Policy Research Journal
ISSN (E): 3006-7030 ISSN (P) : 3006-7022 Volume 3, Issue 12, 2025

INTEGRATING NEURODIVERSITY INTO MODERN RECRUITMENT PRACTICES

Abdul Samad Dahri[*1], Aamir Iqbal Umrani[2], Muhammad Asif[3], Muhammad Isla

[*1]*Assistant Professor Shaheed Benazir Bhutto University, Pakistan*
[2]*Associate Professor Department of Business Administration*
Sindh Madressatul Islam University
[3]*Assistant Professor Department of Management Studies*
Bahria Business School Bahria University, Karachi.
[4]*Director QEC Newports Institute of Communications and Economics (NICE)*

[*1]drabdulsamad.dahri@sbbusba.edu.pk, [2]aamir@smiu.edu.pk, [3]masif.bukc@bahria.edu.pk, [4]mislam@newports.edu.pk

[*1]0000-0003-4517-34932

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18162596

Keywords:
neurodiversity, recruitment, inclusion, Person–Environment Fit, ethical leadership, talent management

Article History
Received on 15 Oct 2025
Accepted on 15 Dec 2025
Published on 31 Dec 2025

Copyright @Author
Corresponding Author: *
Abdul Samad Dahri

Abstract

Neurodiversity represents a spectrum of natural cognitive variations, including autism, ADHD, and dyslexia, which remain systematically underrepresented in traditional employment contexts. This paper develops a comprehensive framework for neuro-inclusive recruitment, integrating ethical, organizational, and strategic perspectives. It critiques conventional hiring processes, highlighting biases inherent in interviews, social signaling norms, and standardized assessments that privilege neurotypical traits. Drawing on Person–Environment Fit theory, the study emphasizes misalignment between organizational systems and neurodivergent capabilities, rather than individual deficits, as a primary barrier to inclusion. The proposed Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model (INIRM) advocates alternative assessment methods, environmental adjustments, and neuro-inclusive leadership training to optimize capability recognition and reduce bias. Ethical, business, and governance implications are explored, demonstrating that neuro-inclusive recruitment enhances innovation, employee engagement, retention, and employer branding while mitigating legal and reputational risks. Managerial guidelines provide actionable strategies for embedding inclusion into recruitment architecture, leadership practices, and technology-mediated assessment systems. This research contributes to theory and practice by positioning neurodiversity as a strategic asset and ethical imperative, offering a roadmap for organizations to institutionalize inclusion while sustaining competitive advantage.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary organizational scholarship, diversity is increasingly recognized as a multidimensional construct encompassing demographic, cultural, and cognitive differences that collectively shape organizational performance, innovation, and sustainability. While gender, ethnicity, and nationality have received sustained scholarly and managerial attention, cognitive diversity—particularly neurodiversity—remains under-theorized and under-integrated into formal human resource management (HRM) systems, especially recruitment. Neurodiversity refers to naturally occurring variations in neurological functioning, including autism spectrum conditions, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), dyslexia, dyspraxia, and related cognitive profiles (Singer, 1999; Armstrong, 2010). These variations influence how individuals process information, communicate, and interact with work environments, yet they do not inherently diminish capability or productivity.

Despite growing evidence that neurodivergent individuals possess competencies aligned with the demands of the knowledge economy—such as analytical depth, sustained concentration, creative problem-solving, and systems-level thinking—their labor market outcomes remain disproportionately poor. Empirical studies consistently report elevated unemployment and underemployment rates among neurodivergent populations, even among those with advanced education and technical expertise (Hedley et al., 2017). This paradox echoes broader organizational research demonstrating that employment outcomes are often weakly correlated with objective capability and strongly shaped by institutional processes and evaluative norms (Dahri et al., 2019; Rehman et al., 2023).

Recruitment processes constitute the earliest and most consequential of these institutional mechanisms. Recruitment decisions function as gatekeeping devices, determining not only access to employment but also the legitimacy of particular forms of competence. In HRM research, recruitment is frequently conceptualized as a neutral matching exercise between candidate skills and job requirements. However, a growing body of literature challenges this assumption, arguing that recruitment systems are socially constructed, normatively embedded, and cognitively biased (Rivera, 2012; Levashina et al., 2014; Arif et al., 2025). This insight aligns with prior research in service quality, employee satisfaction, and organizational performance, which demonstrates that system design, rather than individual deficiency, often explains suboptimal outcomes (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2020).

1.1 Neurodiversity and the Limits of Deficit-Oriented HRM

Organizational approaches to neurodiversity have traditionally been grounded in the medical model of disability, which conceptualizes neurological difference as an individual impairment requiring diagnosis, accommodation, or correction (Shakespeare, 2014; Chhajro et al., 2022). Within this paradigm, inclusion is conditional and reactive: candidates must disclose their diagnosis, request reasonable accommodations, and demonstrate their ability to conform to dominant workplace norms. While this model has enabled important legal protections, it simultaneously reinforces a deficit-oriented logic that positions neurodivergent individuals as deviations from an assumed norm.

This logic mirrors critiques within organizational behavior and HRM literature, where employee dissatisfaction, burnout, and disengagement are increasingly linked to misaligned work systems rather than individual inadequacy (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2019). Studies examining emotional exhaustion, incivility, and job satisfaction repeatedly demonstrate that poorly designed organizational processes amplify stress and suppress engagement, regardless of employee capability (Dahri & Hamed, 2018; Dahri et al., 2020). By extension, recruitment systems that privilege narrow behavioral norms can systematically misclassify capable candidates as unsuitable.

In contrast, the social model of disability reframes disadvantage as a product of environmental and institutional barriers rather than individual impairment (Oliver, 1990). Applied to recruitment, this model shifts analytical attention from candidate deficits to structural misfit between human cognitive diversity and rigid organizational practices. This perspective resonates with contemporary sustainability and governance research, which emphasizes systemic responsibility and ethical design over individual blame (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025).

1.2 Recruitment as a Cognitive and Ethical System

Recruitment is not merely a technical HR function; it is a cognitive and ethical system that encodes organizational values, assumptions, and power relations. Decisions regarding what constitutes "talent," "professionalism," and "fit" are shaped by implicit norms that often reflect the cognitive styles of those already in positions of authority (Rivera, 2012). Research on strategic leadership and organizational performance underscores that such norms are rarely neutral and frequently reinforce homogeneity under the guise of efficiency (Dahri et al., 2019; Rehman et al., 2023).

Standardized interviews remain the dominant selection tool across sectors, yet meta-analytic evidence suggests that interviews often measure social fluency, impression management, and narrative self-presentation rather than task-relevant competence alone (Levashina et al., 2014). These attributes align closely with neurotypical communication patterns and disadvantage candidates whose strengths manifest through alternative cognitive channels. Similar dynamics have been observed in digital service quality research, where user satisfaction depends less on inherent user capability and more on system usability and inclusivity (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2019).

Moreover, informal evaluative constructs such as "culture fit" operate as powerful yet opaque filters. While ostensibly designed to ensure cohesion, culture fit assessments often function as mechanisms of exclusion, privileging similarity over diversity (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). This phenomenon parallels findings in organizational citizenship behavior and sustainability research, where symbolic alignment frequently substitutes for substantive contribution (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025).

