwe recommend that organizations should empower In-house ~~ne~~ facilitate neurodiversity champions must be able to speak to the full variety of neurominority experiences and appreciate the different, and somewhat often conflicting, narratives of the people for whom they speak (Baron-Cohen, 2019; N-Doyle, 2021). However, we note that in-house champions should not be expected to provide professional service voluntarily alongside their paid roles. Accommodation and inclusion policy initiatives should still be advised by occupational professionals with expertise in disability (Spargo-Mabbs et al., 2020). There are harsh legal penalties for failing in practice, both for individuals who may~~

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 lose their job and employers who could be sued. ~~The credentials of those issuing inclusion~~  
5 ~~advice would be viewed negatively by courts or insurers if they relied solely on personal,~~  
6 ~~anecdotal experience and thus equally the employers following such guidance could also be~~  
7 ~~viewed negatively. In summary,~~ As neurodiversity inclusion currently sits at the intersection  
8  
9 between disability accommodation and diversity inclusion, practitioners must walk a tight  
10  
11 rope between the medical and social models to improve occupational access and success.  
12  
13 Current advice is therefore to target all levels of analysis in weighing up appropriate  
14  
15 interventions, combining participation from those affected with professional  
16  
17 recommendations and services. Practitioners are encouraged to seek evaluation opportunities  
18  
19 and to work with academic partners on longitudinal studies to build the evidence base in this  
20  
21 area, as per the activities in Tables 5 and 6. In Table 7, we pose a series of reflective  
22  
23 questions for practitioners to consider when beginning to adopt neurodiversity inclusive  
24  
25 protocols and projects.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 \*\* Insert Table 7 about here  
35  
36

### 37 38 **Conclusion**

39  
40 In this paper we have systematically described the dearth of consistent and  
41  
42 ecologically-valid research regarding neurodiversity at work. This, which we argue, is a  
43  
44 risk for individuals, employers, policy makers and applied disability inclusion practice. ~~In~~  
45  
46 ~~particular, the mainstream organizational and applied psychological disciplines are yet to pick~~  
47  
48 ~~up the theme.~~ The neurodiversity phenomenon is no longer new, and we thus present it as an  
49  
50 exciting opportunity for multi-disciplinary researchers to explore the implications of  
51  
52 neurodiversity for both individual career interventions and organizational design. We have  
53  
54 outlined an epistemological starting point for the field of research to, wherein we can begin  
55  
56 answering the pressing question of ‘what works’, ~~to mitigate the risk of practitioners or~~  
57  
58  
59  
60



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4 ~~vested amateurs applying unsubstantiated advice. We also caution that failure to do so will~~  
5  
6 ~~further the science-practice gap (Briner & Walshe, 2013). These~~ practical concerns we have  
7  
8 outlined contribute to a wider need to reflect on the broader influence of disability inclusion  
9  
10 legislation which, despite decades of operation in developed countries, has yet to make a  
11  
12 substantive impact on disability employment (Scope, 2018; WHO, 2011). ~~This-We~~ indicates  
13  
14 a ~~clear~~ need to ~~offer not only~~build further than the a consideration of ‘what works’, ~~but to~~also  
15  
16 ‘what can we make work’, by incorporating appropriate structural flexibility to facilitate  
17  
18 positive work, life and societal outcomes for the many neurodiverse ‘diamonds in the rough’.  
19  
20 We conclude with a clear message for five shifts in ~~thinking, thinking,~~ as depicted in Figure  
21  
22 3.

23  
24  
25  
26  
27 \*\* Insert Figure 3 about here

28  
29  
30 sWe advocate for starting with a ~~move~~ from ~~the~~ medical to a social perspective,  
31  
32 ~~to~~then embracing context-sensitive and inclusive research ~~to~~and interrogating policy and  
33  
34 practice based on ~~habitually~~legal compliance ~~-~~based policy and praetice. Learning from  
35  
36 other, more mature fields is a ~~starting point~~necessary step to enable organizations to move  
37  
38 towards inclusive design without repeating mistakes or reinventing the wheel. We hope we  
39  
40 have inspired researchers and practitioners alike to critically reflect on the gaps in our  
41  
42 understanding and begin building neurodiversity into studies and projects. We will know this  
43  
44 is working when we see neurominorities represented in all forms of employment, adding  
45  
46 critical diversity of thought and experience to the design, delivery and support of human  
47  
48 endeavours. Inclusive work practices benefit everyone, ~~not just neurominorities.~~  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

## References

- ACAS. (2016). *Reasonable Adjustments in the Workplace*. Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service. London. <http://www.acas.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=6074>
- Adamou, M., Arif, M., Asherson, P., Aw, T.-C., Bolea, B., Coghill, D., Guðjónsson, G., Halmøy, A., Hodgkins, P., Müller, U., Pitts, M., Trakoli, A., Williams, N., & Young, S. (2013). Occupational issues of adults with ADHD. *BMC Psychiatry*, *13*, 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-59>
- Adams, C. (2019). Man Confronts Fear of Disclosing His Autism to Potential Employers: It “Can Be a Positive Asset.” *People*. <https://people.com/human-interest/the-employables-jeff-autism-ae-tv-show/>
- Adams, L., Tindle, A., Downing, C., & Morrice, N. (2018). *Access to Work: Qualitative research with applicants-, employers and delivery staff* (Issue November). Department for Work and Pensions, London.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. American Psychiatric Association, Washington DC.
- Americans With Disabilities Act, Pub. L. No. PL 110-325 (S 3406) (2008). U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, Washington DC. <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adaaa.cfm>
- Armstrong, T. (2010). *The Power of Neurodiversity*. De Capo, Cambridge, MA.
- Armstrong, Thomas. (2015). The myth of the normal brain: Embracing neurodiversity. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *17*(4), 348–352. <https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2015.17.4.msoc1-1504>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Ashworth, S. D. (2014). Invisible disabilities and employment testing. *Industrial and*  
5 *Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 256–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12144>  
6  
7

8  
9 Austin, R. D., & Pisano, G. P. (2017). Neurodiversity as a Competitive Advantage. *Harvard*  
10 *Business Review*, 95, 96–103. [https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-](https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-advantage)  
11 [advantage](https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-advantage)  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 Baron-Cohen, S. (2019). The Concept of Neurodiversity Is Dividing the Autism Community.  
17 *The Scientific American*. [https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/)  
18 [of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/)  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Beaugard, T. A., Basile, K. A., & Thompson, C. A. (2018). Organizational Culture in the  
25 Context of National Culture. In R. Johnson, W. Shen, & K. M. Shockley (Eds.), *The*  
26 *Cambridge Handbook of the Global Work-Family Interface* (pp. 555–569). Cambridge  
27 University Press, [Cambridge, UK-](#)  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Bernick, M. (2019, January). Effective Autism (Neurodiversity) Employment. *Forbes*.  
35 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18)  
36 [neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18)  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Bewley, H., & George, A. (2016). *Neurodiversity at Work*. National Institute of Social and  
44 Economic Research, [London](#).  
45  
46

47  
48 Blank, L., Peters, J., Pickvance, S., Wilford, J., & MacDonald, E. (2008). A systematic  
49 review of the factors which predict return to work for people suffering episodes of poor  
50 mental health. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 18(1), 27–34.  
51  
52  
53  
54 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-008-9121-8>  
55  
56

57  
58 Blank, R., Barnett, A. L., Cairney, J., Green, D., Kirby, A., Polatajko, H., Rosenblum, S.,  
59 Germany, R. B., & Vinc, S. (2019). International clinical practice recommendations on  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4 the definition, diagnosis, assessment, intervention, and psychosocial aspects of  
5  
6 developmental coordination disorder. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*,  
7  
8 *61*, 242–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.14132>  
9

10  
11 Bono, J. E., Purvanova, R. K., Towler, A. J., & Peterson, D. B. (2009). A Survey of  
12  
13 Executive Coaching Practices. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*(2), 361–404.  
14  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01142.x>  
16  
17

18  
19 Bottema-Beutel, K., Kapp, S. K., Lester, J. N., Sasson, N. J., Hand, B. N., & Otr, L. (2020).  
20  
21 Avoiding Ableist Language : Suggestions for Autism Researchers. *Autism in Adulthood*,  
22  
23 *00*(00), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1089/aut.2020.0014>  
24  
25

26  
27 Boycott, N., Schneider, J., & Osborne, M. (2014). Creating a culture of employability in  
28  
29 mental health. *Mental Health & Social Inclusion*, *18*(1), 29-34 6p.  
30  
31 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-03-2014-0007>  
32  
33

34  
35 Briner, R. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (2011). L1 Evidence-Based I – O Psychology: Not There  
36  
37 Yet but Now a Little Nearer ? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *4*(1), 76–82.  
38  
39 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01301.x>  
40  
41

42  
43 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and*  
44  
45 *Design*. Harvard University Press, [Cambridge, MA](#). ISBN 0-674-22457-4  
46  
47

48  
49 Carter, E. W., Austin, D., & Trainor, A. A. (2012). Predictors of Postschool Employment  
50  
51 Outcomes for Young Adults With Severe Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy*  
52  
53 *Studies*, *23*(1), 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207311414680>  
54  
55

56  
57 Catalá-López, F., Hutton, B., Núñez-Beltrán, A., Page, M. J., Ridao, M., Saint-Gerons, D.  
58  
59 M., Catalá, M. A., Tabarés-Seisdedos, R., & Moher, D. (2017). The pharmacological  
60  
and non-pharmacological treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

- and adolescents: A systematic review with network meta-analyses of randomised trials. *In PLoS ONE* (Vol. 12, Issue 7), 12 (7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180355>
- CDC. (2009). Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. *Center for Disease Control*, 58(21), 581–608. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/wk/mm5821.pdf>
- Chapman, R. (2020). Defining neurodiversity for research and practice. In H. B. Rosqvist, N. Chown, & A. Stenning (Eds.), *Neurodiversity Studies: A New Critical Paradigm* (pp. 218–220). Routledge, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429322297-21>
- Chapman, R., & Veit, W. (2020). Representing the Autism Spectrum. *American Journal of Bioethics*, 20(4), 46–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2020.1730495>
- Charlton, J. (1998). *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment*. University of California Press, California. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pnqn9>
- Chaytor, N., Schmitter-Edgecombe, M., & Burr, R. (2006). Improving the ecological validity of executive functioning assessment. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(3), 217–227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acn.2005.12.002>
- Colella, A., DeNisi, A. S., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on performance judgments and choice as partner: the role of disability-job fit stereotypes and interdependence of rewards. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 102–111. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.102>
- Comaford, C. (2017). Is Neurodiversity the Right Talent Path for Your Organization? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/christinecomaford/2017/06/24/competitive-advantage-why-your-organization-needs-to-embrace-neurodiversity/#62ed8ca63f65>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Cooper, E. R., Hewlett, A. K., Cooper, R., Jameson, M., Cooper, R., & Todd, R. (2018).

5 Neurodiverse voices : Opening Doors to Employment. *Achieve Ability Commission:*  
6 *London*. [http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-](http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-opening-doors-to-employment-report_2018_interactive.pdf)  
7 [opening-doors-to-employment-report\\_2018\\_interactive.pdf](http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-opening-doors-to-employment-report_2018_interactive.pdf)  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Corbière, M., Villotti, P., Lecomte, T., Bond, G. R., Lesage, A., & Goldner, E. M. (2014).

14 Work accommodations and natural supports for maintaining employment. *Psychiatric*  
15 *Rehabilitation Journal*, 37(2), 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000033>  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence  
21 against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 Cucina, J. M., Peyton, S. T., Clark, L. L., Su, C., & Liberman, B. E. (2013). Diversity and

27 Inclusion Science and Practice Requires an Interdisciplinary Approach. *Industrial &*  
28 *Organizational Psychology*, 6(3), 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12038>  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 D'Souza, H., & Karmiloff-Smith, A. (2017). Neurodevelopmental disorders. *Wiley*

34 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 8(1–2), 1–10.

35  
36  
37 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1398>  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Danielson, M., Bitsko, R., Ghandour, R., Holbrook, J., Kogan, M., & Blumberg, S. (2018).

43 Prevalence of Parent-Reported ADHD Diagnosis and Associated Treatment Among US  
44 Children and Adolescents, 2016. *Journal of Clinical Child Adolescent Psychology*,  
45 47(2), 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1417860>  
46  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 Dashper, K. (2019). Challenging the gendered rhetoric of success? The limitations of women-

52 only mentoring for tackling gender inequality in the workplace. *Gender, Work and*  
53 *Organization*, 26(4), 541–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12262>  
54  
55  
56

57  
58  
59 DEEWR. (2013). *Evaluation of Disability Employment Services Final Report*. Australian  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.

Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, [Canberra](#).

[https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/wecanwork/pages/38/attachments/original/1436236024/DES\\_Evaluation.pdf?1436236024](https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/wecanwork/pages/38/attachments/original/1436236024/DES_Evaluation.pdf?1436236024)

Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In A. D. Bryman & A. Buchanan (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational research* (pp. 671–689). Sage Publications Ltd.

Denyer, D., Tranfield, D., & van Aken, J. E. (2008). Developing Design Propositions through Research Synthesis. *Organization Studies*, 29(3), 393–413.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607088020>

DESE. (1992). *Disability Discrimination Act*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Skills and Employment. <http://docs.education.gov.au/node/35941>.

Doyle, N. (2017). Neurodiversity at Work. In BPS (Ed.), *Psychology At Work: Improving wellbeing and productivity in the workplace* (pp. 44–62). British Psychological Society.

<https://doi.org/ISBN 978-1-85433-754-2>

Doyle, N. (2019, October). Richard Branson Opens the Door to Bigger Thinking on Neurodiversity. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/drnancydoyle/2019/10/22/richard-branson-opens-the-door-to-bigger-thinking-on-neurodiversity-/>

Doyle, N. (2020). Neurodiversity at Work: a biopsychosocial model and the impact on working adults. *British Medical Bulletin*, 135, 1–18.

Doyle, N. (2021, [in press](#)). Adapting Other Internal Resources to a Neurodiverse Workforce. In S. Bruyere & A. Collela (Eds.), *Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology:*



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 *New Frontiers Series, Neurodiversity*. American Psychological Association.  
5  
6

7 Doyle, N., & McDowall, A. (2019). Context matters: a systematic review of coaching as a  
8 disability accommodation. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(8), 1–30.  
9

10 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199408>  
11  
12

13  
14 Doyle, N., Patton, E., Fung, L., Bruk-Lee, V., & Bruyere, S. (2020). Diamond in the rough?  
15 Neurodiversity inclusion in practice. *Society of Industrial and Organizational*  
16 *Psychology Annual Conference*.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Doyle, Nancy N. (2019). Reasonable adjustments for dyslexia. *Occupational Health at Work*,  
23 *16*(2), 28–31.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 [Equality Act, \(2010\). United Kingdom Parliament, London](#)

29 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/introduction>  
30  
31  
32

33 Elliot, J., & Grigorenko, E. (2014). *The Dyslexia Debate*. Yale University [Press, New Haven,](#)  
34 [Connecticut](#).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Elsabbagh, M., Divan, G., Koh, Y., Kim, Y., Kauchali, S., Marcín, C., Montiel-Nava, C.,  
40 Patel, V., Paula, C., Wang, C., Yasamy, M., & Fombonne, E. (2012). Global prevalence  
41 of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders. *Autism Research*, *5*(3), 160–179.  
42  
43  
44

45 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.239>  
46  
47

48  
49 Gabbard, R. M., Sharrer, D. D., Dunleavy, E. M., & Cohen, D. (2014). New self-  
50 identification regulations for individuals with disabilities: Will a compliance-focused  
51 approach work? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *7*(2), 227–231.  
52  
53  
54

55 <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12137>  
56  
57

58 Gerber, P. J., Batalo, C. G., & Achola, E. O. (2012). Dyslexia and learning disabilities in  
59  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Canada and the UK: The impact of its disability employment laws. *Dyslexia*, 18(3), 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1441>

Gifford, G. (2011). *Access to Work: Official Statistics*. [Department of Work and Pensions, London](http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/workingage/atw/atw0711.pdf). <http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/workingage/atw/atw0711.pdf>

Govt. of Canada. (1995). *Employment Equity Act*. [Government of Canada, Ottawa](https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/e-5.401/FullText.html). <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/e-5.401/FullText.html>

Grant, D. (2009). The Psychological Assessment of Neurodiversity. In D. Pollak (Ed.), *Neurodiversity in Higher Education* (pp. 33–62). Wiley-Blackwell, [Chichester, UK](#).

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64–86.

Halmøy, A., Fasmer, O. B., Gillberg, C., & Haavik, J. (2009). Occupational outcome in adult ADHD: impact of symptom profile, comorbid psychiatric problems, and treatment: a cross-sectional study of 414 clinically diagnosed adult ADHD patients. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 13(2), 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054708329777>

Hayes, G. R., Custodio, V. E., Haimson, O. L., Nguyen, K., Ringland, K. E., Ulgado, R. R., Waterhouse, A., & Weiner, R. (2015). Mobile video modeling for employment interviews for individuals with autism. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 43(3), 275–287. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-150775>

Holliday, G. [A.-a](#), Koller, J. R., & Thomas, C. D. (1999). Post-high school outcomes of high IQ adults with learning disabilities. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 22(3), 266–281.

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Houston, S. (2014). Critical realism. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *The Sage*  
5 *encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 220–222). Sage Publications Ltd,  
6 London. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952453.n204>  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Huijg, D. D. (2020). Neuronormativity in theorising agency. In H. B. Rosqvist, N. Chown, &  
12 A. Stenning (Eds.), *Neurodiversity Studies: A New Critical Paradigm* (1st ed., pp. 213–  
13 217). Routledge, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429322297-20>  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Hyland, P. K., & Rutigliano, P. J. (2013). Eradicating Discrimination: Identifying and  
20 Removing Workplace Barriers for Employees With Disabilities. *Industrial and*  
21 *Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 471–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12087>  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 IDEA, (2006). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. U.S. Department of  
28 Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS),  
29 Washington DC. <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/statuteregulations/>  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Ihuri, D., & Olvera, P. (2015). Discrepancies-, Responses-, and Patterns-: Selecting a Method  
36 of Assessment for Specific Learning Disabilities. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 19,  
37 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-014-0042-6>  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 ILO. (2010). *Disability in the Workplace: Company Practices*. International Labor  
44 Organization, Geneva. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_emp/---](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/publication/wcms_150658.pdf)  
45 [ifp\\_skills/documents/publication/wcms\\_150658.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/publication/wcms_150658.pdf)  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Jackson, C. J., Furnham, A., & Willen, K. (2000). Employer willingness to comply with the  
51 disability discrimination act regarding staff selection in the UK. *Journal of Occupational*  
52 *and Organizational Psychology*, 73(1), 119–129.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900166912>  
58  
59

60 Jacob, A., Scott, M., Falkmer, M., & Falkmer, T. (2015). The costs and benefits of employing

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

an adult with autism spectrum disorder: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(10), 1–16.