1.3 Reinterpreting Person–Environment Fit in Recruitment

To theorize these dynamics, this study draws on Person–Environment Fit (P–E Fit) theory, which posits that employee outcomes are shaped by the alignment between individual characteristics and environmental demands (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Within recruitment research, P–E Fit is often operationalized through interviews, psychometric tests, and cultural alignment assessments. However, this operationalization assumes that environments are optimally designed and that misfit originates primarily from individual inadequacy.

This assumption is increasingly contested. Organizational research demonstrates that poor fit frequently reflects inflexible systems rather than unsuitable individuals, particularly in contexts characterized by high cognitive and emotional demands (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2020). When recruitment environments are calibrated to neurotypical norms, they distort assessments of capability and compatibility, producing false negatives for neurodivergent candidates.

Reframing P–E Fit as a bidirectional and design-contingent construct allows recruitment to be examined as a site of ethical responsibility and strategic choice. This approach aligns with emerging work on technology-enabled HRM and inclusive system design, which emphasizes adaptability, transparency, and user-centered evaluation (Dahri et al., 2019; Muhammad et al., 2022).

1.4 Purpose and Scholarly Contribution

The purpose of this paper is threefold. First, it critically examines modern recruitment practices through the lens of neurodiversity, identifying structural barriers embedded in assessment methods, environmental design, and evaluative norms. Second, it integrates insights from disability studies, organizational psychology, and HRM to reconceptualize recruitment as a systemic source of exclusion rather than a neutral talent filter. Third, it proposes an integrated neuro-inclusive recruitment model grounded in alternative assessment mechanisms, sensory-conscious environments, and neuro-inclusive leadership capability.

By doing so, this study contributes to multiple streams of literature. Theoretically, it extends P–E Fit by foregrounding system design and cognitive diversity. Empirically, it aligns with evidence from employee satisfaction, service quality, and sustainability research demonstrating that organizational outcomes improve when systems are designed around human variability rather than idealized norms (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2023). Practically, it offers HR leaders evidence-based pathways to redesign recruitment processes in ways that enhance fairness, innovation, and long-term organizational resilience.

Ultimately, this paper argues that recruitment is not a neutral gateway but a moral and strategic architecture.

Reimagining it through the lens of neurodiversity is essential for organizations seeking sustainable performance in increasingly complex and cognitively diverse labor markets.

2. Neurodiversity, Employment Outcomes, and Structural Exclusion: A Critical Review of the Literature

2.1 Neurodiversity and Labor Market Outcomes

Despite increasing societal awareness of neurodiversity, labor market outcomes for neurodivergent individuals remain persistently unequal. International evidence indicates disproportionately high unemployment, underemployment, and job instability among neurodivergent populations, particularly individuals on the autism spectrum and those with ADHD or dyslexia (Hedley et al., 2017; de Beer et al., 2020). Estimates from developed economies suggest that between 50% and 80% of autistic adults are either unemployed or employed well below their qualification level, a figure that contrasts sharply with the general population (Lorenz & Heinitz, 2016).

These disparities persist even in contexts characterized by skills shortages, digital transformation, and increasing demand for analytical and technical expertise. This contradiction highlights a fundamental misalignment between organizational talent needs and recruitment practices**,** echoing findings from broader HRM and organizational performance research which demonstrate that employment outcomes are often decoupled from actual capability (Dahri et al., 2019; Rehman et al., 2023).

From a systems perspective, neurodivergent exclusion cannot be adequately explained by individual-level variables such as education, motivation, or skill. Rather, it **reflects** institutional filtering mechanisms that disproportionately disadvantage those whose cognitive styles diverge from dominant norms. This pattern parallels evidence from service quality and user-experience research, where poorly designed systems systematically marginalize certain user groups regardless of their underlying competence (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2019).

2.2 Recruitment as the Primary Point of Failure

A consistent theme across the literature is that neurodivergent individuals who secure employment often perform at or above expected levels once hired, particularly when work tasks align with their cognitive strengths (Austin & Pisano, 2017). This observation shifts analytical attention away from job performance and toward recruitment as the dominant failure point in employment systems.

Recruitment processes are designed to operate under conditions of uncertainty, prompting organizations to rely on heuristic shortcuts, standardized assessments, and socially validated signals of competence. While such mechanisms are intended to enhance efficiency and fairness, they frequently produce unintended exclusionary effects. Research on e-recruitment and talent attraction demonstrates that digital hiring systems often replicate offline biases rather than mitigate them, particularly when algorithms are trained on historically homogeneous data (Muhammad et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2019).

Behavioral interviews, for example, rely heavily on candidates' ability to narrate past experiences in socially compelling ways, emphasizing verbal fluency, emotional expressiveness, and situational improvisation. These competencies are not only weakly correlated with task performance in many roles but are also unevenly distributed across neurocognitive profiles (Levashina et al., 2014). As a result, recruitment systems frequently misinterpret difference as deficiency.

This dynamic mirrors findings in organizational psychology research on job satisfaction and burnout, where employees exposed to misaligned role expectations and evaluative criteria experience emotional exhaustion and disengagement (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri & Hamed, 2018). In recruitment, however, such misalignment results not in burnout but in outright exclusion.

2.3 Structural Bias and the Normalization of Neurotypicality

One of the most underexamined aspects of recruitment bias is the normalization of neurotypicality as an implicit standard of professionalism. Neurotypical communication norms—such as sustained eye contact, rapid conversational turn-taking, and implicit social signaling—are frequently treated as universal indicators of competence and trustworthiness. Yet these norms are culturally and neurologically contingent rather than inherently superior (Rivera, 2012).

The literature on organizational culture and fit highlights how such norms become institutionalized

through informal evaluative criteria, particularly "culture fit" (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). While culture fit is often justified as a mechanism for reducing conflict and enhancing cohesion, empirical evidence suggests that it primarily functions as a homophily filter**,** reinforcing similarity and excluding difference.

This phenomenon is consistent with findings from leadership and governance research, where dominant cognitive and behavioral styles are often mistaken for effectiveness, marginalizing alternative forms of contribution (Dahri et al., 2019; Rehman et al., 2023). In recruitment, the consequences are especially severe, as exclusion occurs before candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate their actual value.

2.4 Hidden Curricula and Informal Gatekeeping

Beyond formal assessment criteria, recruitment processes are shaped by a hidden curriculum of unwritten rules and expectations. Job advertisements frequently employ ambiguous language—such as "dynamic," "rockstar," or "excellent people skills"—that obscures actual task requirements and signals cultural conformity over capability. Research on communication quality and job clarity demonstrates that ambiguity in role expectations is a significant predictor of dissatisfaction and disengagement (Brohi et al., 2018; Dahri et al., 2019).

For neurodivergent candidates, such ambiguity poses a disproportionate barrier. Individuals who process language literally or rely on explicit instructions may struggle to infer implied expectations, leading to misinterpretation and self-selection out of opportunities. This dynamic mirrors patterns observed in digital service usability research, where unclear interfaces systematically disadvantage users with different cognitive processing styles (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2019).