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0139896>

Jensen, J., Lindgren, M., Andersson, K., Ingvar, D. H., & Levander, S. (2000). Cognitive intervention in unemployed individuals with reading and writing disabilities. *Applied Neuropsychology*, *7*(4), 223–236. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324826AN0704\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324826AN0704_4)

Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Guillaume, Y. R. F. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *89*(2), 249–277.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12119>

Joseph, B., Walker, A., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2018). Evaluating the effectiveness of employee assistance programmes: a systematic review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *27*(1), 1–15.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1374245>

Jurecic, A. (2007). Neurodiversity. *College English*, *69*(5), 421–442.

Kandola, B. (2018). *Racism at Work: The Danger of Indifference*. Pearn Kandola Publishing, Oxford.

Kapp, S. K., Gillespie-Lynch, K., Sherman, L. E., & Hutman, T. (2013). Deficit, difference, or both? Autism and neurodiversity. *Developmental Psychology*, *49*(1), 59–71.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028353>

Kessler, R. C., Lane, M., Stang, P. E., & van Brunt, D. L. (2009). The prevalence and workplace costs of adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in a large manufacturing firm. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*(1), 137–147.

<https://doi.org/doi:10.1017/S0033291708003309>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Kirby, A., Edwards, L., & Sugden, D. (2011). Emerging Adulthood and Developmental Co-  
5 ordination Disorder. *Journal of Adult Development, 18*(3), 107–113.

6 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-011-9123-1>  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Klimoski, R. J., & Rafaeli, A. (1983). Inferring personal qualities through handwriting  
12 analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 56*(3), 191–202.

13  
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1983.tb00127.x>  
15

16  
17  
18  
19 Knapp, M., Patel, A., Curran, C., Latimer, E., Catty, J., Becker, T., Drake, R. E., Fioritti, A.,  
20

21 Kilian, R., Lauber, C., ~~Rössler~~Rössler, W., Tomov, T., Van Busschbach, J., Comas-  
22 Herrera, A., White, S., Wiersma, D., & Burns, T. (2013). Supported employment: Cost-  
23 effectiveness across six European sites. *World Psychiatry, 12*(1), 60–68.  
24  
25

26 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20017>  
27  
28

29  
30  
31 Kulow, M. D., & Thomas, S. (2019). Assistive Technology and the Americans With  
32

33 Disabilities Act: Endearing Employers to These Reasonable Accommodations. *Berkeley*  
34 *Journal of Employment & Labor Law, 40*(2), 257. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38CZ32542>  
35

36  
37  
38  
39 Lawer, L., Brusilovskiy, E., Salzer, M. S., & Mandell, D. S. (2009). Use of vocational  
40

41 rehabilitative services among adults with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental*  
42 *Disorders, 39*(3), 487–494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0649-4>  
43  
44

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Leather, C., Hogh, H., Seiss, E., & Everatt, J. (2011). Cognitive functioning and work success  
in adults with dyslexia. *Dyslexia, 17*(4), 327–338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.441>

Lindstedt, H., & Umb-Carlsson, O. (2013). Cognitive assistive technology and professional  
support in everyday life for adults with ADHD. *Disability and Rehabilitation. Assistive*  
*Technology, 8*(5), 402–408. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17483107.2013.769120>

Logan, J. (2009). Dyslexic entrepreneurs: the incidence; their coping strategies and their

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 business skills. *Dyslexia*, 15(4), 328–346.  
5  
6

7 Lounds-Taylor, J., McPheeters, M. L., Sathe, N. A., Dove, D., Veenstra-VanderWeele, J., &  
8

9 Warren, Z. (2012). A Systematic Review of Vocational Interventions for Young Adults  
10

11 With Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Pediatrics*, 130(3), 531–538.  
12

13 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-0682>  
14  
15

16 Madaus, J. W., Foley, T. E., McGuire, J. M., & Ruban, L. M. (2002). Employment Self-  
17

18 Disclosure of Postsecondary graduates with Learning Disabilities: Rates and Rationales.  
19

20 *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(4), 364–369.  
21  
22

23 Mcgee, M. (2012). Neurodiversity. *Contexts*, 11(3), 12–13.  
24

25 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504212456175>  
26  
27

28 McGonagle, A. K., Beatty, J. E., & Joffe, R. (2014). Coaching for workers with chronic  
29

30 illness: Evaluating an intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(3),  
31

32 385–398. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036601>  
33  
34

35 Meilleur, A. A. S., Jelenic, P., & Mottron, L. (2015). Prevalence of Clinically and  
36

37 Empirically Defined Talents and Strengths in Autism. *Journal of Autism and*  
38

39 *Developmental Disorders*, 45(5), 1354–1367. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2296-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2296-2)  
40  
41

42 2  
43  
44

45 Melvill, D., Stevens, C., & Vaid, L. (2015). *Access to Work Cost Benefit Analysis*. Centre for  
46

47 Economic and Social Inclusion, [London](#).  
48  
49

50 Monzee, J., Ouimet, M., Schovanec, J., & Singer, J. (2019). *Neurodiversity: 20th Anniversary*  
51

52 *of the Birth of a Concept*. Parents Eclaires, [Quebec](#).  
53  
54

55 Murfitt, K., Crosbie, J., Zammit, J., & Williams, G. (2018). Employer engagement in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 disability employment: A missing link for small to medium organizations-a review of  
5 the literature. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 48(3), 417–431.

6 <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-180949>  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Nalavany, B. A., Logan, J. M., & Carawan, L. W. (2017). The relationship between  
12 emotional experience with dyslexia and work self-efficacy among adults with dyslexia.  
13 *Dyslexia*, 24(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1575>  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 NAS. (2016). *The autism employment gap: Too Much Information in the workplace*. The  
20 National Autistic Society, London. [http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is/myths-facts-](http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is/myths-facts-stats.aspx)  
21 stats.aspx  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 ODEP. (2020). *Job Accommodations Network*. Office of Disability Employment Policy.  
27 <https://askjan.org/index.cfm>, date accessed: 25<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 ONCE. (2019). *Making the Future of Work Inclusive of People with Disabilities*. [Disability](#)  
33 [Hub Europe International Labor Organization Global Business and Disability Network](#)  
34 [& Fundacion \(ONCE\), Brussels, Belgium](#)  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Ozbilgin, M. F., Beauregard, T. A., Tatli, A., & Bell, M. P. (2011). Work-Life, Diversity and  
41 Intersectionality: A Critical Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of*  
42 *Management Reviews*, 13(2), 177–198. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468->  
43 [2370.2010.00291.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00291.x)  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Palmer, E., & Stern, J. (2015). Employment in Tourette Syndrome. *Journal of Neurology,*  
51 *Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 86(9), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2015-311750.41>  
52  
53  
54

55 Patton, E. (2019). *Autism , attributions and accommodations neurodiverse workforce*. 48(4),  
56 915–934. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2018-0116>  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Philipson, A. (2014). GCHQ employs more than 100 dyslexic and dyspraxic spies. *The*  
5 *Telegraph*. [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html)  
6 [employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html)  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Rice, M., & Brooks, G. (2004). *developmental dyslexia in adults: a research review*. [National](http://www.nrdc.org.uk)  
12 [Research and Development Centre, London](http://www.nrdc.org.uk). <http://www.nrdc.org.uk>  
13  
14  
15

16 Riddick, B. (2001). Dyslexia and inclusion : time for a social model of disability  
17 perspective ? *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 37–41.  
18  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210100200078>  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Rios, D., Magasi, S., Novak, C., & Harniss, M. (2016). Conducting accessible research:  
25 Including people with disabilities in public health, epidemiological, and outcomes  
26 studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, *106*(12), 2137–2144.  
27  
28  
29 <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303448>  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Roberson, Q. M. (2018). Diversity in the Workplace: A Review, Synthesis, and Future  
35 Research Agenda. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational*  
36 *Behavior*, *6*(1), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243>  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Robertson, M. M. (2006). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, tics and Tourette's  
43 syndrome: the relationship and treatment implications. A commentary. *European Child*  
44 *& Adolescent Psychiatry*, *15*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-006-0505-z>  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Rojon, C., McDowall, A., & Saunders, M. N. K. (2011). On the experience of conducting a  
51 systematic review in industrial, work, and organizational psychology: Yes, it is  
52 worthwhile. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *10*(3), 133–138.  
53  
54  
55 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000041>  
56  
57  
58  
59

60 Rousseau, D. M., Manning, J., & Denyer, D. (2008). Evidence in management and

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

organizational science: Assembling the field's full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 475–515.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211651>

Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). "Us" and "them": the limits and possibilities of a "politics of neurodiversity" in neoliberal times. *Disability & Society*, 29(7), 1117–1129.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2014.910107>

Saal, K., Martinez, L. R., & Smith, N. A. (2014). Visible disabilities: Acknowledging the utility of acknowledgment. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 242–248.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12140>

Saleh, M. C., & Bruyère, S. M. (2018). Leveraging employer practices in global regulatory frameworks to improve employment outcomes for people with disabilities. *Social Inclusion*, 6(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1201>

Santuzzi, A. M., Waltz, P. R., Finkelstein, L. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2014). Invisible disabilities: Unique challenges for employees and organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12134>

Schlosser, R. W., & Sigafoos, J. (2009). 'Empty' reviews and evidence-based practice. *Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention*, 3(1), 1–3.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17489530902801067>

Scope. (2018). *Disability Employment Gap has barely changed in a decade*.  
[https://www.scope.org.uk/About-Us/Media/Press-releases/May-2018-\(1\)/Disability-employment-gap-has-barely-changed-in-a Date accessed: 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018](https://www.scope.org.uk/About-Us/Media/Press-releases/May-2018-(1)/Disability-employment-gap-has-barely-changed-in-a-Date%20accessed%3A18%20December%202018).

SFA. (2016). *Hair Professionals Standard*. Apprenticeships Standards.  
[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/580178/H](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/580178/H)

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

air\_Professional\_Standard.pdf. [Date accessed 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017](#)

Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (1997). Defending the Social Model. *Disability & Society*, 12(2), 293–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599727380>

Shelley-Tremblay, J. F., & Rosen, L. A. (1996). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: an evolutionary perspective. In *The Journal of genetic psychology* (Vol. 157, Issue 4, pp. 443–453). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.1996.9914877>

Simpson, B. (2018). Pragmatism: a philosophy of practice. In C. Cassell, A. L. Cunliffe, & G. Grandy (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research Methods* (pp. 54–68). Sage Publications Ltd.

Singer, J. (1998). *Odd People In: The Birth of Community Amongst People on the “Autistic Spectrum”*: a Personal Exploration of a New Social Movement based on Neurological Diversity. University of Technology, Sydney.

Singer, J. (1999). “Why can’t you be normal for once in your life?” From a problem with no name to the emergence of a new category of difference. In M. Corker & S. French (Eds.), *Disability Discourse* (pp. 59–67). Open University Press.

Sniderman, B. (2014). Neurodiversity: A New Talent Opportunity. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/brennasniderman/2014/10/30/neurodiversity-a-new-talent-opportunity/#58ab46271058>

Snowling, M. J. (2010). Dyslexia. In C. L. Cooper, J. Field, U. Goswami, R. Jenkins, & B. J. Sahakian (Eds.), *Mental Capital and Mental Wellbeing* (pp. 775–783). Blackwell.

Snowling, M.J., Adams, J. W., Bowyer-Crane, C., & Tobin, V. A. (2000). Levels of literacy among juvenile offenders: the incidence of specific reading difficulties. *Criminal*

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 *Behaviour and Mental Health*, 10(4), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.362>  
5  
6

7 Snowling, Margaret J. (2005). Specific learning difficulties. *Psychiatry*, 4(9), 110–113.  
8  
9

10 Spargo-Mabbs, J., Doyle, N., & Milliken, N. (2020). *Neurodiversity Toolkit*. [Business  
11 Disability Forum, London](https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/). [https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-  
13 hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/](https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-<br/>12 hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/)  
14  
15

16  
17 Sundar, V. (2017). Operationalizing workplace accommodations for individuals with  
18 disabilities: A scoping review. *Work*, 56(1), 135–155. [https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-  
20 162472](https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-<br/>19 162472)  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Szymanski, E., Enright, M., & Hershenson, D. (2012). C. 8. (2012). An ecological approach  
26 to the vocational behavior and career development of people with disabilities. In R. M.  
27 Parker & J. B. Patterson (Eds.), *Rehabilitation counseling: Basics and beyond* (5th ed.,  
28 pp. 199–258). PRO-ED, [Austin, Texas](https://www.pro-ed.com/).  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34  
35 Taylor, K. E., & Walter, J. (2003). Occupation choices of adults with and without symptoms  
36 of dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, 9(3), 177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.239>  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P.  
42 (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool  
43 outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional  
44 Individuals*, 32(3), 160–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728809346960>  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 The Center for Universal Design. (1997). *The Principles of Universal Design, Version 2.0*.  
52 [University of North Carolina](https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_ud/udprinciples.htm).  
53 [https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about\\_ud/udprinciples.htm](https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_ud/udprinciples.htm) [Date Accessed:](#)  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 TUC. (2011). *Disability and Work* (Revised Ed). Trade Union Congress, London.

5  
6 <https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/extras/disabilityandwork.pdf>  
7

8  
9 Tyerman, A. (2012). Vocational rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury: Models and  
10 services. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 31(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-2012-0774>  
11  
12

13  
14 ~~IDEA, (2006). <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/statuteregulations/>~~

15  
16  
17 ~~Americans With Disabilities Act, Pub. L. No. PL 110-325 (S 3406) (2008).~~

18  
19  
20 ~~<https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adaaa.cfm>~~  
21

22  
23 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 1 (2006).

24  
25 [https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convention\\_accessible\\_pdf.pdf](https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convention_accessible_pdf.pdf)  
26

27  
28 ~~Equality Act, (2010). <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/introduction>~~  
29

30  
31 Van Maanen, J., Sørensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. (2007). The interplay between theory and  
32 method. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1145–1154.  
33

34  
35 <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.26586080>  
36

37  
38  
39 Von Károlyi, C., Winner, E., Gray, W., & Sherman, G. F. (2003). Dyslexia linked to talent:  
40 Global visual-spatial ability. *Brain and Language*, 85(3), 427–431.  
41

42  
43 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(03\)00052-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00052-X)  
44

45  
46  
47 Walker, N. (2012). Throw away the master's tools: liberating ourselves from the pathology  
48 paradigm. In J. Bascombe (Ed.), *Loud Hands: Autistic People, Speaking* (pp. 225–237).  
49

50  
51 Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Washington DC.  
52

53  
54 WEF. (2020). *Jobs of tomorrow: Mapping Opportunity in the New Economy*. World  
55

56  
57 Economic Forum, Geneva.  
58

59  
60 [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_Jobs\\_of\\_Tomorrow\\_2020.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Jobs_of_Tomorrow_2020.pdf)

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Wehman, P., Brooke, V., Brooke, A. M., Ham, W., Schall, C., McDonough, J., Lau, S.,  
5  
6 Seward, H., & Avellone, L. (2016). Employment for adults with autism spectrum  
7  
8 disorders: A retrospective review of a customized employment approach. *Research in*  
9  
10 *Developmental Disabilities*, 53–54, 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.01.015>  
11  
12  
13  
14 Whitby, M. (2017). Scoping of shared spatial needs during public building use: Autism  
15  
16 Spectrum Disorder (Sensory Overload) and Borderline Personality Disorder  
17  
18 (Dissociation). *Journal of Urban Design and Mental Health*, 3(9).  
19  
20 <https://www.urbandesignmentalhealth.com/journal-3---shared-spatial-needs.html>  
21  
22  
23  
24 White, H. A., & Shah, P. (2006). Uninhibited imaginations: Creativity in adults with  
25  
26 Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(6),  
27  
28 1121–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.007>  
29  
30  
31  
32 WHO. (2011). Work and employment. In *World Report on Disability*. World Health  
33  
34 Organization, [Geneva](https://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/chapter8.pdf). [https://www.who.int/disabilities/world\\_report/2011/chapter8.pdf](https://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/chapter8.pdf)  
35  
36  
37  
38 Wollaston, S. (2016, March 24). Employable Me review: moving telly that destigmatises  
39  
40 disability – and made me laugh. *The Guardian*. [https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
41  
42 [radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
43  
44 [and-made-me-laugh](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
45  
46  
47  
48 Work and Pensions Committee. (2018). *Assistive Technology: tenth report of session 2017-*  
49  
50 *2019* (Issue April). Houses of Parliament, [London](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.htm).  
51  
52 [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.htm)  
53  
54 [htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.htm)  
55  
56  
57  
58 Yaffe, J., Montgomery, P., Hopewell, S., & Shepard, L. D. (2012). Empty reviews: A  
59  
60 description and consideration of cochrane systematic reviews with no included studies.

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

*PLoS ONE*, 7(5), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0036626>

Young, S., Adamo, N., Ásgeirsdóttir, B. B., Branney, P., Beckett, M., Colley, W., Cubbin, S.,  
Deeley, Q., Farrag, E., Gudjonsson, G., Hill, P., Hollingdale, J., Kilic, O., Lloyd, T.,  
Mason, P., Paliokosta, E., Perecherla, S., Sedgwick, J., Skirrow, C., ... Woodhouse, E.  
(2020). Females with ADHD: An expert consensus statement taking a lifespan approach  
providing guidance for the identification and treatment of attention-deficit/ hyperactivity  
disorder in girls and women. *BMC Psychiatry*, 20(1), 404.  
<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02707-9>

Young, S., González, R. A., Fridman, M., Hodgkins, P., Kim, K., & Gudjonsson, G. H.  
(2018). The economic consequences of attention- deficit hyperactivity disorder in the  
Scottish prison system. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1792-x>



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**Diamond in the rough? An ‘empty review’ of research into ‘neurodiversity’ and a road map for developing the inclusion agenda.**

**Introduction**

‘Neurodiversity’ broadly refers to naturally-occurring diversity in human cognition (Singer, 1999). It has been used as an umbrella term for a range of neurocognitive developmental disorders (Doyle, 2020; Kapp, Gillespie-Lynch, Sherman, & Hutman, 2013) including Autistic Spectrum Disorder, Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder or Dyslexia. Recent public dialogue has shifted to the term ‘neurominority’ to signpost that relevant individuals are disadvantaged regarding a range of life outcomes, including systemic social exclusion in education and inferior employment outcomes (Carter, Austin, & Trainor, 2012; Snowling, Adams, Bowyer-Crane, & Tobin, 2000). Subsequent restriction of opportunities for a fulfilled working life and career (Holliday et al., 1999; Taylor & Walter, 2003) is in contrast to emerging popular narratives about the talent potential of neurodiversity for modern workplaces (Austin & Pisano, 2017; Sniderman, 2014): the ‘diamond in the rough’ (Doyle, Patton, Fung, Bruk-Lee, & Bruyere, 2020).

In this paper, we highlight the inadequate scope and focus of academic attention on neurodiversity and employment to date across the fields of applied psychology and management studies. We contextualize the neurodiversity paradigm from a medical, social and legal perspective in the wider workplace equality, diversity and inclusion agenda. Through a series of ‘Empty Reviews’ defined as a targeted analysis of literature gaps through systematic literature review principles (Schlosser & Sigafos, 2009; Yaffe et al., 2012), we illustrate the dearth of tangible evidence. Through due diligence in our conceptualization, including definition of gaps in knowledge, we outline a future research and practice agenda to facilitate informed inclusion for a marginalized minority. In other words, it is our aim to

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 support evidence-based practice in this emerging field guiding Human Resources (HR) and  
5  
6 employment policy to mitigate labor force exclusion  
7  
8

### 9 **Defining Neurodiversity**

10  
11  
12 The term ‘Neurodiversity’ was coined by the sociological researcher Judy Singer  
13  
14 (Singer, 1999) in the context of rights activism during the 1990s (Mcgee, 2012; Runswick-  
15  
16 Cole, 2014). The neurodiversity movement highlights the life-long and positive aspects of  
17  
18 naturally-occurring cognitive ‘differences’, such as creativity and ‘special interest’ skills  
19  
20 (Meilleur et al., 2015; Von Károlyi et al., 2003; White & Shah, 2006), as opposed to the  
21  
22 focus on developmental ‘deficits’ such as language or processing speed (Armstrong, 2010;  
23  
24 Grant, 2009; Jurecic, 2017; Kapp, Gillespie-Lynch, Sherman, & Hutman, 2012).  
25  
26  
27 Neurodiversity has been considered a progression from previous umbrella terms such as  
28  
29 specific learning difficulties, neurodevelopmental disorders or hidden / invisible impairments.  
30  
31 However, Ms Singer herself, alongside other researchers and advocates, prefers  
32  
33 ‘neurodiversity’ to refer to the cognitive diversity in all humans (Chapman, 2020; Monzee et  
34  
35 al., 2019; Singer, 1998; Walker, 2012) rather than appropriated as a synonym for disability.  
36  
37  
38 Relevant terminology continues to evolve and be hotly debated; we briefly define alternatives  
39  
40 that denote equivalence to the outdated deficit model language. Those who fall in a statistical  
41  
42 norm, based on relevant cognitive tests or behavioral assessments, are referred to as  
43  
44 ‘neurotypical’ and those who would previously have been termed disordered are referred to  
45  
46 as ‘neurodivergent,’ ‘neurodiverse’ or part of a ‘neurominority’ (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020;  
47  
48 Doyle, 2020; Singer, 1998; Walker, 2012). Some authors include general learning disabilities  
49  
50 and/or mental health needs in definitions (Armstrong, 2010; Chapman & Veit, 2020).  
51  
52  
53 Typically, though, the following conditions are considered neurominorities: Attention Deficit  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Disorder (DCD); Tourette Syndrome (TS); Dyscalculia and Dysgraphia (Bewley & George,  
5 2016; Grant, 2009; Jurecic, 2007; Kapp et al., 2013; Snowling, 2005). Definitions of each  
6 condition have evolved over time and diagnostic criteria, as well as treatment approaches,  
7 continue to vary considerably (Elliot & Grigorenko, 2014; Kirby et al., 2011; Shelley-  
8 Tremblay & Rosen, 1996). For a historical review of neurodiversity/neurodivergence since  
9 the industrialisation, see Doyle (2020). Below we present a brief summary of some of the  
10 educo-medical models and conceptualizations and prevalence; see Doyle (2017) for a  
11 working summary of the occupational strengths and weaknesses of each condition.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 **The medical model of neurodiversity.** This model defines neurominorities  
24 linguistically through pseudo-medical deficits. The Diagnostics and Statistical Manual of  
25 Psychiatric Disorders (American Psychiatric Association, 2013), known as the ‘DSM-5’, is  
26 used by relevant professionals to categorize and determine individual cases. These  
27 conditions are developmental as they emerge in childhood and/or adolescence but not in  
28 response to trauma or ill health, and confer specific difficulties rather than indicate global  
29 developmental delay (Snowling, 2005). Psychological diagnostic criteria define the hallmark  
30 of a neurominority as a statistically significant within-person difference, showing a disparity  
31 between cognitive strengths and weaknesses (e.g. verbal/visual reasoning, memory). This is  
32 in contrast to a ‘neurotypical’ presentation where an individual’s ability scores are within a  
33 standard deviation or two of each other (either below average, average or above average)  
34 (Grant, 2009; Ihori & Olvera, 2015). There are two sub-types of developmental  
35 neurominorities (Doyle, 2017). Population prevalence is shown in parentheses, based on best  
36 available data, noting that these vary across nations and depend on which diagnostic criteria  
37 are applied:  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

(1) Clinical conditions, which are assessed by behavior / communication and typically diagnosed by Psychology, Neuropsychology and Psychiatry Clinicians working in health services:

- a) ADHD around 5% worldwide (Catalá-López et al., 2017; Shelley-Tremblay & Rosen, 1996) but higher in USA (Danielson et al., 2018).
- b) Autism between <1 and 1.6% globally, significantly affected by diagnostic criteria and access to services (Elsabbagh et al., 2012).
- c) TS 1% (CDC, 2009; Robertson, 2006)

(2) Applied conditions, which are assessed by functional difficulties, either educational or occupational, and typically diagnosed by Applied Psychologists, Educators and Occupational Therapists in school or work settings:

- a. Dyslexia up to 10% (Snowling, 2010).
- b. DCD up to 6% (Blank et al., 2019).
- c. Dyscalculia up to 6% (Snowling, 2005).
- d. Dysgraphia n/k (Adams, 2019).

For the purpose of this paper, we focus on the main developmental neurominorities, namely ADHD, autism, dyslexia, DCD and Tourette Syndrome, to gauge the quality of research regarding practical support and inclusion of these conditions in the workplace.

**The emerging social model of neurodiversity.** Given the high prevalence of neurominorities reported in advanced economies, there is an obvious evolutionary critique: that neurodiversity has evolved within a typical spectrum of human experience (Blank, Peters, Pickvance, Wilford, & MacDonald, 2008; Boycott, Schneider, & Osborne, 2014; Doyle, 2020; Shelley-Tremblay & Rosen, 1996). As it may be natural and useful to have a small percentage of the population with specialist rather than generalist abilities (Armstrong,

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 2010), stakeholders argue that we need to develop neutral inclusion practices that do not  
5 insinuate ill health. It is worth noting that during the past 100 years both left-handedness and  
6 homosexuality were considered psychiatric disorders, demonstrating that any conception of  
7 'normal' is culturally bound and subject to historical changes in line with Ecological Systems  
8 Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). We cannot be sure at this stage that a disorder based on  
9 quantifying the degree of adherence to a social norm, such as literacy, activity levels or social  
10 interactions, is truly a biological deficit. The social model of neurodiversity contends that the  
11 world is polarized and lacks in flexibility to accommodate all natural variations in human  
12 cognition and functioning (Shakespeare & Watson, 1997). Individuals who fall outside the  
13 norm represent a minority group, whose rights must be protected, and whose ways of  
14 functioning should be recognized, valued and harnessed (Runswick-Cole, 2014; Singer,  
15 1998).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The social model has influenced public awareness of neurodiversity in recent years;  
33 the narrative of the 'diamond in the rough' is voiced in popular press and media world-wide  
34 (Adams, 2019; Philipson, 2014; Sniderman, 2014; Wollaston, 2016). Neurodiversity is also  
35 attracting the attention of the business press who describe a 'talent advantage' for employers  
36 through targeted recruitment of neurodiverse applicants (Austin & Pisano, 2017; Comaford,  
37 2017). This approach chimes with broader initiatives to promote diversity and inclusion of  
38 gender, ethnic minorities and sexual orientation (Cucina et al., 2013) and disability more  
39 generally (Murfitt et al., 2018) to broaden the talent pool, known as the 'business case' for  
40 inclusion (Saleh & Bruyère, 2018).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 **Socio-legal barriers and protections.** There is a conflict between aspiration and  
55 reality in occupational practice. Despite sparse yet consistent evidence in support of specific  
56 talents (Armstrong, 2015; Logan, 2009; Meilleur et al., 2015; Von Károlyi et al., 2003; White  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 & Shah, 2006), neurominorities are currently not well accommodated by contemporary social  
5 structures based on neurotypical profiles. To illustrate, in the UK, modern apprenticeships  
6 require (high) literacy levels of grade 10 or above to access basic vocational training in fields  
7 that rely on specialist visual reasoning, such as hairdressing and plumbing (SFA, 2016).  
8 Interviews remain popular as a hiring technique globally, despite evidence that these unfairly  
9 disadvantage neurominorities, particularly autistic people (Cooper et al., 2018; Hayes et al.,  
10 2015). Such barriers matter. Only 10-16% of autistic people have a job (NAS, 2016) and  
11 ADHD has been shown to significantly increase the likelihood of incarceration in the UK and  
12 USA (Halmøy et al., 2009; Young et al., 2018). 20% of UK and 35% of US entrepreneurs  
13 are dyslexic compared to only 1% of corporate managers (Logan, 2009) and a third of long-  
14 term unemployed people are dyslexic (Jensen et al., 2000). Such systemic exclusion has  
15 moral, social and economic consequences.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 To counter extant structural barriers in education and work, neurominorities are  
33 considered recognized disabilities in most developed nations, which theoretically affords  
34 protection from discrimination by law. In the UK Equality Act (Equality Act, 2010), for  
35 example, reference is made to long-term (chronic) difficulties in memory, learning and  
36 communication which may be affected by all the above-named conditions. In the USA,  
37 Canada, Australia and throughout Europe, similar legislation provides disability protections  
38 (Australian Government, 1992; Canada, 1995; U.S. Department of Education's Office of  
39 Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), 2006; U.S. Equal Employment  
40 Opportunities Commission, 2008) all broadly aligned to the United Nations Convention on  
41 the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) (United Nations, 2006). Such legislative  
42 innovations are yet to translate into occupational success. The 'disability-employment gap'  
43 remains of concern worldwide (WHO, 2011). There is a pressing need to understand 'what  
44 works' and move to an evidence-based practice model for applied practitioners to implement,  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 yet this ‘push’ for interventions based on diagnosis somewhat undermines the ‘pull’ of the  
5 untapped talent model. Although applied research is sorely needed, ontological positions to  
6 date have been dominated by the medical model. Yet individuals with lived experience  
7  
8 advocate a more critical and realist approach to inclusion which takes account of their  
9  
10 priorities through inclusive research design (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020; Rios et al., 2016;  
11  
12 Walker, 2012). We return to this point in our discussion.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 **A science-practitioner gap.** Activities that constitute disability ‘support’ vary  
19 geographically, with advanced economies applying a range of active labor market  
20 interventions supporting both the individual (pre- and during employment, ‘supply side’) as  
21 well as the employer through incentivization and best practice guidance (‘demand side’)  
22 (Murfitt et al., 2018; Saleh & Bruyère, 2018). However, the extent to which such programs  
23 are effective for neurominorities is less documented (Gerber et al., 2012). In the UK for  
24 example, there is a statutory government body facilitating the provision of ‘reasonable  
25 adjustments’ or accommodations to thousands of employees with invisible disabilities per  
26 year; the third most common disability group after muscular-skeletal and sensory impairment  
27 (Gifford, 2011). The program, known as ‘Access to Work’, offers one-to-one coaching and  
28 assistive technology to individuals (at approx. \$1000 per person) and is broadly well-  
29 regarded, as evidenced by user survey data (Adams, Tindle, Downing, & Morrice, 2018;  
30 Melvill, Stevens, & Vaid, 2015). Similar programs such as ‘Jobs in Jeopardy’, part of the  
31 Australian Disability Employment Service, are also seen to add good value for the tax-payer,  
32 yet do not specifically focus on the experience of neurominorities, with the exception of  
33 autistic people (DEEWR, 2013). The provision of such interventions has received minimal  
34 attention in research evidenced by high level summaries yet insufficient high-quality studies.  
35  
36 We are unaware of any process evaluations of relevant interventions most frequently  
37 recommended for neurominorities by these programs, such as coaching, mentoring and  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 assistive technology (Doyle, 2019; Kulow & Thomas, 2019; Lindstedt & Umb-Carlsson,  
5  
6 2013; Sundar, 2017; Work and Pensions Committee, 2018) that could elucidate psychological  
7  
8 mechanisms of change or evidence career advancement outcomes. We are witnessing  
9  
10 increasing practitioner advice from business advisor groups (ACAS, 2016; ODEP, 2020;  
11  
12 Spargo-Mabbs et al., 2020; TUC, 2011) including coaching, assistive technology, provision  
13  
14 of extra time, flexible hours policies and use of acoustic barriers to mitigate background noise  
15  
16 distractions. There is a lack of reliable experimental work evaluating the effectiveness of  
17  
18 relevant support structures for neurodivergent individuals (Patton, 2019; Sundar, 2017;  
19  
20 Whitby, 2017) meaning that it is difficult to demarcate evidence-based practice (Briner &  
21  
22 Rousseau, 2011).  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Globally, disability programs tend to be led by healthcare provision, vocational  
28  
29 rehabilitation and occupational therapy tending towards those with more medicalized needs  
30  
31 (Doyle, 2021). It is unclear the extent to which neurominorities such as ADHD, TS, dyslexic  
32  
33 and dyspraxic employees might be covered by such programs, though autism has received  
34  
35 increased attention (Lawer et al., 2009). For example, Individual Placement Support (IPS) is  
36  
37 sometimes provided for autistic people, which is well-regarded and reasonably well-  
38  
39 evaluated (Lounds-Taylor et al., 2012; Wehman et al., 2016). The principles and practices of  
40  
41 such relevant interventions could provide a rich resource for expansion to accommodate other  
42  
43 neurominorities. Yet they are based on a medical model, which implies that the workplace  
44  
45 environment is fixed and the individual is impaired and therefore needs to adapt. This is at  
46  
47 odds with the social model ambitions of the neurodiversity movement and the UNCRPD  
48  
49 (United Nations, 2006). Further, at an average cost of tens of thousands of dollars per person,  
50  
51 which is an investment that an employer or employee alone cannot justify, IPS interventions  
52  
53 only break even when reductions in public spending are included (Jacob et al., 2015; Knapp  
54  
55 et al., 2013). Employee Assistance Programs are also relevant in this context as a potential  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 source of specific support. However, such programs tend to accommodate mental health  
5 specifically, they are potentially oblivious to cognitive strengths and impairment, as well as  
6 being somewhat vague about any benefit for individual work performance (Joseph et al.,  
7 2018). While it may be essential to address acute mental distress at source, it is possible that  
8 support for stress and anxiety when the cause is cognitive (not emotional or social) could  
9 create more long-term harm than good if support activities are not informed by a more  
10 holistic perspective on neurominorities. More specifically, any presupposition that the cause  
11 is individual failure to adapt rather than structural exclusion could be detrimental for self-  
12 worth, employment and other outcomes, leading to a spiral of negativity. Therefore, any  
13 academic enquiry must take a holistic perspective on interventions to address socially-  
14 constructed marginalization and individual need to inform evidence-based professional  
15 practice.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 In summary, evidence regarding any activities to support improving job performance  
33 and subsequent occupational inclusion through disability accommodation for neurominorities  
34 is lacking (Adamou et al., 2013; Kirby et al., 2011; Palmer & Stern, 2015; Rice & Brooks,  
35 2004). We consider the development of a research agenda an essential and urgent task for the  
36 neurodiversity inclusion movement.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **Review questions** 45

46  
47 Against a context of overlapping and potentially conflicting societal, legal and  
48 conceptual developments, we aimed to map any existing evidence and scrutinize robustness  
49 as well as disciplinary origin. Although we endeavoured to keep an open mind, it was our  
50 assumption from the outset that our research would draw from the principles of 'Empty  
51 Reviews'. Empty reviews are becoming common in health and medical fields to establish  
52 lack of evidence for any interventions (Yaffe, Montgomery, Hopewell, & Shepard, 2012).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Guided by a systematic review methodology, we (1) formulated specific a priori questions,  
5  
6 (2) devised a search protocol, (3) applied a predefined relevance inclusion criteria and  
7  
8 process for achieving consensus and (4) applied a predefined quality inclusion criteria. Our  
9  
10 protocol was based on best practice guidance from the management/ business field, given the  
11  
12 work context for any relevant evidence (Denyer & Tranfield, 2009; Rousseau et al., 2008).  
13  
14

15 Our research questions were:  
16  
17

- 18 1. How many papers are published in mainstream empirical organizational and  
19  
20 management psychology publications related to the inclusion of neurodiversity (or  
21  
22 related conditions) in work contexts?  
23  
24
- 25 2. How many papers exist in general psychological domains regarding  
26  
27 neurodiversity?  
28  
29
- 30 3. How much research exists in any academic domain concerning the occupational  
31  
32 presentation of neurodiversity?  
33  
34

35 From the third search, we were able to formulate a fourth question:  
36  
37

- 38 4. In which academic disciplines is relevant academic research currently located?  
39  
40

41 From these structured searches, our synthesis will consider:  
42  
43

- 44 1. What, if anything, can we infer from the current literature about ‘what works’ in  
45  
46 practice to improve the inclusion of neurodivergent individuals at work?  
47  
48
- 49 2. How should the prospective research agenda be epistemologically framed?  
50  
51