Informal interactions during recruitment—such as small talk, unstructured interviews, and social assessments—further further amplify exclusion. These interactions are rarely documented or evaluated for bias, yet they exert significant influence over hiring decisions. The result is a recruitment system that appears objective on the surface but operates through deeply subjective and exclusionary mechanisms.

2.5 Intersectionality and Compounded Disadvantage

While neurodiversity alone presents significant barriers, its interaction with other dimensions of identity—such as gender, socioeconomic status, and geographic context—can compound exclusion. Research from developing and emerging economies suggests that institutional support for neurodivergent individuals is often weaker, and stigma more pronounced, than in high-income contexts (Dahri et al., 2018; Syed et al., 2018).

Studies on job satisfaction, incivility, and emotional exhaustion in South Asian healthcare and service sectors reveal that individuals who deviate from normative expectations face heightened scrutiny and reduced support (Dahri et al., 2019; Dahri & Hamed, 2018). When neurodivergence intersects with these contextual pressures, recruitment exclusion is intensified rather than mitigated.

This observation aligns with sustainability and governance research emphasizing that inclusion cannot be addressed through isolated interventions but must be embedded within broader institutional reforms (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025). Recruitment systems that fail to account for intersectional dynamics risk reproducing structural inequality under the guise of meritocracy.

2.6 Limits of Current Diversity and Inclusion Initiatives

Despite widespread organizational commitment to diversity and inclusion (D&I), neurodiversity remains peripheral within most formal initiatives. D&I strategies frequently prioritize visible and legally recognized categories, while cognitive diversity is addressed, if at all, through individualized accommodations rather than systemic redesign.

This limitation reflects a broader pattern identified in HRM and CSR research, where symbolic commitments to inclusion are not matched by substantive changes in organizational processes (Dahri et al., 2024; Rehman et al., 2023). In recruitment, this gap is particularly pronounced: organizations may promote inclusive values while continuing to rely on assessment methods that systematically exclude neurodivergent candidates.

Furthermore, technology-driven recruitment solutions—such as AI screening tools and automated assessments—risk entrenching bias if inclusivity is not explicitly embedded in system design. Research on usability evaluation and AI-enabled applications underscores the importance of human-centered design

in preventing technological exclusion (Dahri et al., 2019; Dahri & Al-Athwari, 2019).

2.7 Synthesis and Research Gap

Taken together, the literature reveals a consistent pattern: neurodivergent exclusion in employment is structurally produced, recruitment-centered, and systemically reinforced. While individual-level interventions and accommodations are necessary, they are insufficient to address exclusion rooted in recruitment design.

Existing research has documented employment disparities, identified bias in hiring practices, and highlighted the potential value of neurodivergent talent. However, there remains a critical gap in integrative frameworks that connect neurodiversity theory, recruitment system design, and organizational performance outcomes. Moreover, few studies explicitly apply established organizational theories—such as Person–Environment Fit—to interrogate how recruitment processes themselves shape perceptions of fit and competence.

This gap mirrors earlier stages of research in service quality, job satisfaction, and sustainability, where progress accelerated only when scholars shifted focus from individual behavior to system design (Raza et al., 2020; Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025). Addressing neurodivergent exclusion in recruitment requires a similar paradigmatic shift.

Accordingly, the next section advances a theoretical foundation grounded in Person–Environment Fit, reframed to account for neurodiversity and recruitment design. This framework provides the conceptual bridge necessary to move from diagnosis of exclusion toward the development of a neuro-inclusive recruitment model.

3. Theoretical Framework: Reframing Person–Environment Fit for Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment

3.1 Person–Environment Fit: Origins and Core Assumptions

Person–Environment Fit (P–E Fit) theory is a foundational framework in organizational psychology, proposing that individual attitudes, behaviors, and performance outcomes are shaped by the degree of alignment between personal characteristics and environmental demands (Kristof-Brown et al., 2005). Fit has traditionally been conceptualized across multiple dimensions, including person–job (P–J), person–organization (P–O), person–group (P–G), and person–supervisor (P–S) fit. Within recruitment research, these dimensions are operationalized through assessments intended to predict future performance, satisfaction, and retention.

At its core, P–E Fit rests on two key assumptions. First, it assumes that both individuals and environments possess relatively stable attributes that can be measured and compared. Second, it implicitly treats environments as normatively appropriate benchmarks, against which individuals are evaluated. When fit is low, the dominant interpretation—particularly in recruitment contexts—is that the individual lacks suitability.

While P–E Fit has generated substantial empirical insight, this interpretation has been increasingly challenged. Research on job satisfaction, emotional exhaustion, and engagement demonstrates that misfit frequently arises from poorly designed roles, unclear expectations, and misaligned evaluation systems rather than individual inadequacy (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri & Hamed, 2018; Dahri et al., 2019). These findings suggest that fit is not merely a diagnostic tool but a design-sensitive construct.

This critique is especially salient when applied to neurodiversity, where recruitment environments are rarely designed with cognitive variability in mind.

3.2 Neurodiversity and the Limits of Traditional Fit Conceptualizations

Traditional applications of P–E Fit assume a relatively homogeneous cognitive baseline. Fit assessments often rely on proxies such as interview performance, personality inventories, and behavioral simulations that privilege neurotypical modes of communication and interaction. As a result, neurodivergent candidates are frequently evaluated against criteria that are orthogonal—or even antagonistic—to their actual job-relevant strengths.

For example, P–O Fit is commonly assessed through perceived value congruence and cultural alignment. Yet organizational values are often inferred through informal interactional cues rather than explicit principles (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). Neurodivergent candidates, who may communicate more directly, interpret language literally, or exhibit atypical social behaviors, are thus at risk of being misclassified as culturally misaligned despite strong task competence.

Similarly, P–J Fit assessments frequently emphasize behavioral flexibility, multitasking, and social adaptability—traits that may be less salient for roles requiring analytical depth, precision, or sustained focus. This misalignment parallels findings in service quality and usability research, where systems optimized for "average users" systematically marginalize those with different cognitive processing styles (Raza et al., 2020; Dahri et al., 2019).

In this sense, traditional P–E Fit models conflate difference with deficiency, reproducing structural exclusion under the guise of objectivity.

3.3 Recruitment as a Fit-Producing System

A critical contribution of this paper is the reconceptualization of recruitment not as a passive evaluator of fit but as an active producer of fit perceptions. Recruitment systems determine which attributes are visible, legible, and valued. They shape how candidates can express competence and how evaluators interpret that expression.

This perspective aligns with organizational research demonstrating that evaluative systems significantly influence outcomes in domains ranging from employee engagement to sustainability performance (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025). In recruitment, the implications are profound: fit is not discovered; it is constructed.

Structured interviews, for instance, are often justified on the grounds of reliability and predictive validity. However, their effectiveness depends on the alignment between assessment format and role requirements. When interviews prioritize social fluency over task demonstration, they systematically bias fit judgments against neurodivergent candidates. This dynamic mirrors findings in digital recruitment and e-HRM research, where system design strongly mediates talent attraction and selection outcomes (Muhammad et al., 2022).

Moreover, algorithmic screening tools increasingly embedded in recruitment pipelines risk codifying historical bias. If training data reflect past hiring decisions shaped by neurotypical norms, automated systems will reproduce those patterns at scale. This concern echoes broader warnings in AI and usability research emphasizing the ethical risks of technology deployed without inclusive design principles (Dahri et al., 2019; Dahri & Al-Athwari, 2019).

3.4 Toward a Neuro-Inclusive Interpretation of Fit

To address these limitations, this paper proposes a neuro-inclusive reinterpretation of P–E Fit, grounded in three core propositions.

Proposition 1: Fit is relational, not individual.

Misfit should be understood as a relationship between individual characteristics and environmental design rather than as an attribute of the individual alone. This perspective aligns with evidence from job satisfaction and burnout research, where stress and disengagement emerge from systemic misalignment rather than personal weakness (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2020).

Proposition 2: Environments are mutable and ethically accountable.

Recruitment environments are not fixed constraints but design choices. Organizations bear ethical responsibility for the inclusionary or exclusionary consequences of these choices. This argument resonates with sustainability and governance research emphasizing organizational accountability for social outcomes (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025).

Proposition 3: Multiple forms of fit can coexist.

Rather than seeking a singular ideal candidate, neuro-inclusive recruitment recognizes that different cognitive profiles may achieve fit through different pathways. For example, a candidate who performs poorly in unstructured interviews may excel in task-based simulations. Recognizing plural forms of fit enhances both fairness and predictive validity.

This reinterpretation reframes recruitment as a site of organizational learning, where feedback from excluded candidates can inform system redesign rather than be dismissed as individual failure.

3.5 Integrating Neurodiversity with Universal Design for Work

The neuro-inclusive reinterpretation of P–E Fit aligns closely with the principles of Universal Design for Work (UDW), which advocate for systems that accommodate human variability by default rather than through retroactive accommodation. Universal design has been widely applied in architecture and digital accessibility, but its application to HRM and recruitment remains limited.

Research on service quality and user satisfaction demonstrates that systems designed for inclusivity often outperform narrowly optimized systems in terms of satisfaction, loyalty, and trust (Raza et al., 2020). Similarly, organizational studies show that clarity, transparency, and flexibility enhance engagement across diverse employee populations (Brohi et al., 2018; Dahri et al., 2019).

In recruitment, UDW implies:

1. Multiple assessment formats (e.g., work samples, simulations, structured written responses)
2. Explicit communication of expectations and evaluation criteria
3. Sensory-conscious and predictable environments
4. Reduced reliance on informal social signaling

These design principles do not lower standards; rather, they increase the validity of fit assessments by isolating job-relevant capability from irrelevant cognitive noise.

3.6 Theoretical Integration with Organizational Outcomes

Reframing P–E Fit for neurodiversity has implications beyond recruitment. Fit perceptions influence downstream outcomes such as job satisfaction, engagement, citizenship behavior, and turnover. Extensive research demonstrates that when employees perceive alignment between their strengths and organizational systems, they exhibit higher engagement and lower emotional exhaustion (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2019).

Conversely, persistent misfit—particularly when attributed to individual deficiency—contributes to burnout, disengagement, and attrition. This dynamic has been well documented in healthcare, service, and knowledge-intensive sectors (Dahri & Hamed, 2018; Dahri et al., 2020). Neurodivergent employees are especially vulnerable to these outcomes when inclusion is superficial rather than systemic.

Thus, neuro-inclusive recruitment is not merely an entry-point intervention but a foundation for sustainable organizational performance. It aligns with strategic HRM perspectives emphasizing long-term capability development, ethical governance, and resilience (Rehman et al., 2023; Dahri et al., 2025).

4. An Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model

4.1 Rationale for an Integrated Model

The preceding section reframed Person–Environment Fit (P–E Fit) as a relational and design-sensitive construct, revealing recruitment as a system that actively produces inclusion or exclusion. Building on this theoretical repositioning, this section advances an Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model (INIRM) that operationalizes neurodiversity principles across the recruitment lifecycle.

Existing diversity initiatives often fail because they treat neurodiversity as an accommodation issue rather than a structural design challenge. Accommodations are typically reactive, individualized, and stigmatizing, reinforcing the medical model of difference (Austin & Pisano, 2017). In contrast, the proposed model adopts a preventive and universal design logic, embedding inclusion into recruitment architecture itself.

The INIRM is structured around three interdependent domains:

1. Alternative Capability-Based Assessment
2. Environmentally Inclusive Recruitment Design
3. Neuro-Inclusive Evaluator and Leadership Capability

Together, these domains shift recruitment from a charisma-centric, norm-driven process to a capability-valid, ethically grounded, and performance-oriented system.

4.2 Domain I: Alternative Capability-Based Assessment

4.2.1 Limitations of Traditional Assessment Methods

Conventional recruitment assessments—particularly unstructured and semi-structured interviews—remain dominant despite well-documented validity limitations. These methods disproportionately reward verbal fluency, social reciprocity, eye contact, and rapid response generation (Levashina et al., 2014). Such attributes are weak predictors of job performance in many roles yet serve as powerful gatekeeping mechanisms.

Research on e-recruitment and digital hiring platforms demonstrates that standardized systems amplify these biases by embedding them into algorithmic filters and scoring rubrics (Muhammad et al., 2022). Neurodivergent candidates may be screened out before demonstrating task-relevant competence, reinforcing exclusion at scale.

4.2.2 Work Samples and Job Simulations

The INIRM prioritizes work samples, job simulations, and task trials as primary assessment tools. Meta-analytic evidence consistently shows that work samples have higher predictive validity for job performance than interviews or personality tests (Schmidt et al., 2016).

From a neuro-inclusion perspective, work samples:

1. Reduce reliance on social signaling
2. Allow asynchronous performance
3. Emphasize demonstrated capability over impression management

For example, coding challenges, data analysis tasks, design prototypes, or scenario-based problem-solving exercises allow candidates to engage through their strengths. This approach aligns with findings in service quality and usability research, where task-based evaluation produces more accurate assessments of user competence and satisfaction (Raza et al., 2020).

4.2.3 Structured Choice Architecture

Rather than mandating a single assessment format, the INIRM introduces structured choice architecture, allowing candidates to select from equivalent assessment modalities (e.g., oral presentation vs. written analysis). Importantly, all options are mapped to the same competency framework to preserve fairness and comparability.

This design reflects evidence from engagement and burnout studies indicating that autonomy moderates stress responses and enhances performance (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2020). Choice does not dilute standards; it enhances construct validity by reducing irrelevant variance.

4.3 Domain II: Environmentally Inclusive Recruitment Design

4.3.1 Sensory and Cognitive Load as Hidden Barriers

Recruitment environments—both physical and virtual—are often saturated with unexamined sensory and cognitive demands. Bright lighting, background noise, crowded waiting areas, time pressure, and ambiguous instructions can trigger sensory overload and anxiety, particularly for autistic and ADHD candidates.

Research on workplace stress and emotional exhaustion highlights the cumulative impact of environmental strain on performance and well-being (Dahri & Hamed, 2018). In recruitment contexts, these stressors distort performance assessments, leading evaluators to misattribute stress responses to incompetence.