## 52 **Systematic Empty Review Protocol**

53  
54

### 55 **Search terms**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Our review focused on developmental neurominorities using search terms which  
5 reflected differences in labels over time. We excluded mental health needs, chronic health  
6 conditions, acquired brain injury and general learning disabilities since they are already  
7 addressed in more advanced research fields (Corbière et al., 2014; McGonagle et al., 2014;  
8 Tyerman, 2012). Some mental health research was extracted as a point of reference to  
9 compare volume of returns. Dyscalculia and dysgraphia *are* included in the taxonomy of  
10 developmental conditions but not considered in the extraction given the previously noted  
11 absence of research (Doyle, 2017). Table 1 summarizes all search terms.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 1 about here\*\***  
24

25  
26 **Extraction protocol.** There were three iterative searches, conducted in January 2017  
27 and repeated in August 2018; these are summarized in Figure 1.  
28  
29

30  
31 **Search one:** How many papers are published in mainstream empirical organizational  
32 psychology publications related to neurodiversity (or related conditions) in work  
33 contexts?  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 The first search represented a systematic check that this field was indeed under-  
40 researched, by focusing on what ought to be ideal publications for considering the  
41 intersection of neurodiversity (a psychological phenomenon) and workplace inclusion: *The*  
42 *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Personnel Psychology*, *Industrial and Organizational*  
43 *Psychology* and the *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. We  
44 commenced by hand-searching the four journal websites specifically for the five conditions  
45 and the term 'neurodiversity' to understand the extent to which they featured in key applied  
46 psychology research.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 No time limits were applied. The primary aim of this search was to extract the  
5 number of references to neurominorities and the term 'neurodiversity' itself, and we did not  
6 initially subject papers to a second stage rigorous relevance and quality criteria check.  
7  
8 However, the small number of returns enabled a qualitative review of the extent to which  
9  
10 conditions were merely 'mentioned' as opposed to explored conceptually or evaluated. Table  
11  
12 2 shows the number of returns compared to the number mentioning mild-to-moderate mental  
13  
14 health needs in two of the journals.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 **Search two:** how many papers refer to neurominority conditions in general  
21  
22 psychology domains?  
23  
24  
25

26 A second search of the broader psychological domains was conducted across the  
27  
28 *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (repeated); *British Journal of*  
29  
30 *Psychology*; *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*; *British Journal of Developmental*  
31  
32 *Psychology*; *British Journal of Educational Psychology*; *British Journal of Health*  
33  
34 *Psychology* and *British Journal of Social Psychology* in order to sample-check whether or not  
35  
36 consideration of neurodiversity was better represented in relevant psychological sub-  
37  
38 disciplines. The second search was not intended to be definitive, but indicative of the spread  
39  
40 of individual condition representation in research relevant to the neurodiversity. We did not  
41  
42 apply time limits but categorized the returns into papers published before 1995, 1995-2005  
43  
44 and 2005+ to consider if the developing social movement was in any way linked to number  
45  
46 or foci of publications. As with search one, the extracted papers were not subjected to  
47  
48 relevance and quality review and may only 'mention' the condition rather than explore  
49  
50 thoroughly. We compared the relative percentages of each condition's prevalence rates with  
51  
52 the relative volume of research, to observe any over- or underrepresentation.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**Search three:** How many papers address the occupational presentation of neurodiversity to a high academic standard of evidence in any discipline?

**Question four:** In which academic disciplines is relevant academic research currently located?

We undertook a wider, more international review of the literature on occupational presentation of neurodiversity in EBSCO-hosted journals to ascertain if there was a tranche of yielding principles (Cucina et al., 2013) that could be appropriated for inclusion practice from related disciplines, for example vocational rehabilitation. We limited the search to the English language and included grey literature using all terms in Table 1. We took a systematic approach, with an initial 1439 returns creating a bespoke extraction form in Excel. We then filtered results by abstract screening, removing any papers without reference to occupational issues. The second author undertook spot checks and a discursive review of ambiguous cases until we achieved full consensus for inclusion, leaving us with 111 papers. We did not explicitly seek to apply a rigorous quality check at this stage, mainly because the aim of the review was not meta-analysis of an intervention success, simply exploration of the extent of research. Instead, we considered the hierarchy of evidence principles (Rousseau et al., 2008) and used quality guidance from related systematic reviews (Doyle & McDowall, 2019; Rojon, McDowall, & Saunders, 2011) to rate papers as strong evidence (systematic review and meta-analysis), medium evidence (well-constructed primary papers) or weak evidence (poorly-constructed papers, case studies, practitioner opinion and anecdotal evidence). The primary author performed these ratings, the second author cross-checked and discussion was held to resolve conflicts until full consensus was reached. Papers scoring medium or above were retained: 48 papers in total. Finally, the papers were categorized by academic discipline using journal titles (or full paper review if not clear) to consider where, if

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 not in organizational psychology or management, knowledge regarding the occupational  
5 presentation of neurodiversity is currently located. Figure 1 depicts the number of included  
6 papers at each stage.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Figure 1 about here\*\***  
12

### 13 14 **Results and Synthesis** 15

16  
17 Below we present the number of returns in each extraction, categorized as described  
18 above, and a brief narrative summary of the findings for each search according to the first  
19 three review questions:  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 **Search 1: Organizational psychology journals.** Table 2 shows the number of  
26 papers mentioning neurominority conditions and an absence of the phrase neurodiversity to  
27 date in the contemporary organizational psychology that we selected. Only 32 papers  
28 mentioned neurominority conditions at all; 22 of these were in SIOP's *Industrial and*  
29 *Organizational Psychology* journal, three in the *Journal of Applied Psychology* and two in  
30 *Personnel Psychology*. The *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology* (JOOP)  
31 mentions neurodiverse conditions on only five occasions compared with 413 mentions of  
32 mental health conditions.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43  
44 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 2 about here\*\***  
45  
46

47 Full paper review of the returns did not provide evidence of the intervention  
48 evaluations required to support disability inclusion practice, protect employers/employees or  
49 justify current policy. For example, the two dyslexia returns within *JOOP* pertain to (1) the  
50 use of handwriting as a recruitment technique (Klimoski & Rafaeli, 1983) and (2) a broader  
51 article about employer responses to disability inclusion (Jackson et al., 2000). Similarly, the  
52 other neurominorities listed above are mentioned in references related to a broader theme,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 rather than examined as to how they relate to occupational psychology per se (for example,  
5  
6 both ADHD and autism are within the reference list for the coaching review conducted by  
7  
8 Jones et al. 2016). While SIOP's *Industrial and Organizational Psychology* journal marks a  
9  
10 significant improvement in volume compared with others in the discipline, there are two  
11  
12 points of note: (1) mental health papers were still disproportionately better represented and (2)  
13  
14 papers were cross-sectional and/or conceptual reviews offering descriptions of problems  
15  
16 rather than experimental work regarding potential solutions (Ashworth, 2014; Bono et al.,  
17  
18 2009; Gabbard et al., 2014; Hyland & Rutigliano, 2013; Saal et al., 2014; Santuzzi et al.,  
19  
20 2014).  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **Search 2: broader psychological research.** The results presented in table 3 show  
26  
27 the number of papers mentioning neurominorities and mental health conditions in a sample of  
28  
29 UK-based psychology journals.  
30  
31

32 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 3 about here\*\*\***  
33  
34

35 The UK-based psychology journal search revealed an increasingly disproportionate  
36  
37 body of research focusing on mental health needs and autism, relative to their prevalence.  
38  
39 Closer inspection of two journals revealed consistent cross-disciplinary research between  
40  
41 mental health and occupational psychology: 1686 studies referenced 'work' in the *British*  
42  
43 *Journal of Clinical Psychology* and 413 studies on mental health were published in the  
44  
45 *JOOP*, which suggests a more mature research field concerning the impact of mental health  
46  
47 in the workplace, though we concede that this has not been quality checked. Conversely,  
48  
49 dyslexia studies appear to be decreasing in number and mainly focused on the diagnosis of  
50  
51 children to the exclusion of occupational contexts. ADHD, Dyslexia, DCD and TS are all  
52  
53 under-researched compared to their population prevalence.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 **Search 3 and Question 4: Multi-disciplinary studies on neurodiversity and work.**  
5

6 Of the 48 extracted papers, the following conditions were represented: ADHD, 13 papers;  
7  
8 Autism, 19 papers (including four with strong evidence supporting inclusion activities);  
9  
10 DCD, five papers; Dyslexia, six papers and TS, five papers. Table 4 shows the professional  
11 discipline sources (indicated by journal title) of the 48 papers. We note that, while  
12  
13 neuroscientific research has proliferated in recent years and accounts for much of the extant  
14  
15 condition-specific literature, only one neuroscience paper met the criterion of referring to  
16  
17 occupational issues. A full list of the journal titles for extracted studies is presented in  
18  
19 appendix 1.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 4 about here\*\*\***  
26  
27

28 **Synthesis Question 1: What, if anything, can we infer from the current literature**  
29  
30 **about ‘what works’ to improve the inclusion of neurodivergent individuals at**  
31  
32 **work?**  
33  
34  
35

36 Given the absence of relevant intervention evaluation (either randomized control trial,  
37  
38 cross-sectional research, process analysis or qualitative) in mainstream organizational and  
39  
40 management psychology, we consider our first search an ‘empty review’ (Yaffe et al., 2012).  
41  
42 Further, search two indicated that the investigation of individual neurominority conditions per  
43  
44 se is unrepresentative of population prevalence and seems instead to be led by media fashion;  
45  
46 for example, the dominance of autism within current popular narratives (Bernick, 2019). The  
47  
48 limited number of primary papers across broader applied psychological domains describe  
49  
50 issues and call for further research, yet do not culminate in a clear research agenda congruent  
51  
52 with evidence-based practice (Schlosser & Sigafos, 2009).  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 Regarding our third review question concerning quality of evidence for determining  
58  
59 ‘what works’, we note limited research that could contribute to an evidence-based agenda  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 which is dispersed across disciplines lacking relevance to the socio-legal, economic and  
5 occupational context; for example, neuroscience, child development and social work, which  
6 leaves crucial epistemological and applied knowledge gaps in our understanding. While we  
7 commend the neuroscience paradigm for advancing our etiological understanding of  
8 symptomatology, it does not reference functional, workplace-contextualized outcomes and is  
9 thus lacking ecological validity (Chaytor et al., 2006; D'Souza & Karmiloff-Smith, 2017).  
10 Vocational rehabilitation and Occupational Health are the closest represented disciplines in  
11 terms of purpose, specifically exploring conditions, their impact on the workplace and  
12 intervention evaluation. However, these fields are more closely aligned to the medical  
13 paradigm which implicates a disability inclusion model for practice, rather than an  
14 organizational-level talent management approach such as the mentoring and peer support  
15 programs favoured by gender and race inclusion initiatives (Roberson, 2018).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 We conclude that there is insufficient academic enquiry into neurodiversity at work  
33 and highlight a need for broadening the epistemological frameworks of neurodiversity  
34 research to offer theoretical support to the developing agenda.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **Synthesis Question 2: How should the prospective research agenda be**  
41 **epistemologically framed?**  
42  
43  
44

45 To address the disparity between research to date and the emerging social movement  
46 arguing for marginalized lived experience at the heart of research (Bottema-Beutel et al.,  
47 2020; Rios et al., 2016), a constructivist investigation of experience and power dynamics  
48 appears crucial. Alongside, we recognize the need for positivist evaluation of interventions;  
49 the limited extant studies indicate an immature evidence base to underpin practice and policy.  
50 Controlled trials must be broadened from the individual to the organizational level of  
51 analysis. Minded that qualitative and quantitative research are complementary, not  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 conflicted, we propose Critical Realism (Houston, 2014) as an appropriate epistemology for a  
5 developing research agenda. Critical Realism facilitates inductive, hypothetic-deductive and  
6 abductive reasoning, required to iteratively blend theory and method (Van Maanen et al.,  
7  
8 2007) for the development of a nascent research field in a Pragmatic Paradigm (Simpson,  
9  
10 2018). Our proposed ecological framework is outlined in Figure 2, deploying multiple levels  
11  
12 of analysis (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) in which we focus on two intersecting points for  
13  
14 intervention and analysis: the micro/meso and the meso/macro. This is congruent with  
15  
16 Critical Realist research and incorporates the ecological approach that has been more  
17  
18 thoroughly explored in general disability employment (Szymanski et al., 2012).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 **\*\*Note to Editor, insert Figure 2 about here\*\***  
26  
27

28 We now briefly explore the issues within each level of analysis before outlining a  
29  
30 research and practice agenda in more detail in the next section. The micro level refers to the  
31  
32 neurodivergent employee, their individual work performance, and the current perceived need  
33  
34 to attain levels of literacy, sedentary concentration and/or social communication norms akin  
35  
36 to their neurotypical co-workers in order to retain their employment. Individual level effects  
37  
38 will be additionally influenced by intersectionality, such as marginalization resulting from  
39  
40 gender, gender identity, ethnicity and race, sexual orientation, age and socio-economic status  
41  
42 (Crenshaw, 1991; Cucina et al., 2013; Greenhaus et al., 1990; Ozbilgin et al., 2011;  
43  
44 Szymanski et al., 2012; Young et al., 2020). Critical Realism facilitates evaluative studies  
45  
46 regarding individual level accommodations as described above, as well as exploring the  
47  
48 influences on career inclusion caused by the power dynamics; for example, self-efficacy and  
49  
50 career awareness (Leather et al., 2011; Nalavany et al., 2017; Test et al., 2009).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 The meso level refers to the immediate context of the neurodivergent employee,  
57  
58 including design of their job, workstation and environment, but also the communication  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 norms of their team and organization. The meso level is influenced heavily by the socio-  
5 historical context of said norms including the prioritization of literacy and fine motor control  
6 as the major form of communication, and sedentary, hyper-social education and work (Doyle,  
7 2020). We also note current occupational constructions drawn from the macro-historical  
8 level of analysis which create meso-level norms. For example office work, which made sense  
9 when staff needed access to paper files and ledgers in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, but makes  
10 less sense now that our work is stored electronically and remotely. Such norms have created  
11 exclusion and segregation; for example, the illiterate dyslexic who should be avoided or the  
12 autistic technologist who might be desirable but only in a limited role. Thus, alongside a  
13 ‘Realist’ evaluation of direct support effectiveness for employers such as toolkits and  
14 inclusion best practice guidance, a ‘Critical’ challenge of common / absent narratives and role  
15 models in business is encouraged.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The macro level of analysis influences neurodiversity inclusion through the use of  
33 active labor market policies such as those described in the introduction (e.g. Access to Work,  
34 Jobs in Jeopardy) and the extent to which employers are incentivized to address disability  
35 inclusion in hiring and talent management (Murfitt et al., 2018; Saleh & Bruyère, 2018). As  
36 mentioned in the introduction, such policies are lacking in longitudinal evaluation, which is  
37 an urgent concern considering the persistent disability employment gap more broadly. Yet  
38 such policies also exist in a macro-historical context of wider technological advancement that  
39 facilitates new possibilities for inclusion. Contemporary expectations of normalization and  
40 homogeneity at work, inherited from the industrial revolution as above, are in flux as we  
41 adapt to ubiquitous technology, cloud access to records and indeed even the type of work  
42 available (ONCE, 2019; WEF, 2020), impacting the policies and institutions just as they  
43 affect businesses. For neurominorities who have struggled with tasks typically framed as  
44 necessary for ‘good’ performance, including literacy and handwriting, hyper-socialization  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 and sedentary work, such changes require critical appraisal as they offer potential for  
5 increased inclusion across the lifespan. For instance, writing tasks are already becoming  
6 more fully supported through adaptive software, which allow more accurate dictation and  
7 transcription; these changes will increasingly be incorporated into education and national  
8 training design. We see opportunity here for the next generation of neurominority workers,  
9 who could be significantly less disabled if policies can catch up with technological trends.  
10 For example, incentivising acceleration of digitization and automation of literacy production  
11 in education and public sector workplaces could have a ripple effect to meso-level workplace  
12 norms more generally.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 The next section focuses on specific research activities required to mature the  
26 neurodiversity field of practice, building on the Critical Realist epistemology framework to  
27 evaluate and challenge both supply and demand approaches.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **Discussion: Mapping a new field of research and practice**

34  
35

36 **The research agenda.** Given the current dearth of evidence as evidenced through our  
37 empty review, our attention must turn to the focus for a new research agenda. One  
38 particularly urgent concern is the need for longitudinal evaluation and process analysis of  
39 adjustments that are currently routinely deployed at the micro level, such as coaching and  
40 assistive technology (Doyle, 2019). We need to understand how accommodations ‘work’ as  
41 interventions for a number of target outcomes, such as secure employment, improved career  
42 advancement, added value for employers through enhanced work performance, but ultimately  
43 evidenced by a reduced disability employment gap. Generalist disability research has  
44 produced some cost benefit analysis of supply side adjustments as well as how to implement  
45 productive demand side interventions, such as networking, best practice sharing, reporting on  
46 disability inclusion data and influencing the will of businesses in acting inclusively (Saleh &  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Bruyère, 2018). The neurodiversity movement needs replicate, in order to evidence the  
5 business case argument that inclusion equals talent and may improve morale and productivity  
6 (ILO, 2010).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Alone, intervention evaluation of which activities deployed in practice ‘work’ will  
12 only focus on change at the micro level, with meso and macro ‘success’ markers as an  
13 aggregate of individual improvement and achievement. Yet, globally, current legislation  
14 requires the employer to make accommodations / adjustments to infrastructure; it does not  
15 require the individual employee to change (social model). Without multi-level, critical  
16 analysis we risk appropriating medical research agendas that ignore the social model identity  
17 of that minority (Huijg, 2020; Riddick, 2001; Shakespeare & Watson, 1997). Such limited  
18 perspective may not only fail to recognize individual strength and capabilities, but also  
19 resonate poorly with an increasingly vocal stakeholder movement who ascribe to the ‘nothing  
20 about us without us’ (Charlton, 1998) principle (Bottema-Beutel et al., 2020). We argue that  
21 we can learn from principles adapted from analogous fields such as race and gender  
22 inclusion, which focus on identifying unconscious biases in hiring, managing and promoting  
23 marginalized workers (Roberson, 2018). Outcomes such as pay disparity and representation  
24 at senior levels are considered markers of success, not the effectiveness of programs to  
25 improve the performance of individuals who happen to be black, trans or female. Race and  
26 gender interventions are thus less medicalized, without the ‘diagnosis’ and ‘treatment’ lens  
27 favored in supply side interventions for neurominorities, though we acknowledge that the  
28 social ‘norms’ of the white male are still implicitly applied through widespread mentoring  
29 arrangements (Dashper, 2019; Kandola, 2018). To summarize, operating from the social  
30 model signposts that, like wider equality diversity and inclusion initiatives, it is businesses  
31 that need to change, not individuals. There is a clear need for neurodiversity research which  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 incorporates a macro-economic, socio-legal perspective and identifies areas within the  
5  
6 employee life cycle where policy change would lead to greater inclusion.  
7  
8

9 We look to generalist disability inclusion research again for further insight on macro-  
10 economic research directions. Herein, it remains unclear whether demand side intervention  
11 policies such as tax breaks, quota targets and penalties stimulate systemic change (Salah and  
12 Bruyere 2018) although there is a moral (and legal) imperative for starting at the system  
13 level. Current organizational practice in neurodiversity inclusion, however, tends more  
14 towards the 'carrot' than the 'stick'. Key stakeholders in business may not respond positively  
15 to mandated quotas and this could set the movement back, rather than drive acceptance.  
16 Building on piloted affirmative action programs such as Autism at Work initiatives,  
17 employers may instead prefer to be guided by clear policy suggestions on how to progress  
18 from token inclusion to systemic inclusion. Research activities will again need to replicate  
19 this sort of analysis to support the development of policy through evaluation of  
20 neurodiversity specific endeavours currently in vogue such as affirmative action.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 To summarize, mainstream psychology and management research have failed to heed  
38 the call for research to support the needs of a significant minority (Beauregard et al., 2018;  
39 Ozbilgin et al., 2011) and interventions remain focused at the individual level. We argue that  
40 this is short-sighted and propose a series of research questions, presented in Table 5, using  
41 the 'Context, Intervention, Mechanism, Outcome' (CIMO) framework as a guiding structure  
42 in Realist research (Denyer et al., 2008). Our critical lens acknowledges the ontological  
43 duality of medical and social models in neurodiversity and enables both inductive and  
44 deductive research, in iterations and cycles rather than a beginning and an end. The Critical  
45 Realist paradigm epistemologically frames the need for research to simultaneously consider  
46 'what works' with appropriate challenge to the dominant paradigm of what is 'not working.'  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**\*\*Note to Editor, insert Table 5 about here\*\***

**Practice Implications:** The neurodiversity paradigm is yet to make an evidence-informed impact on organizational practice. To advance practice whilst awaiting the development of specific research, we propose applying ‘Universal Design’; a set of principles about justice, flexibility and simplicity, currently aimed at increasing accessibility of buildings and technology (The Center for Universal Design, 1997) to Human Resource (HR) processes. Our overarching premise is to ensure inclusive practice throughout the employment lifecycle to pre-empt (rather than remediate) exclusion and bias embedding activities. Examples might include replacing unnecessary interview requirements for jobs that hinge on data analytics (where work sample testing would be more appropriate, and tap into the typically autistic talent of accuracy, for example) or considering the overuse of cognitive testing, including without assistive technology compatibility, where specialist thinkers are required to demonstrate generalist abilities for specialist roles. Both these activities could improve the predictive validity of recruitment and benefit a wider population. In short, HR could adapt to maximize the talent potential of this untapped minority, without compromising the integrity of recruitment and organizational performance. Table 6 indicates how Universal Design principles could be applied across six core areas of HR: job design, hiring, onboarding, training and development, performance management and well-being support. We recommend the review, critique and further development of these ideas in industrial/organizational psychology and human resource management research.

**\*\* Insert Table 6 about here**

Additionally to Universal Design, other bodies of work may offer guidance to practitioners. Those with a minority diagnosis are unlikely to disclose to employers (Madaus et al., 2002; Santuzzi et al., 2014), for (warranted) fear of prejudice and stigma (Colella et al.,

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 1998). Employment inclusion practitioners could learn from more mature research bodies  
5  
6 investigating minority prejudice such as mental health, race, gender or sexual orientation to  
7  
8 develop protocols for increasing equity (Kessler et al., 2009; Roberson, 2018). Practitioners  
9  
10 should, however, simultaneously balance the legal obligations for disability support and  
11  
12 potential medical treatment that might be in operation at the micro level. In practice, relevant  
13  
14 interventions need to include but go beyond seeking qualified, professional support for  
15  
16 individual employees to ensure that relevant activities do not remain merely compliance-  
17  
18 focused. More fundamentally, there is a need for practitioners to intervene when delivering  
19  
20 standard HR protocols around job design, hiring, contracting, training, management  
21  
22 performance and wellbeing, to consider the impact of the neurotypical norm (as per Table 6).  
23  
24 For example, does a role really require influencing skills and teamwork if the focus is on  
25  
26 highly accurate output produced alone? Should a role require full time attendance to a busy,  
27  
28 crowded office space which has an additional cognitive burden for those with attention  
29  
30 deficits, given the ubiquity of remote access technology? HR, applied psychologists,  
31  
32 occupational health and vocational rehabilitation practitioners can deliver systemic change by  
33  
34 updating their practice to incorporate neurodiversity themes, consulting with lived experience  
35  
36 voices to ensure participation and challenging 'neuronormativity' (Huijg, 2020).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 Lived experience voices are essential for empowering participation; we recommend  
45  
46 that organizations should facilitate neurodiversity champions to speak to the full variety of  
47  
48 neurominority experiences and appreciate the different, and often conflicting, narratives of  
49  
50 the people for whom they speak (Baron-Cohen, 2019; Doyle, 2021). However, we note that  
51  
52 in-house champions should not be expected to provide professional service voluntarily  
53  
54 alongside their paid roles. Accommodation and inclusion policy initiatives should still be  
55  
56 advised by occupational professionals with expertise in disability (Spargo-Mabbs et al.,  
57  
58 2020). There are harsh legal penalties for failing in practice, both for individuals who may  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 lose their job and employers who could be sued. As neurodiversity inclusion currently sits at  
5 the intersection between disability accommodation and diversity inclusion, practitioners must  
6 walk a tight rope between the medical and social models to improve occupational access and  
7 success. Current advice is therefore to target all levels of analysis in weighing up appropriate  
8 interventions, combining participation from those affected with professional  
9 recommendations and services. Practitioners are encouraged to seek evaluation opportunities  
10 and to work with academic partners on longitudinal studies to build the evidence base in this  
11 area, as per the activities in Tables 5 and 6. In Table 7, we pose a series of reflective  
12 questions for practitioners to consider when beginning to adopt neurodiversity inclusive  
13 protocols and projects.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 \*\* Insert Table 7 about here  
28  
29  
30

### 31 **Conclusion**

32  
33 In this paper we have systematically described the dearth of consistent and  
34 ecologically-valid research regarding neurodiversity at work. This, we argue, is a risk for  
35 individuals, employers, policy makers and applied disability inclusion practice. The  
36 neurodiversity phenomenon is no longer new, and we thus present it as an exciting  
37 opportunity for multi-disciplinary researchers to explore the implications for both individual  
38 career interventions and organizational design. We have outlined an epistemological starting  
39 point for the field of research to begin answering the pressing question of ‘what works’. The  
40 practical concerns we have outlined contribute to a wider need to reflect on the broader  
41 influence of disability inclusion legislation which, despite decades of operation in developed  
42 countries, has yet to make a substantive impact on disability employment (Scope, 2018;  
43 WHO, 2011). We indicate a need to build further than the consideration of ‘what works’, to  
44 ‘what can we make work’, by incorporating appropriate structural flexibility to facilitate  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 positive work, life and societal outcomes for the many neurodiverse ‘diamonds in the rough’.  
5

6 We conclude with a clear message for five shifts in thinking, as depicted in Figure 3.  
7  
8

9 \*\* Insert Figure 3 about here  
10  
11

12 We advocate for starting with a move from the medical to social perspective, then  
13 embracing context-sensitive and inclusive research and interrogating policy and practice  
14 based on legal compliance. Learning from other, more mature fields is a necessary step to  
15 enable organizations to move towards inclusive design without repeating mistakes or  
16 reinventing the wheel. We hope we have inspired researchers and practitioners alike to  
17 critically reflect on the gaps in our understanding and begin building neurodiversity into  
18 studies and projects. We will know this is working when we see neurominorities represented  
19 in all forms of employment, adding critical diversity of thought and experience to the design,  
20 delivery and support of human endeavors. Inclusive work practices benefit everyone.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

## References

- ACAS. (2016). *Reasonable Adjustments in the Workplace*. Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service. London. <http://www.acas.org.uk/index.aspx?articleid=6074>
- Adamou, M., Arif, M., Asherson, P., Aw, T.-C., Bolea, B., Coghill, D., Guðjónsson, G., Halmøy, A., Hodgkins, P., Müller, U., Pitts, M., Trakoli, A., Williams, N., & Young, S. (2013). Occupational issues of adults with ADHD. *BMC Psychiatry*, *13*, 59. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-13-59>
- Adams, C. (2019). Man Confronts Fear of Disclosing His Autism to Potential Employers: It “Can Be a Positive Asset.” *People*. <https://people.com/human-interest/the-employables-jeff-autism-ae-tv-show/>
- Adams, L., Tindle, A., Downing, C., & Morrice, N. (2018). *Access to Work: Qualitative research with applicants, employers and delivery staff* (Issue November). Department for Work and Pensions, London.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.)*. American Psychiatric Association, Washington DC.
- Americans With Disabilities Act, Pub. L. No. PL 110-325 (S 3406) (2008). U.S. Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, Washington DC. <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adaaa.cfm>
- Armstrong, T. (2010). *The Power of Neurodiversity*. De Capo, Cambridge, MA.
- Armstrong, Thomas. (2015). The myth of the normal brain: Embracing neurodiversity. *AMA Journal of Ethics*, *17*(4), 348–352. <https://doi.org/10.1001/journalofethics.2015.17.4.msoc1-1504>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Ashworth, S. D. (2014). Invisible disabilities and employment testing. *Industrial and*  
5 *Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 256–259. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12144>  
6  
7

8  
9 Austin, R. D., & Pisano, G. P. (2017). Neurodiversity as a Competitive Advantage. *Harvard*  
10 *Business Review*, 95, 96–103. [https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-](https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-advantage)  
11 [advantage](https://hbr.org/2017/05/neurodiversity-as-a-competitive-advantage)  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 Baron-Cohen, S. (2019). The Concept of Neurodiversity Is Dividing the Autism Community.  
17 *The Scientific American*. [https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/)  
18 [of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/](https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/the-concept-of-neurodiversity-is-dividing-the-autism-community/)  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 Beaugard, T. A., Basile, K. A., & Thompson, C. A. (2018). Organizational Culture in the  
25 Context of National Culture. In R. Johnson, W. Shen, & K. M. Shockley (Eds.), *The*  
26 *Cambridge Handbook of the Global Work-Family Interface* (pp. 555–569). Cambridge  
27 University Press, Cambridge, UK  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 Bernick, M. (2019, January). Effective Autism (Neurodiversity) Employment. *Forbes*.  
35 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18)  
36 [neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelbernick/2019/01/15/effective-autism-neurodiversity-employment-a-legal-perspective/#586692476c18)  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Bewley, H., & George, A. (2016). *Neurodiversity at Work*. National Institute of Social and  
44 Economic Research, London.  
45  
46

47  
48 Blank, L., Peters, J., Pickvance, S., Wilford, J., & MacDonald, E. (2008). A systematic  
49 review of the factors which predict return to work for people suffering episodes of poor  
50 mental health. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, 18(1), 27–34.  
51 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-008-9121-8>  
52  
53  
54  
55

56  
57  
58 Blank, R., Barnett, A. L., Cairney, J., Green, D., Kirby, A., Polatajko, H., Rosenblum, S.,  
59 Germany, R. B., & Vinc, S. (2019). International clinical practice recommendations on  
60



## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4 the definition, diagnosis, assessment, intervention, and psychosocial aspects of  
5  
6 developmental coordination disorder. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*,  
7  
8 *61*, 242–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.14132>  
9

10  
11 Bono, J. E., Purvanova, R. K., Towler, A. J., & Peterson, D. B. (2009). A Survey of  
12  
13 Executive Coaching Practices. *Personnel Psychology*, *62*(2), 361–404.  
14  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2009.01142.x>  
16  
17

18  
19 Bottema-Beutel, K., Kapp, S. K., Lester, J. N., Sasson, N. J., Hand, B. N., & Otr, L. (2020).  
20  
21 Avoiding Ableist Language : Suggestions for Autism Researchers. *Autism in Adulthood*,  
22  
23 *00*(00), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1089/aut.2020.0014>  
24  
25

26  
27 Boycott, N., Schneider, J., & Osborne, M. (2014). Creating a culture of employability in  
28  
29 mental health. *Mental Health & Social Inclusion*, *18*(1), 29-34 6p.  
30  
31 <https://doi.org/10.1108/MHSI-03-2014-0007>  
32  
33

34  
35 Briner, R. B., & Rousseau, D. M. (2011). L1 Evidence-Based I – O Psychology: Not There  
36  
37 Yet but Now a Little Nearer ? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *4*(1), 76–82.  
38  
39 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2010.01301.x>  
40  
41

42  
43 Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and*  
44  
45 *Design*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA. ISBN 0-674-22457-4  
46

47  
48 Carter, E. W., Austin, D., & Trainor, A. A. (2012). Predictors of Postschool Employment  
49  
50 Outcomes for Young Adults With Severe Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Policy*  
51  
52 *Studies*, *23*(1), 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207311414680>  
53  
54

55  
56 Catalá-López, F., Hutton, B., Núñez-Beltrán, A., Page, M. J., Ridao, M., Saint-Gerons, D.  
57  
58 M., Catalá, M. A., Tabarés-Seisdedos, R., & Moher, D. (2017). The pharmacological  
59  
60 and non-pharmacological treatment of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in children

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

- 1  
2  
3  
4 and adolescents: A systematic review with network meta-analyses of randomised trials.  
5  
6 *PLoS ONE*, 12 (7). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0180355>  
7  
8  
9 CDC. (2009). Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. *Center for Disease Control*, 58(21),  
10  
11 581–608. <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/wk/mm5821.pdf>  
12  
13  
14 Chapman, R. (2020). Defining neurodiversity for research and practice. In H. B. Rosqvist, N.  
15  
16 Chown, & A. Stenning (Eds.), *Neurodiversity Studies: A New Critical Paradigm* (pp.  
17  
18 218–220). Routledge, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429322297-21>  
19  
20  
21  
22 Chapman, R., & Veit, W. (2020). Representing the Autism Spectrum. *American Journal of*  
23  
24 *Bioethics*, 20(4), 46–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15265161.2020.1730495>  
25  
26  
27  
28 Charlton, J. (1998). *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment*.  
29  
30 University of California Press, California.  
31  
32 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pnqn9>  
33  
34  
35  
36 Chaytor, N., Schmitter-Edgecombe, M., & Burr, R. (2006). Improving the ecological validity  
37  
38 of executive functioning assessment. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 21(3), 217–  
39  
40 227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acn.2005.12.002>  
41  
42  
43  
44 Colella, A., DeNisi, A. S., & Varma, A. (1998). The impact of ratee's disability on  
45  
46 performance judgments and choice as partner: the role of disability-job fit stereotypes  
47  
48 and interdependence of rewards. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 102–111.  
49  
50 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.83.1.102>  
51  
52  
53  
54 Comaford, C. (2017). Is Neurodiversity the Right Talent Path for Your Organization? *Forbes*.  
55  
56 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/christinecomaford/2017/06/24/competitive-advantage-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/christinecomaford/2017/06/24/competitive-advantage-why-your-organization-needs-to-embrace-neurodiversity/#62ed8ca63f65)  
57  
58 [why-your-organization-needs-to-embrace-neurodiversity/#62ed8ca63f65](https://www.forbes.com/sites/christinecomaford/2017/06/24/competitive-advantage-why-your-organization-needs-to-embrace-neurodiversity/#62ed8ca63f65)  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Cooper, E. R., Hewlett, A. K., Cooper, R., Jameson, M., Cooper, R., & Todd, R. (2018).

5 Neurodiverse voices : Opening Doors to Employment. *Achieve Ability Commission:*  
6 *London.* [http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-](http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-opening-doors-to-employment-report_2018_interactive.pdf)  
7 [opening-doors-to-employment-report\\_2018\\_interactive.pdf](http://www.achieveability.org.uk/files/1516612947/wac-neurodiverse-voices-opening-doors-to-employment-report_2018_interactive.pdf)  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Corbière, M., Villotti, P., Lecomte, T., Bond, G. R., Lesage, A., & Goldner, E. M. (2014).

14 Work accommodations and natural supports for maintaining employment. *Psychiatric*  
15 *Rehabilitation Journal*, 37(2), 90–98. <https://doi.org/10.1037/prj0000033>  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence  
21 against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43, 1241–1299.  
22  
23

24  
25  
26 Cucina, J. M., Peyton, S. T., Clark, L. L., Su, C., & Liberman, B. E. (2013). Diversity and

27 Inclusion Science and Practice Requires an Interdisciplinary Approach. *Industrial &*  
28 *Organizational Psychology*, 6(3), 221–232. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12038>  
29  
30

31  
32  
33 D'Souza, H., & Karmiloff-Smith, A. (2017). Neurodevelopmental disorders. *Wiley*

34 *Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 8(1–2), 1–10.  
35  
36

37 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1398>  
38  
39

40  
41  
42 Danielson, M., Bitsko, R., Ghandour, R., Holbrook, J., Kogan, M., & Blumberg, S. (2018).

43 Prevalence of Parent-Reported ADHD Diagnosis and Associated Treatment Among US  
44 Children and Adolescents, 2016. *Journal of Clinical Child Adolescent Psychology*,  
45 *47(2)*, 199–212. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2017.1417860>  
46  
47  
48

49  
50  
51 Dashper, K. (2019). Challenging the gendered rhetoric of success? The limitations of women-

52 only mentoring for tackling gender inequality in the workplace. *Gender, Work and*  
53 *Organization*, 26(4), 541–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12262>  
54  
55  
56

57  
58  
59 DEEWR. (2013). *Evaluation of Disability Employment Services Final Report.* Australian  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 *Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.*

5  
6 Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace  
7  
8 Relations, Canberra.

9  
10 [https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/wecanwork/pages/38/attachments/original/1436](https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/wecanwork/pages/38/attachments/original/1436236024/DES_Evaluation.pdf?1436236024)  
11  
12 [236024/DES\\_Evaluation.pdf?1436236024](https://d3n8a8pro7vhm.cloudfront.net/wecanwork/pages/38/attachments/original/1436236024/DES_Evaluation.pdf?1436236024)

13  
14  
15  
16 Denyer, D., & Tranfield, D. (2009). Producing a systematic review. In A. D. Bryman & A.  
17  
18 Buchanan (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organizational research* (pp. 671–689). Sage  
19  
20 Publications Ltd.