4.3.2 Predictability and Transparency

The INIRM emphasizes predictability as an inclusion mechanism**.** Candidates are provided with:

1. Clear timelines
2. Explicit evaluation criteria
3. Sample questions or task previews
4. Transparent communication about process stages

This approach reduces uncertainty-driven anxiety and aligns with evidence that role clarity enhances satisfaction and engagement (Brohi et al., 2018). Transparency also strengthens organizational trust, an outcome linked to lower turnover intentions and stronger employer branding (Memon et al., 2022).

4.3.3 Sensory-Conscious Design Principles

Environmentally inclusive recruitment adopts sensory-conscious design principles derived from universal design and usability research:

1. Quiet interview spaces or noise-canceling options
2. Flexible lighting
3. Reduced visual clutter in digital interfaces
4. Asynchronous assessment windows

Notably, these adjustments benefit neurotypical candidates as well, echoing findings in digital health and mobile usability research that inclusive design improves overall user satisfaction (Dahri et al., 2019).

4.4 Domain III: Neuro-Inclusive Evaluator and Leadership Capability

4.4.1 The Evaluator as a Source of Bias

Even the most inclusive systems fail if evaluators interpret difference through deficit-based lenses. Similarity bias, halo effects, and professionalism norms remain deeply entrenched in managerial cognition (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016). Without targeted intervention, evaluators may penalize atypical communication styles despite formal inclusion policies.

Research on leadership and emotional intelligence demonstrates that awareness and self-regulation significantly moderate biased judgment and stress reactions (Goleman, 1998; Dahri et al., 2019).

4.4.2 Neuro-Inclusive Leadership Training

The INIRM incorporates mandatory neuro-inclusive training for recruiters, hiring managers, and panel members**,** focusing on:

1. Understanding neurodiversity as cognitive variation

2. Distinguishing job-relevant behaviors from social norms
3. Interpreting alternative communication styles accurately
4. Providing clear, non-ambiguous feedback

This training reframes leadership competence as adaptive sensemaking, consistent with research on resonant leadership and emotional intelligence as buffers against burnout and misjudgment (Dahri et al., 2020).

4.4.3 Redefining Performance Signals

A critical intervention involves redefining what constitutes "professionalism" and "potential." Rather than equating confidence with competence or sociability with leadership, evaluators are trained to:

1. Anchor judgments in evidence
2. Use behaviorally anchored rating scales
3. Document decisions transparently

This approach aligns with governance and ethics research emphasizing accountability and traceability in decision-making systems (Rehman et al., 2023).

4.5 System-Level Integration and Feedback Loops

4.5.1 Recruitment as Organizational Learning

The INIRM positions recruitment as a **learning system** rather than a one-off screening mechanism. Data on candidate drop-off points, assessment performance variance, and feedback are systematically analyzed to identify structural exclusion patterns.

This mirrors continuous improvement logic found in sustainability and quality management research, where feedback loops drive long-term performance gains (Memon et al., 2022).

4.5.2 Alignment with Downstream HR Systems

Neuro-inclusive recruitment must align with onboarding, performance management, and career development systems. Misalignment risks tokenism, where inclusion at entry is undermined by exclusionary practices post-hire.

Research on high-performance work systems demonstrates that coherence across HR practices amplifies positive outcomes (Rehman et al., 2023). Thus, the INIRM serves as a foundational architecture rather than an isolated intervention.

4.6 Ethical and Strategic Implications

Beyond fairness, the INIRM delivers strategic value. Cognitive diversity enhances problem-solving, innovation, and resilience—capabilities increasingly critical in volatile environments. Empirical research consistently links inclusive climates with higher engagement and lower turnover (Ahmed et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2019).

Ethically, the model aligns recruitment with principles of justice, dignity, and equal opportunity. By shifting from accommodation to design, organizations move toward Universal Design for Work**,** where inclusion becomes a default feature rather than an exception.

4.7 Conceptual Model Overview

Figure 1 depicts the Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model, illustrating:

a) The three core domains
b) Their interaction with recruitment stages
c) Feedback loops into organizational learning and performance outcomes



Inclusion arises from system alignment, not isolated actions.

Figure 1 – Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model (INIRM)

The model visually reinforces the argument that inclusion emerges from systemic coherence, not isolated goodwill.

5. Ethical and Business Implications of Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment

5.1 Reframing Neuro-Inclusion as an Ethical Imperative

Neuro-inclusive recruitment is frequently justified through a narrow compliance lens—meeting legal accommodation requirements or signaling corporate social responsibility. However, such framing underestimates the ethical depth of exclusion embedded in conventional hiring systems. When recruitment processes systematically privilege neurotypical norms, they violate foundational principles of procedural justice, distributive fairness, and respect for human dignity.

Ethical management literature emphasizes that fairness is not merely about equal treatment but about equitable access to opportunity (Rawls, 1971). Treating all candidates identically within a biased system reproduces injustice rather than resolving it. Neuro-inclusive recruitment, therefore, represents a shift from formal equality to substantive fairness, aligning organizational practices with ethical governance principles articulated in contemporary management scholarship (Mehboob et al., 2019).

Moreover, research on workplace incivility and emotional exhaustion demonstrates that ethical blind spots in organizational systems generate downstream harm, including disengagement, burnout, and turnover (Dahri & Hamed, 2018; Dahri et al., 2020). Exclusion at entry not only denies opportunity but signals to society which cognitive profiles are deemed legitimate contributors, reinforcing stigma beyond organizational boundaries.

5.2 From Compliance to Moral Legitimacy

Legitimacy theory posits that organizations survive not only through efficiency but through alignment with societal values (Suchman, 1995). As awareness of neurodiversity grows, stakeholders—including job seekers, investors, regulators, and consumers—are increasingly attentive to how firms operationalize inclusion. Tokenistic diversity statements without structural reform risk legitimacy erosion.

Neuro-inclusive recruitment enhances moral legitimacy by demonstrating congruence between stated values and operational practices. Unlike symbolic diversity initiatives, recruitment redesign directly affects life chances, making it one of the most ethically consequential organizational systems.

This logic parallels findings in sustainability and environmental governance research, where substantive integration of ethical principles—rather than superficial

compliance—drives stakeholder trust and long-term performance (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2025).

5.3 The Business Case: Beyond the "Diversity Dividend" Narrative

5.3.1 Cognitive Diversity and Innovation

The most cited business argument for neurodiversity concerns innovation. Cognitive diversity enhances problem-solving by introducing non-redundant perspectives, heuristics, and pattern-recognition styles. Neurodivergent individuals often exhibit strengths in systemizing, attention to detail, and sustained focus—capabilities critical in data analytics, engineering, cybersecurity, research, and quality assurance roles.

However, innovation gains materialize only when recruitment systems allow these capabilities to surface. Charisma-centric hiring suppresses precisely the forms of cognition that fuel exploratory thinking. This insight aligns with research on knowledge-based firms, which demonstrates that heterogeneous cognitive capital drives organizational learning and adaptability (Rehman et al., 2023).

5.3.2 Performance Accuracy and Reduced Hiring Error

Traditional interviews are not only exclusionary but inefficient. Bias-driven misjudgments increase false negatives (rejecting capable candidates) and false positives (hiring socially adept but underperforming individuals). These errors inflate recruitment costs and undermine performance.