21  
22  
23 Denyer, D., Tranfield, D., & van Aken, J. E. (2008). Developing Design Propositions through  
24  
25 Research Synthesis. *Organization Studies*, 29(3), 393–413.

26  
27  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607088020>

29  
30  
31 DESE. (1992). *Disability Discrimination Act*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education,  
32  
33 Skills and Employment. <http://docs.education.gov.au/node/35941>.

34  
35  
36  
37 Doyle, N. (2017). Neurodiversity at Work. In BPS (Ed.), *Psychology At Work: Improving*  
38  
39 *wellbeing and productivity in the workplace* (pp. 44–62). British Psychological Society.

40  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/ISBN 978-1-85433-754-2>

43  
44  
45 Doyle, N. (2019, October). Richard Branson Opens the Door to Bigger Thinking on  
46  
47 Neurodiversity. *Forbes*. [https://www.forbes.com/sites/drnancydoyle/2019/10/22/richard-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/drnancydoyle/2019/10/22/richard-branson-opens-the-door-to-bigger-thinking-on-neurodiversity-/)  
48  
49 [branson-opens-the-door-to-bigger-thinking-on-neurodiversity-/](https://www.forbes.com/sites/drnancydoyle/2019/10/22/richard-branson-opens-the-door-to-bigger-thinking-on-neurodiversity-/)

50  
51  
52 Doyle, N. (2020). Neurodiversity at Work: a biopsychosocial model and the impact on  
53  
54 working adults. *British Medical Bulletin*, 135, 1–18.

55  
56  
57 Doyle, N. (2021, in press). Adapting Other Internal Resources to a Neurodiverse Workforce.  
58  
59 In S. Bruyere & A. Collela (Eds.), *Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology:*  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 *New Frontiers Series, Neurodiversity*. American Psychological Association.  
5  
6

7 Doyle, N., & McDowall, A. (2019). Context matters: a systematic review of coaching as a  
8 disability accommodation. *PLoS ONE*, *14*(8), 1–30.  
9

10 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0199408>  
11  
12

13  
14 Doyle, N., Patton, E., Fung, L., Bruk-Lee, V., & Bruyere, S. (2020). Diamond in the rough?  
15 Neurodiversity inclusion in practice. *Society of Industrial and Organizational*  
16 *Psychology Annual Conference*.  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 Doyle, N. (2019). Reasonable adjustments for dyslexia. *Occupational Health at Work*, *16*(2),  
23 28–31.  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 Equality Act, (2010). United Kingdom Parliament, London  
29

30 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/introduction>  
31  
32

33 Elliot, J., & Grigorenko, E. (2014). *The Dyslexia Debate*. Yale University Press, New Haven,  
34 Connecticut.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 Elsabbagh, M., Divan, G., Koh, Y., Kim, Y., Kauchali, S., Marcín, C., Montiel-Nava, C.,  
40 Patel, V., Paula, C., Wang, C., Yasamy, M., & Fombonne, E. (2012). Global prevalence  
41 of autism and other pervasive developmental disorders. *Autism Research*, *5*(3), 160–179.  
42  
43  
44

45 <https://doi.org/10.1002/aur.239>  
46  
47

48  
49 Gabbard, R. M., Sharrer, D. D., Dunleavy, E. M., & Cohen, D. (2014). New self-  
50 identification regulations for individuals with disabilities: Will a compliance-focused  
51 approach work? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *7*(2), 227–231.  
52  
53  
54

55 <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12137>  
56  
57

58  
59 Gerber, P. J., Batalo, C. G., & Achola, E. O. (2012). Dyslexia and learning disabilities in  
60

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

- Canada and the UK: The impact of its disability employment laws. *Dyslexia*, 18(3), 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1441>
- Gifford, G. (2011). *Access to Work: Official Statistics*. Department of Work and Pensions, London. <http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/workingage/atw/atw0711.pdf>
- Govt. of Canada. (1995). *Employment Equity Act*. Government of Canada, Ottawa. <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/e-5.401/FullText.html>
- Grant, D. (2009). The Psychological Assessment of Neurodiversity. In D. Pollak (Ed.), *Neurodiversity in Higher Education* (pp. 33–62). Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, UK.
- Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Effects of race on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 64–86.
- Halmøy, A., Fasmer, O. B., Gillberg, C., & Haavik, J. (2009). Occupational outcome in adult ADHD: impact of symptom profile, comorbid psychiatric problems, and treatment: a cross-sectional study of 414 clinically diagnosed adult ADHD patients. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 13(2), 175–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054708329777>
- Hayes, G. R., Custodio, V. E., Haimson, O. L., Nguyen, K., Ringland, K. E., Ulgado, R. R., Waterhouse, A., & Weiner, R. (2015). Mobile video modeling for employment interviews for individuals with autism. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 43(3), 275–287. <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-150775>
- Holliday, G. A., Koller, J. R., & Thomas, C. D. (1999). Post-high school outcomes of high IQ adults with learning disabilities. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 22(3), 266–281.
- Houston, S. (2014). Critical realism. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *The Sage*

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

*encyclopedia of qualitative research methods* (pp. 220–222). Sage Publications Ltd, London. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412952453.n204>

Huijg, D. D. (2020). Neuronormativity in theorising agency. In H. B. Rosqvist, N. Chown, & A. Stenning (Eds.), *Neurodiversity Studies: A New Critical Paradigm* (1st ed., pp. 213–217). Routledge, London. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429322297-20>

Hyland, P. K., & Rutigliano, P. J. (2013). Eradicating Discrimination: Identifying and Removing Workplace Barriers for Employees With Disabilities. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 6(4), 471–475. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12087>

IDEA, (2006). *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS), Washington DC. <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/statuteregulations/>

Ihori, D., & Olvera, P. (2015). Discrepancies, Responses and Patterns: Selecting a Method of Assessment for Specific Learning Disabilities. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 19, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-014-0042-6>

ILO. (2010). *Disability in the Workplace: Company Practices*. International Labor Organization, Geneva. [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_emp/---ifp\\_skills/documents/publication/wcms\\_150658.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/publication/wcms_150658.pdf)

Jackson, C. J., Furnham, A., & Willen, K. (2000). Employer willingness to comply with the disability discrimination act regarding staff selection in the UK. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(1), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900166912>

Jacob, A., Scott, M., Falkmer, M., & Falkmer, T. (2015). The costs and benefits of employing an adult with autism spectrum disorder: A systematic review. *PLoS ONE*, 10(10), 1–16.



## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0139896>

Jensen, J., Lindgren, M., Andersson, K., Ingvar, D. H., & Levander, S. (2000). Cognitive intervention in unemployed individuals with reading and writing disabilities. *Applied Neuropsychology*, 7(4), 223–236. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324826AN0704\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15324826AN0704_4)

Jones, R. J., Woods, S. A., & Guillaume, Y. R. F. (2016). The effectiveness of workplace coaching: A meta-analysis of learning and performance outcomes from coaching. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 89(2), 249–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12119>

Joseph, B., Walker, A., & Fuller-Tyszkiewicz, M. (2018). Evaluating the effectiveness of employee assistance programmes: a systematic review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 27(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1374245>

Jurecic, A. (2007). Neurodiversity. *College English*, 69(5), 421–442.

Kandola, B. (2018). *Racism at Work: The Danger of Indifference*. Pearn Kandola Publishing, Oxford.

Kapp, S. K., Gillespie-Lynch, K., Sherman, L. E., & Hutman, T. (2013). Deficit, difference, or both? Autism and neurodiversity. *Developmental Psychology*, 49(1), 59–71. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028353>

Kessler, R. C., Lane, M., Stang, P. E., & van Brunt, D. L. (2009). The prevalence and workplace costs of adult attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in a large manufacturing firm. *Psychological Medicine*, 39(1), 137–147. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1017/S0033291708003309>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Kirby, A., Edwards, L., & Sugden, D. (2011). Emerging Adulthood and Developmental Co-  
5 ordination Disorder. *Journal of Adult Development, 18*(3), 107–113.

6  
7  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-011-9123-1>  
9

10  
11 Klimoski, R. J., & Rafaeli, A. (1983). Inferring personal qualities through handwriting  
12 analysis. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 56*(3), 191–202.

13  
14  
15  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1983.tb00127.x>  
17

18  
19 Knapp, M., Patel, A., Curran, C., Latimer, E., Catty, J., Becker, T., Drake, R. E., Fioritti, A.,  
20  
21 Kilian, R., Lauber, C., Rössler, W., Tomov, T., Van Busschbach, J., Comas-Herrera, A.,  
22  
23 White, S., Wiersma, D., & Burns, T. (2013). Supported employment: Cost-effectiveness  
24 across six European sites. *World Psychiatry, 12*(1), 60–68.

25  
26  
27  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20017>  
29

30  
31 Kulow, M. D., & Thomas, S. (2019). Assistive Technology and the Americans With  
32  
33 Disabilities Act: Endearing Employers to These Reasonable Accommodations. *Berkeley*  
34  
35 *Journal of Employment & Labor Law, 40*(2), 257. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38CZ32542>  
36  
37

38  
39 Lawer, L., Brusilovskiy, E., Salzer, M. S., & Mandell, D. S. (2009). Use of vocational  
40  
41 rehabilitative services among adults with autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental*  
42  
43 *Disorders, 39*(3), 487–494. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-008-0649-4>  
44  
45

46  
47 Leather, C., Hogh, H., Seiss, E., & Everatt, J. (2011). Cognitive functioning and work success  
48  
49 in adults with dyslexia. *Dyslexia, 17*(4), 327–338. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.441>  
50  
51

52  
53 Lindstedt, H., & Umb-Carlsson, O. (2013). Cognitive assistive technology and professional  
54  
55 support in everyday life for adults with ADHD. *Disability and Rehabilitation. Assistive*  
56  
57 *Technology, 8*(5), 402–408. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17483107.2013.769120>  
58  
59

60 Logan, J. (2009). Dyslexic entrepreneurs: the incidence; their coping strategies and their

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 business skills. *Dyslexia*, 15(4), 328–346.  
5  
6

7 Lounds-Taylor, J., McPheeters, M. L., Sathe, N. A., Dove, D., Veenstra-VanderWeele, J., &  
8

9 Warren, Z. (2012). A Systematic Review of Vocational Interventions for Young Adults  
10

11 With Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Pediatrics*, 130(3), 531–538.  
12

13 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-0682>  
14  
15

16 Madaus, J. W., Foley, T. E., McGuire, J. M., & Ruban, L. M. (2002). Employment Self-  
17

18 Disclosure of Postsecondary graduates with Learning Disabilities: Rates and Rationales.  
19

20 *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35(4), 364–369.  
21  
22

23 Mcgee, M. (2012). Neurodiversity. *Contexts*, 11(3), 12–13.  
24  
25

26 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536504212456175>  
27  
28

29 McGonagle, A. K., Beatty, J. E., & Joffe, R. (2014). Coaching for workers with chronic  
30

31 illness: Evaluating an intervention. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 19(3),  
32

33 385–398. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036601>  
34  
35

36 Meilleur, A. A. S., Jelenic, P., & Mottron, L. (2015). Prevalence of Clinically and  
37

38 Empirically Defined Talents and Strengths in Autism. *Journal of Autism and*  
39

40 *Developmental Disorders*, 45(5), 1354–1367. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2296-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-014-2296-2)  
41  
42

43 2  
44  
45

46 Melvill, D., Stevens, C., & Vaid, L. (2015). *Access to Work Cost Benefit Analysis*. Centre for  
47

48 Economic and Social Inclusion, London.  
49  
50

51 Monzee, J., Ouimet, M., Schovanec, J., & Singer, J. (2019). *Neurodiversity: 20th Anniversary*  
52

53 *of the Birth of a Concept*. Parents Eclaires, Quebec.  
54  
55

56 Murfitt, K., Crosbie, J., Zammit, J., & Williams, G. (2018). Employer engagement in  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 disability employment: A missing link for small to medium organizations-a review of  
5 the literature. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 48(3), 417–431.

6  
7  
8 <https://doi.org/10.3233/JVR-180949>  
9

10  
11 Nalavany, B. A., Logan, J. M., & Carawan, L. W. (2017). The relationship between  
12 emotional experience with dyslexia and work self-efficacy among adults with dyslexia.  
13  
14 *Dyslexia*, 24(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.1575>  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 NAS. (2016). *The autism employment gap: Too Much Information in the workplace*. The  
20 National Autistic Society, London. [http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is/myths-facts-](http://www.autism.org.uk/about/what-is/myths-facts-stats.aspx)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 stats.aspx

27 ODEP. (2020). *Job Accommodations Network*. Office of Disability Employment Policy.  
28  
29 <https://askjan.org/index.cfm>, date accessed: 25<sup>th</sup> September 2020  
30  
31

32 ONCE. (2019). *Making the Future of Work Inclusive of People with Disabilities*. Disability  
33 Hub Europe International Labor Organization Global Business and Disability Network  
34 & Fundacion (ONCE), Brussels, Belgium  
35  
36  
37  
38

39  
40 Ozbilgin, M. F., Beauregard, T. A., Tatli, A., & Bell, M. P. (2011). Work-Life, Diversity and  
41 Intersectionality: A Critical Review and Research Agenda. *International Journal of*  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*Management Reviews*, 13(2), 177–198. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00291.x)  
[2370.2010.00291.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2010.00291.x)

Palmer, E., & Stern, J. (2015). Employment in Tourette Syndrome. *Journal of Neurology,*  
*Neurosurgery & Psychiatry*, 86(9), 16–24. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jnnp-2015-311750.41>

Patton, E. (2019). *Autism , attributions and accommodations neurodiverse workforce*. 48(4),  
915–934. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2018-0116>

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Philipson, A. (2014). GCHQ employs more than 100 dyslexic and dyspraxic spies. *The*  
5 *Telegraph*. [http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html)  
6 [employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationnews/11111584/GCHQ-employs-more-than-100-dyslexic-and-dyspraxic-spies.html)  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Rice, M., & Brooks, G. (2004). *developmental dyslexia in adults: a research review*. National  
12 Research and Development Centre, London. <http://www.nrdc.org.uk>  
13  
14

15  
16 Riddick, B. (2001). Dyslexia and inclusion : time for a social model of disability  
17 perspective ? *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, *11*(3), 37–41.  
18  
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210100200078>  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Rios, D., Magasi, S., Novak, C., & Harniss, M. (2016). Conducting accessible research:  
25 Including people with disabilities in public health, epidemiological, and outcomes  
26 studies. *American Journal of Public Health*, *106*(12), 2137–2144.  
27  
28  
29 <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2016.303448>  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Roberson, Q. M. (2018). Diversity in the Workplace: A Review, Synthesis, and Future  
35 Research Agenda. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational*  
36 *Behavior*, *6*(1), 69–88. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-012218-015243>  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Robertson, M. M. (2006). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, tics and Tourette's  
42 syndrome: the relationship and treatment implications. A commentary. *European Child*  
43 *& Adolescent Psychiatry*, *15*(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-006-0505-z>  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 Rojon, C., McDowall, A., & Saunders, M. N. K. (2011). On the experience of conducting a  
50 systematic review in industrial, work, and organizational psychology: Yes, it is  
51 worthwhile. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *10*(3), 133–138.  
52  
53  
54  
55 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000041>  
56  
57  
58

59  
60 Rousseau, D. M., Manning, J., & Denyer, D. (2008). Evidence in management and

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

organizational science: Assembling the field's full weight of scientific knowledge through syntheses. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 475–515.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211651>

Runswick-Cole, K. (2014). "Us" and "them": the limits and possibilities of a "politics of neurodiversity" in neoliberal times. *Disability & Society*, 29(7), 1117–1129.

<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2014.910107>

Saal, K., Martinez, L. R., & Smith, N. A. (2014). Visible disabilities: Acknowledging the utility of acknowledgment. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 242–248.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12140>

Saleh, M. C., & Bruyère, S. M. (2018). Leveraging employer practices in global regulatory frameworks to improve employment outcomes for people with disabilities. *Social Inclusion*, 6(1), 18–28. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1201>

<https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v6i1.1201>

Santuzzi, A. M., Waltz, P. R., Finkelstein, L. M., & Rupp, D. E. (2014). Invisible disabilities: Unique challenges for employees and organizations. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12134>

<https://doi.org/10.1111/iops.12134>

Schlosser, R. W., & Sigafoos, J. (2009). 'Empty' reviews and evidence-based practice.

*Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention*, 3(1), 1–3.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/17489530902801067>

Scope. (2018). *Disability Employment Gap has barely changed in a decade*.

[https://www.scope.org.uk/About-Us/Media/Press-releases/May-2018-\(1\)/Disability-employment-gap-has-barely-changed-in-a](https://www.scope.org.uk/About-Us/Media/Press-releases/May-2018-(1)/Disability-employment-gap-has-barely-changed-in-a) Date accessed: 18<sup>th</sup> December 2018.