Capability-based assessment—central to the Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model (INIRM)— improves selection validity, reducing costly turnover and performance mismatches. Evidence from service quality and human capital research shows that alignment between capability assessment and role requirements enhances satisfaction, engagement, and retention (Raza et al., 2020; Muhammad et al., 2022).

5.3.3 Retention, Engagement, and Psychological Safety

Recruitment sets the psychological contract. When individuals enter organizations through inclusive systems, they experience higher perceptions of fairness and belonging. These perceptions strengthen engagement and reduce emotional exhaustion—outcomes repeatedly linked to performance and retention in empirical studies (Ahmed et al., 2017; Awang et al., 2017).

Conversely, exclusionary recruitment contributes to early disengagement, particularly for neurodivergent employees who enter environments misaligned with their needs. This dynamic mirrors findings in nursing and healthcare research, where misfit between system design and human capacity accelerates burnout (Dahri et al., 2019).

5.4 Employer Branding and Talent Market Signaling

In tight labor markets, recruitment practices function as signals of organizational values. Neuro-inclusive recruitment sends a credible signal of fairness, adaptability, and future-oriented leadership. Importantly, such signaling attracts not only neurodivergent candidates but neurotypical candidates who value ethical and flexible workplaces.

Research on employer branding suggests that authenticity—alignment between internal practices and external messaging—is critical for talent attraction (Rizvi et al., 2020). Organizations that publicly commit to inclusion but maintain exclusionary hiring processes face reputational risk, particularly in digitally transparent labor markets.

Neuro-inclusive recruitment thus enhances brand trust, reinforcing findings from marketing and service research that trust emerges from consistent, experience-based interactions rather than promotional claims (Raza et al., 2020).

5.5 Risk Management, Governance, and Accountability

From a governance perspective, exclusionary recruitment represents an unrecognized organizational risk. Biased systems expose firms to:

1. Legal challenges
2. Reputational damage
3. Loss of scarce talent
4. Strategic rigidity

Enterprise risk management research emphasizes the importance of identifying non-financial risks embedded in organizational processes (Hameed et al., 2020). Neuro-inclusive recruitment mitigates these risks by enhancing transparency, documentation, and decision traceability.

Furthermore, as AI-driven recruitment tools proliferate, ethical scrutiny intensifies. Algorithms trained on biased historical data risk amplifying exclusion under the guise of objectivity. A neuro-inclusive framework provides governance guardrails, ensuring that technology augments rather than automates bias—consistent with research advocating

augmented intelligence over replacement (Dahri et al., 2025).

5.6 Inclusion as Sustainable Competitive Advantage

Resource-Based View (RBV) theory argues that sustainable competitive advantage arises from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable. Neuro-inclusive recruitment contributes to all four dimensions by enabling access to underutilized talent pools and embedding inclusion into organizational routines.

Unlike isolated diversity initiatives, recruitment architecture is difficult to imitate because it involves:

1. Cultural norms
2. Leadership cognition
3. Process design
4. Learning systems

This mirrors findings in sustainability and SME research, where incremental, system-level integration of ethical practices generates durable performance advantages (Dahri et al., 2025).

5.7 Societal Spillovers and Institutional Impact

Organizations do not operate in isolation. Recruitment practices shape labor market norms and influence broader societal inclusion. By normalizing neuro-inclusive design, firms contribute to reducing unemployment and underemployment among neurodivergent populations—outcomes with significant social and economic implications.

This institutional perspective aligns with research on governance, education, and social responsibility, which emphasizes the role of organizations as intermediaries between individuals and societal opportunity structures (Ali et al., 2025).

5.8 Ethical Leadership and the Future of Work

Ultimately, neuro-inclusive recruitment is a leadership issue. It requires leaders willing to question inherited norms, tolerate ambiguity, and redesign systems around human variability rather than convenience. Emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and reflexivity—qualities linked to sustainable leadership— are central to this transformation (Goleman, 1998; Dahri et al., 2020).

As work becomes increasingly knowledge-intensive, digitally mediated, and cognitively demanding, exclusion based on narrow behavioral norms becomes strategically irrational. Neuro-inclusive recruitment anticipates the future of work by aligning organizational systems with the full spectrum of human capability.

6. Managerial Implications and Implementation Guidelines

6.1 Introduction

The preceding sections established the theoretical foundation, structural model, and ethical-business case for neuro-inclusive recruitment. While conceptual clarity is essential, practical implementation remains the critical bottleneck. Translating neuro-inclusive principles into actionable strategies requires alignment across recruitment design, leadership capabilities, HR systems, and organizational culture.

This section provides a managerial roadmap for operationalizing the Integrated Neuro-Inclusive Recruitment Model (INIRM) in contemporary organizations. The discussion draws on recent research in human capital management, organizational behavior, and technology-mediated recruitment to ensure applicability across industries and firm sizes (Muhammad et al., 2022; Rehman et al., 2023; Raza et al., 2020).

6.2 Organizational Readiness and Cultural Alignment

6.2.1 Assessing Organizational Readiness

Implementation begins with a candid assessment of organizational readiness for neuro-inclusion. Key dimensions include:

1. **Leadership Awareness and Commitment** – Leaders must recognize neurodiversity as a strategic and ethical priority, not merely a compliance issue. Empirical studies indicate that top management commitment positively influences inclusion outcomes, including employee engagement, innovation, and retention (Memon et al., 2022; Dahri et al., 2020).
2. **Existing Recruitment Architecture** – Assessing current recruitment processes, tools, and evaluation criteria reveals structural barriers such as overreliance on interviews or subjective "culture fit" judgments (Levashina et al., 2014; Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).
3. **Technological Infrastructure** – Organizations leveraging AI-driven applicant tracking systems must ensure algorithmic neutrality and transparency. Without intervention, biased historical data can systematically exclude neurodivergent candidates (Dahri et al., 2025).

6.2.2 Building an Inclusive Culture

Culture shapes behaviors and interpretations. Organizations aiming for neuro-inclusion should:

1. Promote psychological safety, encouraging employees to voice ideas without fear of judgment (Edmondson, 2018).
2. Institutionalize language sensitivity, avoiding jargon or culturally coded expressions that disadvantage neurodivergent individuals (Awang et al., 2017).
3. Embed flexibility in schedules, assessment formats, and work arrangements to accommodate diverse cognitive and sensory needs (Ahmed et al., 2017).

Cultural alignment ensures that inclusion is sustained rather than episodic, reinforcing the ethical and strategic rationale.

6.3 Recruitment Process Redesign

6.3.1 Competency Mapping and Role Design

A neuro-inclusive process begins with precise competency mapping, focusing on job-relevant skills rather than social conformity. Role descriptions should:

1. Define essential tasks clearly
2. Differentiate between technical competencies and social preferences
3. Identify flexibility in task execution methods

Research indicates that clear role specifications reduce ambiguity, improve performance, and mitigate stress, particularly for neurodivergent employees (Brohi et al., 2018; Dahri & Hamed, 2018).

6.3.2 Alternative Assessment Modalities

INIRM recommends multi-modal assessment frameworks, including:

1. **Work Samples and Task Simulations**: High predictive validity tools for skill assessment (Schmidt et al., 2016; Raza et al., 2020).
2. **Asynchronous Testing Options**: Reduces sensory and temporal pressure, allowing candidates to perform optimally.
3. **Structured Choice Architecture**: Candidates select from equivalent assessment options to leverage strengths (Muhammad et al., 2022).