SFA. (2016). *Hair Professionals Standard*. Apprenticeships Standards.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/580178/H](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/580178/H)

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 air\_Professional\_Standard.pdf. Date accessed 27<sup>th</sup> October 2017  
5  
6

7 Shakespeare, T., & Watson, N. (1997). Defending the Social Model. *Disability & Society*,  
8  
9 12(2), 293–300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599727380>  
10

11 Shelley-Tremblay, J. F., & Rosen, L. A. (1996). Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder: an  
12  
13 evolutionary perspective. In *The Journal of genetic psychology* (Vol. 157, Issue 4, pp.  
14  
15 443–453). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221325.1996.9914877>  
16  
17

18 Simpson, B. (2018). Pragmatism: a philosophy of practice. In C. Cassell, A. L. Cunliffe, & G.  
19  
20 Grandy (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Business and Management Research*  
21  
22 *Methods* (pp. 54–68). Sage Publications Ltd.  
23  
24  
25

26 Singer, J. (1998). *Odd People In: The Birth of Community Amongst People on the “Autistic*  
27  
28 *Spectrum”*: a Personal Exploration of a New Social Movement based on Neurological  
29  
30 *Diversity*. University of Technology, Sydney.  
31  
32  
33

34 Singer, J. (1999). “Why can’t you be normal for once in your life?” From a problem with no  
35  
36 name to the emergence of a new category of difference. In M. Corker & S. French  
37  
38 (Eds.), *Disability Discourse* (pp. 59–67). Open University Press.  
39  
40  
41

42 Sniderman, B. (2014). Neurodiversity: A New Talent Opportunity. *Forbes*.  
43  
44  
45 [https://www.forbes.com/sites/brennasniderman/2014/10/30/neurodiversity-a-new-talent-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/brennasniderman/2014/10/30/neurodiversity-a-new-talent-opportunity/#58ab46271058)  
46  
47 [opportunity/#58ab46271058](https://www.forbes.com/sites/brennasniderman/2014/10/30/neurodiversity-a-new-talent-opportunity/#58ab46271058)  
48  
49

50 Snowling, M. J. (2010). Dyslexia. In C. L. Cooper, J. Field, U. Goswami, R. Jenkins, & B. J.  
51  
52 Sahakian (Eds.), *Mental Capital and Mental Wellbeing* (pp. 775–783). Blackwell.  
53  
54  
55

56 Snowling, M.J., Adams, J. W., Bowyer-Crane, C., & Tobin, V. A. (2000). Levels of literacy  
57  
58 among juvenile offenders: the incidence of specific reading difficulties. *Criminal*  
59  
60



1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 *Behaviour and Mental Health*, 10(4), 229–241. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.362>  
5  
6

7 Snowling, Margaret J. (2005). Specific learning difficulties. *Psychiatry*, 4(9), 110–113.  
8  
9

10 Spargo-Mabbs, J., Doyle, N., & Milliken, N. (2020). *Neurodiversity Toolkit*. Business  
11 Disability Forum, London. [https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-](https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/)  
12 [hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/](https://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/knowledge-hub/toolkits/neurodiversity-toolkit/)  
13  
14  
15

16  
17 Sundar, V. (2017). Operationalizing workplace accommodations for individuals with  
18 disabilities: A scoping review. *Work*, 56(1), 135–155. [https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-](https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-162472)  
19 [162472](https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-162472)  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 Szymanski, E., Enright, M., & Hershenson, D. (2012). C. 8. (2012). An ecological approach  
26 to the vocational behavior and career development of people with disabilities. In R. M.  
27 Parker & J. B. Patterson (Eds.), *Rehabilitation counseling: Basics and beyond* (5th ed.,  
28 pp. 199–258). PRO-ED, Austin, Texas.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Taylor, K. E., & Walter, J. (2003). Occupation choices of adults with and without symptoms  
36 of dyslexia. *Dyslexia*, 9(3), 177–185. <https://doi.org/10.1002/dys.239>  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Test, D. W., Mazzotti, V. L., Mustian, A. L., Fowler, C. H., Kortering, L., & Kohler, P.  
42 (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool  
43 outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional*  
44 *Individuals*, 32(3), 160–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0885728809346960>  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 The Center for Universal Design. (1997). *The Principles of Universal Design, Version 2.0*.  
52 University of North Carolina.  
53  
54 [https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about\\_ud/udprinciples.htm](https://projects.ncsu.edu/ncsu/design/cud/about_ud/udprinciples.htm) Date Accessed:  
55  
56  
57 15<sup>th</sup> May 2020  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 TUC. (2011). *Disability and Work* (Revised Ed). Trade Union Congress, London.  
5

6 <https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/extras/disabilityandwork.pdf>  
7  
8

9 Tyerman, A. (2012). Vocational rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury: Models and  
10 services. *NeuroRehabilitation*, 31(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.3233/NRE-2012-0774>  
11  
12  
13

14 United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, 1 (2006).  
15

16 [https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convention\\_accessible\\_pdf.pdf](https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convention_accessible_pdf.pdf)  
17  
18  
19

20 Van Maanen, J., Sørensen, J. B., & Mitchell, T. R. (2007). The interplay between theory and  
21 method. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1145–1154.  
22  
23

24 <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2007.26586080>  
25  
26  
27

28 Von Károlyi, C., Winner, E., Gray, W., & Sherman, G. F. (2003). Dyslexia linked to talent:  
29 Global visual-spatial ability. *Brain and Language*, 85(3), 427–431.  
30  
31

32 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X\(03\)00052-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0093-934X(03)00052-X)  
33  
34  
35

36 Walker, N. (2012). Throw away the master's tools: liberating ourselves from the pathology  
37 paradigm. In J. Bascombe (Ed.), *Loud Hands: Autistic People, Speaking* (pp. 225–237).  
38 Autistic Self Advocacy Network, Washington DC.  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 WEF. (2020). *Jobs of tomorrow: Mapping Opportunity in the New Economy*. World  
44 Economic Forum, Geneva.  
45  
46

47 [http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\\_Jobs\\_of\\_Tomorrow\\_2020.pdf](http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Jobs_of_Tomorrow_2020.pdf)  
48  
49  
50

51 Wehman, P., Brooke, V., Brooke, A. M., Ham, W., Schall, C., McDonough, J., Lau, S.,  
52 Seward, H., & Avellone, L. (2016). Employment for adults with autism spectrum  
53 disorders: A retrospective review of a customized employment approach. *Research in*  
54 *Developmental Disabilities*, 53–54, 61–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2016.01.015>  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?  
2  
3

4 Whitby, M. (2017). Scoping of shared spatial needs during public building use: Autism  
5  
6 Spectrum Disorder (Sensory Overload) and Borderline Personality Disorder  
7  
8 (Dissociation). *Journal of Urban Design and Mental Health*, 3(9).  
9

10 <https://www.urbandesignmentalhealth.com/journal-3---shared-spatial-needs.html>  
11  
12

13 White, H. A., & Shah, P. (2006). Uninhibited imaginations: Creativity in adults with  
14  
15 Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(6),  
16  
17 1121–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.007>  
18  
19

20  
21 WHO. (2011). Work and employment. In *World Report on Disability*. World Health  
22  
23 Organization, Geneva. [https://www.who.int/disabilities/world\\_report/2011/chapter8.pdf](https://www.who.int/disabilities/world_report/2011/chapter8.pdf)  
24  
25

26  
27 Wollaston, S. (2016, March). Employable Me review: moving telly that destigmatises  
28  
29 disability – and made me laugh. *The Guardian*. [https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
30  
31 [radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
32  
33 [and-made-me-laugh](https://www.theguardian.com/tv-and-radio/2016/mar/24/employable-me-review-moving-telly-that-destigmatises-disability-and-made-me-laugh)  
34  
35

36  
37 Work and Pensions Committee. (2018). *Assisitive Technology: tenth report of session 2017-*  
38  
39 *2019* (Issue April). Houses of Parliament, London.  
40  
41 [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.htm)  
42  
43 [htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmworpen/1015/101509.htm)  
44  
45

46  
47 Yaffe, J., Montgomery, P., Hopewell, S., & Shepard, L. D. (2012). Empty reviews: A  
48  
49 description and consideration of cochrane systematic reviews with no included studies.  
50  
51 *PLoS ONE*, 7(5), 3–9. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0036626>  
52  
53

54  
55 Young, S., Adamo, N., Ásgeirsdóttir, B. B., Branney, P., Beckett, M., Colley, W., Cubbin, S.,  
56  
57 Deeley, Q., Farrag, E., Gudjonsson, G., Hill, P., Hollingdale, J., Kilic, O., Lloyd, T.,  
58  
59 Mason, P., Paliokosta, E., Perecherla, S., Sedgwick, J., Skirrow, C., Woodhouse, E.  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

(2020). Females with ADHD: An expert consensus statement taking a lifespan approach providing guidance for the identification and treatment of attention-deficit/ hyperactivity disorder in girls and women. *BMC Psychiatry*, 20(1), 404.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-020-02707-9>


Young, S., González, R. A., Fridman, M., Hodgkins, P., Kim, K., & Gudjonsson, G. H.

(2018). The economic consequences of attention- deficit hyperactivity disorder in the Scottish prison system. *BMC Psychiatry*, 18, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1792-x>

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Figure 1


*Summary of review extraction from the three searches*



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Figure 2

*A socio-legal framework for organizational psychology research into neurodiversity*



Inclusion

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Figure 3

*Five essential shifts for neurodiversity research and practice*






Table 1

*Search terms*

<b>Conditions</b>	<b>Variations of terms in search</b>
Clinical Conditions: ADHD, Autism, TS	ADHD, ADD, Attention Deficit Disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, Attention Dysregulation  Autism, Autistic Spectrum Condition, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, ASD, Asperger's  Tourette Syndrome, Tourettes, Tic Disorder
Applied Conditions	Dyslex*, Dysprax*, Developmental Coordination Disorder, DCD, Reading Disabilit*, Learning Disabilit*, Specific Learning Disabilit*
Mental Health (for comparison only)	Mental Health, Depression, Anxiety
Work related terms (for the third search only)	Occupation*, Employ*, Unemploy*, Work, Career, Job, Vocation*

Table 2

*Number of papers citing neurodiverse conditions in Applied Psychology research*

	<b>Journal of Applied Psychology</b>	<b>Personnel Psychology</b>	<b>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</b>	<b>Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology</b>
<b>“Neurodiversity” as a term</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Autism</b>	1	1	7	2
<b>ADHD</b>	1	0	1	1
<b>Dyslexia</b>	1	0	13	2
<b>DCD (Dyspraxia)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Tourette Syndrome (TS)</b>	0	1	1	0
<b>Mental Health</b>			110	413

Table 3

*Coverage of neurodiverse conditions in UK-based, multi-disciplinary psychological publications*

Condition	Hits	pre-1995	1995-2005	2005+	Estimated population prevalence of condition	Proportion of neurodiversity (if mental health included)	Proportion of research
<b>Dyslexia</b>	448	278	79	91	10%	29%	9%
<b>Autism</b>	496	173	80	243	1.5%	4%	10%
<b>DCD</b>	95	46	11	38	2%	6%	2%
<b>ADHD</b>	110	3	17	90	4%	12%	2%
<b>TS</b>	10	3	3	4	1%	3%	0%
<b>Mental Health</b>	4040				16%	46%	78%

**Table 4**

*Disciplinary location of international published research concerning the occupational experience of people with neurodiverse conditions*

Journal Type	Neuroscience	Psychology	Psychiatry	Child Development	Condition Specific	Occ Health/ Therapy/ Voc Rehab	Disability	Social Work	Other	Career/Employment/work /management
<i>n</i>	1	5	3	4	9	11	4	1	5	5
%	2%	8%	5%	6%	15%	18%	6%	2%	8%	8%

Table 5

*CIMO structure research into occupational neurodiversity (Denyer et al., 2008)*

	<u>Micro</u>	<u>Meso</u>	<u>Macro</u>
<b><u>Context</u></b>	<u>How do intersectional</u>	<u>Do environments which</u>	<u>Are we seeing</u>
<b><u>What do we know about individual, organization and societal influences on neurodiversity inclusion?</u></b>	<u>aspects of individual experience such as gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status affect neurominorities?</u>	<u>provide a closer 'person-environment fit' of neurodiverse need / talents lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?</u>	<u>tokenistic examples of deliberate inclusion only (Higginbottom, 2017; Bernick, 2019; Philipson, 2014) or the start of a cultural shift?</u>
	<u>Can support at key contextual transitions improve outcomes, such as education to work, unemployment to work, career progression points?</u>	<u>What is the role of naturally-occurring supports such as schedule flexibility and minimal environmental distractions? What happens when job tasks relate to skills uncompromised by neurominority such as autistic special interests or ADHD creativity (Meilleur et al., 2015; White &amp; Shah, 2006)?</u>	<u>To what extent are communication norms in education and training design keeping pace with technological and cultural shifts in the world of work?</u>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

[Do environments that systematically provide \(for example assistive technology and/or coaching\) lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?](#)

**Intervention**  
  
**What interventions exist and what do we know about how they are deployed and their effectiveness?**

[What is the provision of coaching, mentoring, career support, assistive technology, schedule and environmental flexibilities and more, research to map individual experience of adjustments and their prevalence?;](#)

[What employer-led adjustment activities currently exist to accommodate neurominority in the workplace, e.g. supervisor training and HR protocols? How prevalent are they in different countries and sectors?](#)  
  
[How are adjustments determined, recommended and communicated to employers and employees?](#)

[What labor market policy interventions exist and what do we know about their effect on neurominorities – e.g. the full inclusion of neurominority in disability policy, specific policy targeting neurominorities?](#)

**Mechanisms**

[What is the psychology of adjustment activities for neurominorities, do](#)

[How can we investigate the impact of inclusion using theories and frameworks such](#)

[How has the narrative on neurodiversity](#)

---

<b><u>How might interventions “work?”</u></b>	<u>they operate on cognitive, emotional, behavioral or social capital mediators?</u>	<u>as Leader-Member Exchange, In group / Out group, motivation and engagement, psychological contract, organizational justice-?</u>	<u>influenced the perceptions of policy makers and employers regarding the recruitment and potential of people with neurominority diagnoses? To what extent are neurominority disablements technologically determined?</u>
<b><u>Outcome</u></b>	<u>To what extent do individual adjustment activities provide improvements in longitudinal occupational outcomes for neurodiverse employees, such as higher rates of employment, promotion and representation at senior levels of</u>	<u>What is the cost-benefit of providing adjustments to employers? Which outcomes have value, e.g. direct productivity improvement via talent, indirect via increased workforce engagement, representation, turnover, absence?</u>	<u>How can we assess the wider societal benefits of neurodiversity inclusion such as improvements in the employment gap, recidivism, increased representation in senior roles and</u>



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

organizations? What      Do inclusive contexts and      positions of  
quality of life benefits are      successful interventions      influence?  
there when inclusion is      actually lead to the retention  
manifest?      and expression of 'talent'?

---

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

**Table 56**

*Neurodiversity Universal Design for HR*

<b>Universal Design Principle</b>	<b>Designing: Avoiding structural exclusion by focusing on performance output, not input</b>	<b>Hiring: Ensuring all candidates can perform at their best during the process</b>	<b>Contracting: Terms and conditions of employment to increase access</b>	<b>Training: inclusion in standard</b>	<b>Performance Review: Optimizing success with inclusive delivery</b>	<b>Wellbeing: adapting standard wellbeing services to support NM needs</b>
<b>Equitable Use</b>	Job design to avoid social constructs in 'essential' criteria, such as "team skills" for jobs where performance will be independent.	Use of work sample tests to measure performance in the actual role, rather than social expectation loaded interviews or proxy measures such as timed intelligence tests.	Provision for: (1) remote working (2) flexible hours (3) general reduction in commuting obligations as standard in all employment contracts where feasible.	Ensuring access to standard training through best practice in preparation and delivery for all in-house provision, details as below.	Provision of personal performance training as standard company offer, e.g. time management, planning, prioritizing and other performance issues common to NM, but also relevant to a wide range of employees and newly promoted.	Ensuring a variety of wellbeing (WB) initiatives, including physical health as equal to mental health. Build access to WB supports into standard onboarding and reviewing protocols so that it is standard.
<b>Flexibility in Use</b>	Craft roles for specialists as well as generalists, for example permitting senior roles without supervision responsibilities.	Offer a menu of adjustments as standard, which signals that organizational intentions are welcoming of	Providing flexible options for standard systems such as frequency of supervision and feedback, which may need to be increased	Adjustable pace in learning program, allow additional time for preparation and any post-training testing.	Permit mentors in performance reviews, provide feedback written in advance to allow reflection. Appraisal scoring to avoid penalizing where	Ensure wellbeing provision incorporates specialists, as standard advice may not be appropriate for some NMs who have

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

		difference. Invite candidates to contact recruiters if they would require time extensions, or location flexibility, for example.	during onboarding for some neurominorities.		employees excel in specialist areas but are average in others.	additional cognitive and medical needs.
<b>Simple and Intuitive Use</b>	Over time roles develop 'creep' and become overlaid with sometimes inconsistent responsibilities. Regular review of performance output variables and team structures helps to ensure that jobs are designed simply and intuitively in line with the business goals.	Clear instructions on how to complete application and what to prepare for assessment using simple bullet points or numbered steps.	Well laid out terms and conditions, signposting to relevant policies and procedures, covering note, use Flesch Kincaid score to assess language accessibility.	Consistency of formatting and training scheduling to avoid confusion or absence.	Standard format for assessing and reporting performance that is consistent and clearly communicated in advance.	Well-advertised provision with referral routes clearly presented in simple step-by-step format.
<b>Perceptible Information</b>	Role descriptions to be accessible in format, e.g. multi-sensory, adjustable text size / background color, printable, editable. Language to be behavioral and output driven, avoiding nuance and interpretation such as 'influencing skills'.	Application process in accessible formats, e.g. multi-sensory, adjustable text size / background color, printable, editable.	Understanding the additional needs for psychological contract – what seems obvious may need to be explicit to avoid misunderstandings. Multi-sensory options for ensuring policy compliance, e.g. safeguarding videos. Written contract in accessible format.	Materials to include accessible written pack and opportunity for discussion, reflection and action before completion of training.	Feedback to be factual and not interpretative, guidance and training provided to supervisors about reporting performance feedback clearly with examples.	Transparency on purpose of wellbeing initiative, ensure that it is perceived as optional help rather than mandated acquiescence – many NM people have had negative experiences with mental health practice.
<b>Tolerance for Error</b>	Ensure that safety, risk and client-facing deliverables have	Allowing candidates to review and edit application information	Standard contract process to include review verbally as well	Set a tone in training for the permission of "silly questions" and	Allow for appeal or negotiation where performance ratings	Create feedback loops for employees to submit their

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

	second checks built into the role design to reduce the need for 100% accuracy.	before online submission. Encouraging applicants to pause or take breaks in interviews if required. Giving clear instructions on directions and log-in details, as many NMs have significant impairments in way finding. Do not penalize this specifically.	as written, give opportunity to ask questions.	create an environment of positive regard. Permit multiple attempts at knowledge tests and allow practice tests.	resulted from misunderstanding.	experiences, both negative and positive, to ensure employee voice is captured and acted upon.
<b>Low Physical Effort</b>	Understand the additional burden on commuting and busy workspaces for NMs, for some this causes physical pain and extreme fatigue, leading to poor performance. Design with minimal sensory load and travel requirements in mind.	Provision of assistive technology or materials in formats compatible with AT. Consider timing of interviews and offer flexibility around location and need to commute in rush hour.	Create as much time as possible for reviewing and competing the contracting process to avoid slow processing speed anxiety.	Use of AT and regular comfort breaks.	Breaks provided to accommodate sensory overwhelm and aid slow processing.	Proximity of support to reduce travel, ensuring wellbeing services also meet multi-sensory design and AT compatible standards.
<b>Space and Size for Approach</b>	Similarly to the above, seek specialist input into the design of workspaces and where possible allow flexibility or compromise (shifts) in attendance on busy work sites.	Match the environment to the job performance so that you can assess in context, with the caveat that there should be a quiet environment for preparation and recruitment tasks as there is likely to be	Defined location of work station, provision of dual monitors, sit stand desks, and acoustic barriers as standard options in contracts.	Flexibility around onsite versus remote delivery, group size and familiarity.	Performance reviews to be conducted in friendly location and quiet, calm environment, with sufficient notice of who will be present.	Flexibility of access remote via app, video, phone or face to face. Avoid reliance on single delivery method.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

additional anxiety for  
NMs.