Managerial guidance includes standardization of scoring rubrics to ensure fairness across modalities and continuous monitoring for bias.

6.3.3 Interview Modifications

When interviews are necessary, managers should:

1. Conduct panel interviews with trained evaluators to reduce individual bias (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).
2. Offer quiet, distraction-free environments or digital alternatives.
3. Use behaviorally anchored rating scales focusing on task-relevant competencies (Levashina et al., 2014).

This reduces subjective judgment and aligns hiring decisions with organizational objectives rather than social conformity.

6.4 Leadership and Evaluator Training

6.4.1 Neuro-Inclusive Leadership Competencies

Effective implementation requires leaders capable of recognizing and leveraging cognitive diversity. Essential competencies include:

1. **Emotional Intelligence (EI)**: Enhances empathy, reduces bias, and moderates stress responses (Goleman, 1998; Dahri et al., 2020).
2. **Adaptive Decision-Making**: Ability to interpret atypical behaviors as capabilities rather than deficits (Austin & Pisano, 2017).
3. **Ethical Reasoning**: Anchoring decisions in fairness, transparency, and inclusivity (Mehboob et al., 2019).

Leadership development programs should incorporate case-based learning, simulation exercises, and reflective coaching to cultivate these skills.

6.4.2 Evaluator Bias Mitigation

Training should explicitly address cognitive and social biases, including:

1. **Similarity Bias**: Preference for candidates resembling evaluators in communication style or background.
2. **Halo Effect**: Overrating superficial attributes like charisma at the expense of performance indicators.
3. **Professionalism Norms**: Reassessing culturally coded expectations that disadvantage neurodivergent candidates (Chatman & O'Reilly, 2016).

Evidence-based strategies include debiasing workshops, structured evaluation checklists, and feedback calibration sessions (Rehman et al., 2023).

6.5 Technology-Enabled Implementation

6.5.1 AI and Digital Tools

Digital tools can enhance neuro-inclusive recruitment if designed ethically:

1. **Bias-Audited Algorithms**: Machine learning systems must be validated against diverse candidate performance data to avoid exclusionary patterns (Dahri et al., 2025).
2. **Digital Assessment Platforms**: Enable asynchronous work sample submissions, simulations, and automated scoring.
3. **Analytics Dashboards**: Track candidate performance variance, drop-off points, and evaluator patterns to

inform continuous improvement (Muhammad et al., 2022).

6.5.2 Gamification and Engagement

Gamified assessments can engage candidates while capturing authentic performance data. Studies in digital engagement show that structured gamification improves candidate experience, reduces anxiety, and reveals cognitive strengths often masked in traditional assessments (Dahri et al., 2019; Rizvi et al., 2020).

6.6 Policy and Governance Considerations

6.6.1 Documentation and Accountability

Neuro-inclusive recruitment should be codified in formal policies, including:

1. Clear inclusion standards
2. Evaluation criteria templates
3. Audit trails for decision-making

This aligns with enterprise risk management and corporate governance research emphasizing traceability, transparency, and accountability (Hameed et al., 2020; Rehman et al., 2023).

6.6.2 Alignment with Broader HR Practices

Recruitment cannot operate in isolation. Implementation requires integration with onboarding, career development, and performance evaluation systems. Misalignment risks tokenism, where inclusion at entry is undermined by exclusionary practices post-hire (Awang et al., 2017; Dahri et al., 2020).

6.7 Monitoring, Evaluation, and Continuous Improvement

6.7.1 Key Metrics

Organizations should monitor inclusion and effectiveness using metrics such as:

1. Candidate diversity and success rates across assessment modalities
2. Time-to-hire and attrition rates for neurodivergent employees
3. Employee engagement, satisfaction, and psychological safety scores

6.7.2 Feedback Loops

Regular feedback from candidates, evaluators, and managers **enables** iterative refinement of the recruitment process. Data-driven adjustments ensure that inclusion evolves with organizational needs and workforce trends (Raza et al., 2020; Muhammad et al., 2022).

6.8 Strategic Roadmap for Implementation

1. **Organizational Assessment** – Evaluate readiness, culture, and technological infrastructure.
2. **Policy Development** – Codify neuro-inclusive recruitment standards.
3. **Competency and Role Mapping** – Identify essential, flexible, and discretionary task requirements.
4. **Assessment Redesign** – Incorporate work samples, simulations, gamified tools, and asynchronous options.
5. **Leadership and Evaluator Training** – Build EI, bias awareness, and adaptive decision-making capacity.
6. **Technology Integration** – Implement bias-audited ATS and analytics dashboards.
7. **Pilot Programs** – Test and refine before full-scale rollout.
8. **Continuous Monitoring** – Track KPIs and incorporate feedback loops for improvement.

This roadmap aligns ethical imperatives with operational efficiency, ensuring neuro-inclusion is both principled and strategic.

IEER Institute for Excellence in Education & Research

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S., Khan, D. S., & Mehmood, A. S. (2023). Let them play: A systematic review investigating the benefits of free play in emotional development of children. Academy of Education and Social Sciences Review, 3(4), 509-520.

Ahmed, U., Shah, M. H., Siddiqui, B. A., Shah, S. A., Dahri, A. S., & Qureshi, M. A. (2017). Troubling job demands at work: Examining the deleterious impact of workload and emotional demands on work engagement. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 7*(8), 96–112. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v7-i8/3219

Ali, U. A., Shamim, M. A., & Dahri, A. S. (2025). Governance, education, and anti-corruption synergies: Mapping the foundations of global political stability. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review, 4*(5), 350–378.

Arif, W., Ahmed, S., Saeed, M., & Khan, D. S. (2025). Language as Dual Capital: Linguistic Predictors of Inclusion in Pakistani Business Context. *International Journal of Emerging Business and Economic Trends*, *4*(1), 93-105.

Armstrong, T. (2010). *Neurodiversity: Discovering the extraordinary gifts of autism, ADHD, dyslexia, and other brain differences*. Da Capo Press.

Austin, R. D., & Pisano, G. P. (2017). Neurodiversity as a competitive advantage. *Harvard Business Review, 95*(3), 96–103.

Awang, Z., Ahmed, U., Hoque, A., Siddiqui, B. A., Dahri, A. S., & Muda, H. (2017). The mediating role of meaningful work in the relationship between career growth opportunities and work engagement. *International Academic Conference on Business and Economics (IACBE)*, 1–15.

Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1394–1411.

Brohi, N. A., Abdullah, M. M. B., Khan, A. M., Dahri, A. S., Ali, R., & Markhand, K. H. (2018). Communication quality, job clarity, supervisor support and job satisfaction among nurses in Pakistan: The moderating influence of fairness perception. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8*(6), 1–17.

Brohi, N. A., Abdullah, M. M. B., Khan, A. M., Dahri, A. S., Ali, R., & Markhand, K. H. (2018). Communication quality, job clarity, supervisor support and job satisfaction among nurses in Pakistan: The moderating influence of fairness perception. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8*(6), 1–17.

Chatman, J. A., & O'Reilly, C. A. (2016). Paradigm lost: Reinvigorating the study of organizational culture. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 36*, 199–224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2016.11.004

Chhajro, M. A., Arshad, A., Luhana, K., Wagan, A., Muneed, M., & Umrani, A. I. (2022). Electronic Ledger Management: A mobile-enabled sentiment reviews analysis of Urdu Language. *J. Tianjin Univ. Sci. Technolo*, *55*(6).

Dahri, A. S., & Hamed, K. (2018). Effect of workplace incivility on job satisfaction among nurses: Mediating role of emotional exhaustion. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research, 4*(2), 80–90. https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.42.80.90

Dahri, A. S., Al-Athwari, A., & Hussain, A. (2019). Usability evaluation of mobile health application from AI perspective in rural areas of Pakistan. *International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (iJIM), 13*(11), 213–225. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v13i11.11527

Dahri, A. S., Hameed, W. U., Nawaz, M., Sami, A., & Shah, S. K. B. (2019). Nurses' job satisfaction is burned out by their leaders and stress. *Journal of Managerial Sciences, 13*(2), 158–171.

Dahri, A. S., Qureshi, M. A., & Mallah, A. G. (2020). The negative effect of incivility on job satisfaction through emotional exhaustion moderated by resonant leadership. *3C Empresa: Investigación y Pensamiento Crítico*, *9*(4), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.17993/3cemp.2020.090444.1-20

Dahri, A. S., Qureshi, M. A., & Mallah, A. G. (2020). The negative effect of incivility on job satisfaction through emotional exhaustion moderated by resonant leadership. *3C Empresa*, *9*(4), 55–71.

Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Hameed, W. U., Waseem, M., Sabir, S. A., & Dahri, A. S. (2020). Effect of enterprise risk management system and implementation problem on financial performance: An empirical evidence from Malaysian listed firms. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(1), 33–47.

Hedley, D., Uljarević, M., Foley, K. R., Richdale, A., & Trollor, J. (2017). Risk and protective factors underlying depression and suicidal ideation in autism spectrum disorder. *Depression and Anxiety*, *35*(7), 648–657.

Husain, I., Qureshi, A. A., & Hussain, N. (2019). *The economy of modern Sindh: opportunities lost and lessons for the future*. Oxford University Press.

Kakepoto, I., Said, H., Habil, H., Umrani, A. I., & Memon, I. A. (2013). Analyzing oral communication apprehension prevailing among engineers in engineering workplace of Pakistan. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, *4*(3), 255-261.

Kristof-Brown, A. L., Zimmerman, R. D., & Johnson, E. C. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person–job, person–organization, person–group, and person–supervisor fit. *Personnel Psychology*, *58*(2), 281–342.

Kumar, K., Wagan, A. A., Khuhro, M. A., Umrani, A., Chhajro, A., Hafeez, A., & Laghari, A. A. (2020). Texture based FACE recognition using GLCM and LBP schemes. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, *13*(13), 1401-1411.

Levashina, J., Hartwell, C. J., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2014). The structured employment interview: Narrative and quantitative review of the research literature. *Personnel Psychology*, *67*(1), 241–293. https://doi.org/10.1111/peps.12052

Lorenz, T., & Heinitz, K. (2016). Aspergers—Different, not less: Occupational strengths and job interests of individuals with Asperger's syndrome. *PLoS ONE*, *11*(6), e0157400.

Mehboob, F., Dahri, A. S., Kazouz, H., Qureshi, M. A., & Qureshi, Z. F. (2019). Corporate governance reforms review: Proactively averting the next financial crisis. *Journal of Corporate Governance Research*, *14*(3), 45–62.

Memon, S. B., Rasli, A., Dahri, A. S., & Abas, I. H. (2022). Importance of top management commitment to organizational citizenship behaviour towards the environment, green training and environmental performance in Pakistani industries. *Sustainability*, *14*(17), 11059. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141711059

Muhammad, G., Siddique, M., & Dahri, A. S. (2022). Innovative e-recruitment strategies as a tool for human capital management effectiveness: A mediating role of talent attraction. *Middle East Journal of Management*, *9*(5), 504–523. https://doi.org/10.1504/MEJM.2022.125489

Pirzada, A. M., Mahar, F., Umrani, A. I., Wagan, A. A., Qureshi, M. A., Khan, M. M., & Samoon, N. A. (2021). Impact of Occupational Health & Safety Management on Risk Existing At Construction Sites of Karachi. *International Journal*, *10*(2).

Rafique, M. O., Abdullah, A. S. C., & Fatoni, M. A. W. (2023). Analysis of Ḥiyal (Legal Stratagems) Cases in Islamic Financial Law. Russian Law Journal, 11(2), 299-308. https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i2.666

Rafique, M. O., Abdullah, A. S. C., Fatoni, M. A. W., & Lubis, A. (2023). Hiyal (Legal Stratagems) in Islamic Finance: Systematic Literature Review. International Journal of Professional Business Review, 8(6), 9. https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i6.1752

Rafique, M. O., Hureri, M. A., & Riaz, M. (2025). *Green banking: Performance of three Pakistani Islamic banks in environmental projects*. *Southern Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(1). Retrieved from https://sjss.isp.edu.pk/index.php/about/article/view/55/31

Rafique, M. O., Saeed, A., Anis, M., Mahboob, F., Ghaffar, A., & Jalbani, A. A. (2022). Isomorphic pressures on Shari'ah board members in Islamic banks (to apply the legal stratagems in IF products). *Journal of Xidian University, 16*(5), 489–502. https://doi.org/10.37896/jxu16.5/049

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Raza, S. A., Umer, A., Qureshi, M. A., & Dahri, A. S. (2020). Internet banking service quality, e-customer satisfaction and loyalty: The modified e-SERVQUAL model. *The TQM Journal, 32*(6), 1443–1466.

Rehman, J., Hawryszkiewycz, I., Sohaib, O., Namisango, F., & Dahri, A. S. (2023). Towards the knowledge-smart professional service firms: How high-performance work systems support the transformation. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 14*(4), 3640–3670.

Rivera, L. A. (2012). Hiring as cultural matching: The case of elite professional service firms. *American Sociological Review, 77*(6), 999–1022.

Schmidt, F. L., Oh, I. S., & Shaffer, J. A. (2016). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 100 years of research findings. *Working Paper*. University of Iowa.

Shaikh, Z. A., Umrani, A. I., Jumani, A. K., & Laghari, A. A. (2019). Technology enhanced learning: a digital timeline learning system for higher educational institutes. *International Journal of Computer Science and Network Security, 19*(10), 1-5.

Shakespeare, T. (2014). *Disability rights and wrongs revisited*. Routledge.

Singer, J. (1999). Why can't you be normal for once in your life? Disability discourse and the emergence of neurodiversity.

Smolo, E., & Rafique, M.O. (Eds.). (2025). Islamic Green Finance: Towards Ethical and Environmentally Responsible Investing (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003540403

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Umrani, A. I., Johl, S. K., & Ibrahim, M. Y. (2015). Corporate governance practices and problems faced by SMEs in Malaysia. *Global Business & Management Research*, 7(2).

IEER
Institute for Excellence in Education & Research