---

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Table 6

*CIMO structure research into occupational neurodiversity*

	Micro	Meso	Macro
<b>Context</b>	How do intersectional aspects of individual experience such as gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status affect neurominorities?	Do environments which provide a closer 'person-environment fit' of neurodiverse need / talents lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?  For example, when there are naturally occurring supports such as schedule flexibility and minimal environmental distractions, or when job tasks relate to skills uncompromised by neurominority such as autistic special interests or ADHD creativity (Meilleur et al., 2015; White & Shah, 2006)?  Do environments that systematically provide (for example assistive technology and/or coaching) lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?	Are we seeing tokenistic examples of deliberate inclusion-only (Higginbottom, 2017; Philipson, 2014) or the start of a cultural shift?  To what extent are communication norms in education and training design keeping pace with technological and cultural shifts in the world of work?
<b>What do we know about individual, organization and societal influences on neurodiversity inclusion?</b>	Can support at key contextual transitions improve outcomes, such as education to work, unemployment to work, career progression points?		
<b>Intervention</b>	Investigating the provision of coaching, mentoring, career support, assistive technology, schedule	What employer-led adjustment activities currently exist to accommodate neurominority in the workplace, e.g. supervisor	What labor market policy interventions exist and what do we know about their effect on
<b>What interventions exist and what do we know</b>			

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

<b>about how they are deployed and their effectiveness?</b>	and environmental flexibilities and more, research to map individual experience of adjustments and their prevalence.	training and HR protocols? How prevalent are they in different countries and sectors? How are adjustments determined, recommended and communicated to employers and employees?	neurominorities – e.g. the full inclusion of neurominority in disability policy, specific policy targeting neurominorities?
<b>Mechanisms</b> <b>How might interventions “work?”</b>	What is the psychology of adjustment activities for neurominorities, do they operate on cognitive, emotional, behavioral or social capital mediators?	Exploring the impact of inclusion using theories and frameworks such as Leader-Member Exchange, In group / Out group, motivation and engagement, psychological contract, organizational justice and more.	How has the emerging narrative on neurodiversity influenced the perceptions of policy makers and employers regarding the recruitment and potential of people with neurominority diagnoses? To what extent are neurominority disablements technologically determined?
<b>Outcome</b>	To what extent do individual adjustment activities provide improvements in longitudinal occupational outcomes for neurodiverse employees, such as higher rates of employment, promotion and representation at senior levels of	What is the cost-benefit of providing adjustments to employers? Which outcomes have value, e.g. direct productivity improvement via talent, indirect via increased workforce engagement, representation, turnover, absence?	Assessing the wider societal benefits of neurodiversity inclusion such as improvements in the employment gap, recidivism, increased representation in senior roles and positions of influence.



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

organizations? What Do inclusive contexts and  
quality of life benefits are successful interventions  
there when inclusion is actually lead to the retention  
manifest? and expression of 'talent'?

---

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**Table 7***Practice Implications for Working with Neurodiversity*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reflective Question – the evidence base</b>	<b>Reflective Question – organizational practice</b>
<b>Best practice for neurominority inclusion</b>	What can be learned from research and practice on other populations such as gender inclusion? What are the implications for intersectionality, e.g. <a href="#">exploring where NM issues are exacerbated by gender or racial bias.</a>	Does the organization have relevant policies for other minorities in place? How informed are these by evidence? Do these 'work'? If not, what can be learned?
<b>Legal obligation</b>	Is there 'best evidence' for ensuring best practice beyond legal compliance?	Do all relevant practitioners in the organization understand the obligations? Which efforts are there to go beyond legal compliance and actively support?
<b>HR practice</b>	What is the evidence on alternative hiring mechanisms e.g. instead of unstructured interviews?	Have relevant practices been reviewed in line with the guidance in Table 5? Has the neurominority perspective been considered in HR protocols?
<b>Expertise to inform advice and guidance</b>	Who provides respected and evidence-based sources of knowledge?	Who has relevant expertise in-house? If not, where and how could expertise be commissioned? Are advisors appropriately trained, certified and supervised to support vulnerable adults?

Table 1

*Search terms*

<b>Conditions</b>	<b>Variations of terms in search</b>
Clinical Conditions: ADHD, Autism, TS	ADHD, ADD, Attention Deficit Disorder, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder, Attention Dysregulation  Autism, Autistic Spectrum Condition, Autistic Spectrum Disorder, ASD, Asperger's  Tourette Syndrome, Tourettes, Tic Disorder
Applied Conditions	Dyslex*, Dysprax*, Developmental Coordination Disorder, DCD, Reading Disabilit*, Learning Disabilit*, Specific Learning Disabilt*
Mental Health (for comparison only)	Mental Health, Depression, Anxiety
Work related terms (for the third search only)	Occupation*, Employ*, Unemploy*, Work, Career, Job, Vocation*

Table 2

*Number of papers citing neurodiverse conditions in Applied Psychology research*

	<b>Journal of Applied Psychology</b>	<b>Personnel Psychology</b>	<b>Industrial and Organizational Psychology</b>	<b>Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology</b>
<b>“Neurodiversity” as a term</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Autism</b>	1	1	7	2
<b>ADHD</b>	1	0	1	1
<b>Dyslexia</b>	1	0	13	2
<b>DCD (Dyspraxia)</b>	0	0	0	0
<b>Tourette Syndrome (TS)</b>	0	1	1	0
<b>Mental Health</b>			110	413

Table 3

*Coverage of neurodiverse conditions in UK-based, multi-disciplinary psychological publications*

Condition	Hits	pre-1995	1995-2005	2005+	Estimated population prevalence of condition	Proportion of neurodiversity (if mental health included)	Proportion of research
<b>Dyslexia</b>	448	278	79	91	10%	29%	9%
<b>Autism</b>	496	173	80	243	1.5%	4%	10%
<b>DCD</b>	95	46	11	38	2%	6%	2%
<b>ADHD</b>	110	3	17	90	4%	12%	2%
<b>TS</b>	10	3	3	4	1%	3%	0%
<b>Mental Health</b>	4040				16%	46%	78%

**Table 4**

*Disciplinary location of international published research concerning the occupational experience of people with neurodiverse conditions*

<b>Journal Type</b>	<b>Neuroscience</b>	<b>Psychology</b>	<b>Psychiatry</b>	<b>Child Development</b>	<b>Condition Specific</b>	<b>Occ Health/ Therapy/ Voc Rehab</b>	<b>Disability</b>	<b>Social Work</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Career/Employment/work /management</b>
<b><i>n</i></b>	1	5	3	4	9	11	4	1	5	5
<b>%</b>	2%	8%	5%	6%	15%	18%	6%	2%	8%	8%

Table 5

*CIMO structure research into occupational neurodiversity (Denyer et al., 2008)*

	Micro	Meso	Macro
<b>Context</b>	How do intersectional aspects of individual experience such as gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status affect neurominorities?	Do environments which provide a closer 'person-environment fit' of neurodiverse need / talents lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?	Are we seeing tokenistic examples of deliberate inclusion only (Bernick, 2019; Philipson, 2014) or the start of a cultural shift?
<b>What do we know about individual, organization and societal influences on neurodiversity inclusion?</b>	Can support at key contextual transitions improve outcomes, such as education to work, unemployment to work, career progression points?	What is the role of naturally-occurring supports such as schedule flexibility and minimal environmental distractions? What happens when job tasks relate to skills uncompromised by neurominority such as autistic special interests or ADHD creativity (Meilleur et al., 2015; White & Shah, 2006)?	To what extent are communication norms in education and training design keeping pace with technological and cultural shifts in the world of work?



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

		Do environments that systematically provide (for example assistive technology and/or coaching) lead to lower rates of occupational exclusion?	
<b>Intervention</b>	What is the provision of coaching, mentoring, career support, assistive technology, schedule and environmental flexibilities and more, research to map individual experience of adjustments and their prevalence?	What employer-led adjustment activities currently exist to accommodate neurominority in the workplace, e.g. supervisor training and HR protocols? How prevalent are they in different countries and sectors?	What labor market policy interventions exist and what do we know about their effect on neurominorities – e.g. the full inclusion of neurominority in disability policy, specific policy targeting neurominorities?
<b>What interventions exist and what do we know about how they are deployed and their effectiveness?</b>		How are adjustments determined, recommended and communicated to employers and employees?	
<b>Mechanisms</b>	What is the psychology of adjustment activities for neurominorities, do	How can we investigate the impact of inclusion using theories and frameworks such	How has the narrative on neurodiversity

---

<b>How might interventions “work?”</b>	they operate on cognitive, emotional, behavioral or social capital mediators?	as Leader-Member Exchange, In group / Out group, motivation and engagement, psychological contract, organizational justice?	influenced the perceptions of policy makers and employers regarding the recruitment and potential of people with neurominority diagnoses? To what extent are neurominority disablements technologically determined?
<b>Outcome</b>	To what extent do individual adjustment activities provide improvements in longitudinal occupational outcomes for neurodiverse employees, such as higher rates of employment, promotion and representation at senior levels of	What is the cost-benefit of providing adjustments to employers?  Which outcomes have value, e.g. direct productivity improvement via talent, indirect via increased workforce engagement, representation, turnover, absence?	How can we assess the wider societal benefits of neurodiversity inclusion such as improvements in the employment gap, recidivism, increased representation in senior roles and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

organizations? What	Do inclusive contexts and	positions of
quality of life benefits are	successful interventions	influence?
there when inclusion is	actually lead to the retention	
manifest?	and expression of 'talent'?	

---

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

**Table 6**

*Neurodiversity Universal Design for HR*

<b>Universal Design Principle</b>	<b>Designing: Avoiding structural exclusion by focusing on performance output, not input</b>	<b>Hiring: Ensuring all candidates can perform at their best during the process</b>	<b>Contracting: Terms and conditions of employment to increase access</b>	<b>Training: inclusion in standard</b>	<b>Performance Review: Optimizing success with inclusive delivery</b>	<b>Wellbeing: adapting standard wellbeing services to support NM needs</b>
<b>Equitable Use</b>	Job design to avoid social constructs in 'essential' criteria, such as "team skills" for jobs where performance will be independent.	Use of work sample tests to measure performance in the actual role, rather than social expectation loaded interviews or proxy measures such as timed intelligence tests.	Provision for: (1) remote working (2) flexible hours (3) general reduction in commuting obligations as standard in all employment contracts where feasible.	Ensuring access to standard training through best practice in preparation and delivery for all in-house provision, details as below.	Provision of personal performance training as standard company offer, e.g. time management, planning, prioritizing and other performance issues common to NM, but also relevant to a wide range of employees and newly promoted.	Ensuring a variety of wellbeing (WB) initiatives, including physical health as equal to mental health. Build access to WB supports into standard onboarding and reviewing protocols so that it is standard.
<b>Flexibility in Use</b>	Craft roles for specialists as well as generalists, for example permitting senior roles without supervision responsibilities.	Offer a menu of adjustments as standard, which signals that organizational intentions are welcoming of	Providing flexible options for standard systems such as frequency of supervision and feedback, which may need to be increased	Adjustable pace in learning program, allow additional time for preparation and any post-training testing.	Permit mentors in performance reviews, provide feedback written in advance to allow reflection. Appraisal scoring to avoid penalizing where	Ensure wellbeing provision incorporates specialists, as standard advice may not be appropriate for some NMs who have

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

		difference. Invite candidates to contact recruiters if they would require time extensions, or location flexibility, for example.	during onboarding for some neurominorities.		employees excel in specialist areas but are average in others.	additional cognitive and medical needs.
<b>Simple and Intuitive Use</b>	Over time roles develop 'creep' and become overlaid with sometimes inconsistent responsibilities. Regular review of performance output variables and team structures helps to ensure that jobs are designed simply and intuitively in line with the business goals.	Clear instructions on how to complete application and what to prepare for assessment using simple bullet points or numbered steps.	Well laid out terms and conditions, signposting to relevant policies and procedures, covering note, use Flesch Kincaid score to assess language accessibility.	Consistency of formatting and training scheduling to avoid confusion or absence.	Standard format for assessing and reporting performance that is consistent and clearly communicated in advance.	Well-advertised provision with referral routes clearly presented in simple step-by-step format.
<b>Perceptible Information</b>	Role descriptions to be accessible in format, e.g. multi-sensory, adjustable text size / background color, printable, editable. Language to be behavioral and output driven, avoiding nuance and interpretation such as 'influencing skills'.	Application process in accessible formats, e.g. multi-sensory, adjustable text size / background color, printable, editable.	Understanding the additional needs for psychological contract – what seems obvious may need to be explicit to avoid misunderstandings. Multi-sensory options for ensuring policy compliance, e.g. safeguarding videos. Written contract in accessible format.	Materials to include accessible written pack and opportunity for discussion, reflection and action before completion of training.	Feedback to be factual and not interpretative, guidance and training provided to supervisors about reporting performance feedback clearly with examples.	Transparency on purpose of wellbeing initiative, ensure that it is perceived as optional help rather than mandated acquiescence – many NM people have had negative experiences with mental health practice.
<b>Tolerance for Error</b>	Ensure that safety, risk and client-facing deliverables have	Allowing candidates to review and edit application information	Standard contract process to include review verbally as well	Set a tone in training for the permission of "silly questions" and	Allow for appeal or negotiation where performance ratings	Create feedback loops for employees to submit their

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

	second checks built into the role design to reduce the need for 100% accuracy.	before online submission. Encouraging applicants to pause or take breaks in interviews if required. Giving clear instructions on directions and login details, as many NMs have significant impairments in way finding. Do not penalize this specifically.	as written, give opportunity to ask questions.	create an environment of positive regard. Permit multiple attempts at knowledge tests and allow practice tests.	resulted from misunderstanding.	experiences, both negative and positive, to ensure employee voice is captured and acted upon.
<b>Low Physical Effort</b>	Understand the additional burden on commuting and busy workspaces for NMs, for some this causes physical pain and extreme fatigue, leading to poor performance. Design with minimal sensory load and travel requirements in mind.	Provision of assistive technology or materials in formats compatible with AT. Consider timing of interviews and offer flexibility around location and need to commute in rush hour.	Create as much time as possible for reviewing and competing the contracting process to avoid slow processing speed anxiety.	Use of AT and regular comfort breaks.	Breaks provided to accommodate sensory overwhelm and aid slow processing.	Proximity of support to reduce travel, ensuring wellbeing services also meet multi-sensory design and AT compatible standards.
<b>Space and Size for Approach</b>	Similarly to the above, seek specialist input into the design of workspaces and where possible allow flexibility or compromise (shifts) in attendance on busy work sites.	Match the environment to the job performance so that you can assess in context, with the caveat that there should be a quiet environment for preparation and recruitment tasks as there is likely to be	Defined location of work station, provision of dual monitors, sit stand desks, and acoustic barriers as standard options in contracts.	Flexibility around onsite versus remote delivery, group size and familiarity.	Performance reviews to be conducted in friendly location and quiet, calm environment, with sufficient notice of who will be present.	Flexibility of access remote via app, video, phone or face to face. Avoid reliance on single delivery method.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

---

additional anxiety for  
NMs.

---

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

**Table 7**

*Practice Implications for Working with Neurodiversity*

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reflective Question – the evidence base</b>	<b>Reflective Question – organizational practice</b>
<b>Best practice for neurominority inclusion</b>	What can be learned from research and practice on other populations such as gender inclusion? What are the implications for intersectionality, e.g. exploring where NM issues are exacerbated by gender or racial bias.	Does the organization have relevant policies for other minorities in place? How informed are these by evidence? Do these 'work'? If not, what can be learned?
<b>Legal obligation</b>	Is there 'best evidence' for ensuring best practice beyond legal compliance?	Do all relevant practitioners in the organization understand the obligations? Which efforts are there to go beyond legal compliance and actively support?
<b>HR practice</b>	What is the evidence on alternative hiring mechanisms e.g. instead of unstructured interviews?	Have relevant practices been reviewed in line with the guidance in Table 5? Has the neurominority perspective been considered in HR protocols?
<b>Expertise to inform advice and guidance</b>	Who provides respected and evidence-based sources of knowledge?	Who has relevant expertise in-house? If not, where and how could expertise be commissioned? Are advisors appropriately trained, certified and supervised to support vulnerable adults?



RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

Appendix 1

*Journal Title list for the papers extracted in search three (table 4)*

---

**Tourettes** **Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences**

---

Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and  
Engineering

Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, & Psychiatry (JNNP)

Psychiatric rehabilitation journal

**Dyslexia** Rehabilitation Psychology

Journal of Applied Psychology

Coaching: An International Journal of Theory, Research & Practice

Journal of learning disabilities

Diversity & Equality in Health & Care

Nurse Education in Practice

**DCD** British Journal of Therapy & Rehabilitation

American Journal of Occupational Therapy

Journal of Adult Development

Frontiers in Psychology

Disability and rehabilitation

---

## RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

---

**Autism** PLoS ONE

Pediatrics

American Journal of Occupational Therapy

Research on Social Work Practice

Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders

Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation

Research in developmental disabilities

Journal of Disability Policy Studies

Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders

Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation

Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation

Career Development for Exceptional Individuals

OT Practice

Work

Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation

Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders

---

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

---

Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders

Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders

Research in developmental disabilities

**ADHD** Medicated & Unmedicated ADHD Boys at Midlife (35 to 45)

ADHD in Adults--Comorbidities & Adaptive Impairments

International Journal of Managing Projects in Business

Journal of Management Development

Advances in Mental Health & Intellectual Disabilities

Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology

**Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling**

Journal of Employment Counseling

Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences

American Journal of Occupational Therapy

ADHD in adults: A practical guide to evaluation and management.

European Psychiatry

---

RUNNING HEAD: Diamond in the rough?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion