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**Introduction**

This review study aims to act as a critical platform to unveil ‘hidden’ aspects of organisational reality, challenge individual abilities to informal personal and professional practices, enhance personal learning and support the development of positive working environment for all employees. We acknowledge that it is difficult to review all aspects of managing diversity and equality in the workplace. The past decade or so has witnessed of a battle to address diversity and equality needs in the workplace. We note that recent changes in employment relations and working conditions underscore the increase in thinking around diversity and equality. Although, organisational issues differ from nation to nation, current socio-political environment across the globe raises concern as to how organisations can achieve greater inclusion which promotes visible and non-visible differences. Various laws and legislations have somehow provided a legal framework to protect the rights of individuals and advance equality of opportunity for all. Nevertheless, changing workforce demographics have created a number of ongoing organisational and individual challenges including gender bias, non-declared medical or physical conditions, voluntary and involuntary disclosure of difference, dietary requirements, lifestyle, organisational engagement. Many organisations have recognised those difficult challenges which it could be a first step towards improving awareness. A plethora of academic tools and framework are available to support businesses; however, there is not a single blue print for recasting organisational attitude and addressing social stigma, and discrimination in the workplace. We have the tendency to reduce things into tidy dichotomies and homogeneous groups, but as Lisa Burrell (2016) says ‘reality is a lot messier than that’. Organisations comprise of a diverse beliefs among employees, managers, and executives as to what are the most ethically appropriate or inappropriate courses of actions to take in their daily workplace situations. This is a challenge for individuals to identify, assess and address any issues emerged from management decisions in the workplace.

Overall, this literature-based review aims to assess how organisations manage hidden inequalities and the extent to which current organisational practices and thinking pause any ethical dilemmas in an attempt to addressing individual differences. The term ‘hidden’ is used here as an explicit label to assess whether any form of organisational practice and function reinforces not readily unseen potential differences amongst individuals in the workplace. There is no doubt that managing individual differences and supporting people of all walks of life have attracted more visibility in media, academic community and public debate. Nevertheless, organisations need to accept and support employees who are experiencing any form of unseen inequalities in the workplace, and take ethical decisions in promoting fairness and inclusion.

**Understanding hidden inequalities: An ethical dilemma?**

The purpose of this review is to examine the importance of understanding ‘hidden’ inequalities in the workplace in particular dealing with the implementation of diversity policies and organisational capacity to manage ethically individual differences. Many organisations have developed various strategies to diversify the workforce and establish an inclusive working environment. A number of organisational policies and procedures have been adopted to assist individuals in establishing consistent practice and addressing attitude related issues. This is partly supported through various training and developmental activities with the aim to address diversity challenges and to somehow enhance people’s awareness of the need to recognise differences in the workplace. Although there is a growing academic literature on diversity and equality, discrimination and social related stigmas, it is still a major organisational issue (CIPD 2012). Some organisations might offer instructional diversity training (awareness and enlightenment learning practices) to encourage individuals to challenge held assumptions and ultimately, entrenched stereotypical beliefs (Anderson 2004; Harris 2003). Other organisations might offer behavioural-based training to educate participants to take personalised and participatory action towards the development of behavioural-based skills and modify implicit and explicit biases in self-reported behaviour. Nevertheless, we still find hard to deliver long-term changes in individual attitudes and behaviour within the workplace (Celik et al. 2012). For example, recent survey into sexism in the UK reveals that sexism in the workplace is increasing rather than decreasing, with 42% of 18-34 year olds experiencing sexism compared to 26% of the baby boom generation (CIPD 2012). This is critical, as appropriate individual attitudes towards any organisational policy is a critical factor in achieving an inclusive working environment (Purcell and Hutchinson 2007).

At a personal level, we have found it sometimes difficult to deal with the level of ignorance amongst individuals, but most importantly to understand existing management perceptions in addressing organisational diversity issues. We believe that addressing diversity and equality needs requires sufficient knowledge (both at individual and organisational level), effective leadership skills and appropriate assessment of the wider business environment. Some people might call this thinking ‘naive’ because theory is less strong than practice due to differences in the economic and organisational context. Nevertheless, there is now the expectation to address cultural intelligence failures and ensure diversity is part of the business model roots. The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD – 2012) argued that most British organisations have developed a strategy, policy or guidelines to address diversity needs, however most covered the legally protected individual requirements. We do not blame them as addressing diversity issues is almost as diverse as the subject itself, and this has made the interpretation of findings and experience highly judgemental. The issue here is that there is a kind of a ‘fore-feeding’ attitude towards satisfying legal expectations and preventing discrimination in the workplace. As Sherbin and Rashid (2017) argued in the Harvard Business Review, ‘diversity doesn't stick without inclusion’ as measuring diversity is easy, measuring feeling is dicey. This can better explained by highlighting Ahonen et al. (2014, p. 278) argument that we are unable to break the ‘cycle of production of knowledge about diversity’ that does not relinquish the benefits of diversity and protect individuals different needs.

Of course we do not agree that the legal framework is solely the one to blame. Decades of social and organisational science research point to a simple truth, ‘you won’t get individuals on board by blaming and shaming them with rules and rededications’ (Dobbin and Kalev 2016). As educators, we felt the need to assess how to ease up on the control tactics and somehow take actions in understanding the behaviour and attitude of those people who have experienced discrimination and social exclusion. Thomas Roosevelt’s work was particularly influential as he argued that affirmative action is essential to manage diversity challenges by learning to understand and modify organisational and individual values. Therefore, we are very fortune as we have the ability to design curriculum interventions and activities aiming to educate individuals on how to manage effectively individual differences and address social stigmas in the workplace. Higher education can have a powerful effect upon improving future practices and developing appropriate management practices. This is not to assume that providing appropriate learning opportunities is one-size-fits-all solution to long-standing issues around diversity and equality. Nevertheless, we share some responsibility for the current organisational ineffectiveness on addressing ‘hidden’ inequalities and inability to support individuals in transferring appropriate knowledge back in the workplace.

A key theme is that diversity is a stepping stone in modern organisations; however organisational diversity practices reflect a more cosmetic rather than deep-rooted changes as to how diversity is supported by leaders. What it is more positive is the fact that many individuals are very keen to discuss any challenges they face in the workplace and vent out their frustration with current thinking. We recognise that organisational realities might be different in theory; nevertheless, personal development, resource allocation and skills capacity seems to contribute towards addressing workplace stigmas and discrimination, but most importantly in developing a progressive and productive workplace. Individual awareness is an important first step in enabling change to happen at both an individual and organisational level, with Celik et al. (2012) suggesting that establishment of awareness is followed by acceptance, adoption and adherence. Therefore, management of ‘hidden’ inequalities should be seen as a necessity, where individuals should be involved in a process of examining the operational and behavioural realities leading to durable and relevant diversity work-based solutions.

Within the business ethics arena, organisations have a responsibility to accept and support employees with visible and non-visible needs and ensure that social stigmas are removed from the workplace. The review shows that organisations needs to assess and evaluate any form of organisational practice and function that could reinforce ‘hidden’ systematic and potential remediable differences amongst individuals in the workplace. Current wider debate highlights that individual diversity (differences in background, education and knowledge) is critical to sustain and improve economic performance by bringing different skills, experience, ideas and perspectives. To achieve that we need to challenge current thinking and mobilise individual action towards developing positive working environments. As Lisa Burrell (2016) argued, ‘we just can’t handle diversity’ as cognitive roadblocks keep getting in the way. Therefore, it is important to enable people, and most importantly management, to express their perception and provide insightful arguments as to how key processes by which equality and diversity are ascribed to people and systems might reinforce workplace ‘hidden’ inequalities.

**Equal or Diverse?**

Since the 1990s, authors have viewed diversity as a conventional approach to equal opportunities and legislation compliances enabling organisations to create a productive environment that promotes visible and non-visible differences. There is a growing debate about the emergence of the business case perspective for diversity, as opposed to the equal opportunities perceptive where emphasis has been paid on adopting sameness practices with an emphasis on moral concern for social justice (sameness reflects a uniform, group-focused approach in addressing equality), (CIPD 2012; Mavin and Girling 2000). The mainly goal is to achieve greater social justice from within a society through affirmative action consists of government-mandated or voluntary programmes undertaken to support disadvantaged groups (Herring and Henderson 2014). Legislation has played a key role in delivering progress towards inclusivity and equality through tackling unfair discrimination (Harris 2003). However, the equal opportunity approach was perceived to have failed, that is in the achievement of greater organisational inclusion. Evidence suggest that few organisations have taken proactive steps to enable the mainstreaming of diversity into the way people do their jobs or operational practices (CIPD 2006). As a result, a more neo-liberal perspective is being sought which moves away from the ‘stick’ of legal compliance (Mavin and Girling 2000). Diversity is perceived as ‘…the background of new thinking about the implications of a person being different’ (CIPD 2012, p. 14). This perspective has its origins in the United States (US) with a growing interest about its strategic benefits worldwide. This diversity philosophy has a broader scope and perspective when compared to traditional and accepted ways of understanding diversity within business (Kirton and Greene 2010), and has been influenced by rapidly changing workforce demographics and social mobility which led many businesses to re-evaluate organisational values and belief systems (CIPD 2012). A fundamental value of diversity management is the need to managing people strategically through the adoption of Human Resources practices (Foster and Harris 2005). Embracing diversity is not only a moral imperative but also has a sound business case with an explicit strategic approach to valuing individual differences (van Dijk et al. 2012). The real benefit assigned to diversity management is gaining competitive advantage and enhance performance through human capital (Mavin and Girling 2000). This lends supports from Cox’s (2001) findings that organisations that are actively seeking and managing a diverse workforce are able to meet complex business and organisational problems.

Although, the challenge is how to best enhance the opportunities that diversity has identified. Organisational studies literature highlights that diverse groups outperform homogeneous groups (Cox 2001; Kumra and Manfredi 2012), there are recognised difficulties in managing these teams. These include cultural differences in communication and performance (Watson et al. 1993). From a social perspective, social identity theory emphasises that diversity management creates ingroup-outgroup distinctions generating negative social processes that influence group performance (Turner 1987). Group members establish a positive identity by favouring characteristics of the ingroup and developing negative identities by behaving towards the out-group in a belligerent way. This is not surprising as finding a way to break free from the status quo is a hard task to achieve. Nevertheless, fosters awareness, value and acceptance of individual differences through the deployment of key talents in an environment of trust (Kumra and Manfredi, 2012) requires resources and most importantly people’s commitment to change. Failure to achieve this, it leads to performance loss (Ely 2004), prevents effective management decision making regarding team performance (Kumra and Manfred 2012) and reinforces social stigmas in the workplace. Other studies have identified a lack of diversity policy and positive management action could result in high labour turnover and loss of talented individuals, and consequently damaging publicity through employment tribunals (CIPD 2012).

Some others have been critical with regard to diversity management paradigm (Kumra and Mandfedi 2012). Foster and Harris (2005) suggest, however that the diversity management approach is not something distinctively different or new, it is just a repackaging of equal opportunities. Kumra and Manfredi (2012) support this consideration suggesting that the new diversity approach is focusing on the quality of the opportunity supporting and justifying equality initiatives which are still based in promoting ‘sameness’ rather than ‘difference’. Greene and Kirton (2011, p. 65) from an organisational perspective raise concerns over the place of diversity within strategic planning suggesting that although it ‘is not entirely absent from the approach, it is not central’. Therefore, the achievement of organisational goals then becomes the ultimate guiding principle and explanatory device for people in organisations (Kumra and Mandfedi 2012), rather than educating a truly diverse organisation. Nevertheless, the narrative of equal opportunities creates a culture of silent acceptance with limited focus on the individual aspects of diversity (Mavin and Girling 2000). This culture may be generated through a discourse that promotes diversity as a prerequisite for company success (CIPD 2012), without providing a uniform managerial solution. It has been identified that uniform solutions seek the identification of ‘sameness’ developing in and out groups (Celik et al. 2012), which does not release the new insights into organisational culture that individual differences can bring (Argote et al. 2001). Seeking to identify ‘difference’ creates a complex challenge for managers through the demand of identifying a plurality of interventions to ‘diminish effects of social categorization processes without relinquishing the benefits of diversity’ (Ely 2004, p. 756).

Managing diversity is perceived as a unitarist managerial concept (matching individual differences) rather than diversifying. Implementation of diversity management is context-specific and vary significantly across organisations (Janssens and Zanoni 2005). Nonetheless, providing flexible practices, supporting employee wellbeing and developing key talents are prerequisites in establishing a truly inclusive and diverse workforce. Different organisations can promote diversity for the sake of satisfying numbers (ticking the box), but diversity along with appropriate inclusive practices often leads to a diversity backlash. As Verna Myers (2017) ‘diversity is being invited to the party. Inclusion is being asked to dance’. In other words understanding individual needs leads to a positive, productive, and purposeful working environment for employees at all levels. Management decisions and organisational function influence the working environment and generate ethical issues around individual needs. Therefore, organisation’s moral and ethical code do play a vital role in managing differences and reinforcing a positive culture.

**The Legal Framework and Expectations**

Over the last four decades, policy makers have been actively addressing a number of equality and diversity problems that arise with the implementation of national legal initiatives against discriminative practices. In the UK, the Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination in the workplace and in wider society. It replaced previous anti-discrimination laws with a single Act, making the law easier to understand and strengthening protection in some situations. The European Union (EU) Member States have also empowered it to take appropriate action to combat discrimination through the introduction of two EU directives on anti-discrimination and Racial Equality. This is similar to the United States Equality Act of 2015 which amends the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to include protections that ban discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, gender identity, and sex. In fact, the United States and the EU are the most powerful players in a number of international regulatory hard and soft regimes. Legal positivists refer to hard law as legal obligations of a formally binding nature including key protecting characteristics and formal areas that prohibits discrimination in employment. While soft law refers to those that are not formally binding but may nonetheless lead to binding hard law (Shaffer and Pollack 2010) including individual attitude and behaviour in the workplace. Rationalists, in contrast, argue that hard and soft law have distinct attributes due to different contexts. Regardless the perspective, both hard and soft laws mutually supporting anti-discrimination. We aim not to adjudicate the weaknesses and strengths of hard and soft laws, but to focus on understanding individuals and their perceptions on ‘hidden’ social stigmas and discriminatory practices in the workplace and the imperative for organisations to act from an ethical standpoint.

In a recent survey, the Government Equalities Office (2016) found that there is a widespread organisational engagement with equality legislation through the use of written policies. Interestingly, compliance and external image has been mainly seen as a key organisational concern with workplace equality legislation. Evidence suggests that practice can be influenced by legislation and create a sense of moral and social responsibility. Nevertheless, the workplace is still not succeeding in reducing issues of racism and sexism (Tomlinson and Schwabenland 2010), examples include the accusation of institutionalised racism within the London Metropolitan Police 15 years after the first allegation (Dodd and Evans 2014). There are also reports to provide tougher restrictions over workplace dress code and sexist language (‘get along with the boys’) as the legal framework might be inadequate to protect women, people of colour, and LGBT individuals from being directly and indirectly discriminated. A recent survey conducted by the European Commission, only one-third of people in Europe know that they are protected by EU anti-discrimination law. They also found that 15% of respondents have suffered discrimination or harassment in last 12 months and 29% have witnessed discrimination (European Commission 2016). A longitudinal study of over 700 US companies found little positive effect of training to individual attitude towards gender and ethnicity, in fact they found that there is a decreased representation of black workers (Hewlett et al. 2008). In addition, recent events in the UK and USA political arenas, have brought into the surface infamous, offensive behaviours around immigration, social mobility and gender equality.

Given the complexity of the current business environment, organisations may struggle to balance compliance with affirmative action and find appropriate management practices in addressing individual needs. Indeed, as Klarsfeld et al. (2012, p. 312) assert, neither hard nor soft approaches are effective, in that ‘control rules are not as binding as they appear … [and] voluntary practices are not as deliberate as they seem’. They go further on to explain how these rules are subverted in order to portray compliance. There are also concerns over the feasibility and efficiency of diversity strategy (Greene and Kirton 2011; Foster and Harris 2007) and whether organisations have the appropriate capacity to address diversity policy needs (Mavin and Girling 2000). Evidence shows that there are ‘grey’ areas which may not specifically legislated for, but when used to identify an individual as ‘other’ can serve as an exclusionary mechanism and impact upon individuals’ dignity and well-being. At the same time, organisations place less strategic emphasis in managing those ‘hidden’ inequalities due to poor leadership commitment (Tomlinson and Schwabenland 2010) and limited allocation of budget and resources for addressing diversity issues in the work (CIPD 2012). Of course it would not be productive to regulate every aspects of organisational life. Nevertheless, poor recognition of ‘hidden’ inequalities could have a detrimental effect upon individual behaviour including turnover and psychological withdrawal and performance issues (Parzefall and Coyle-Shapiro 2011). In other words, the extent and nature of individual discretionary behaviour in the workplace is influenced by the level of organisational support and workplace norms (Ehrke et al. 2014).

Regardless the academic perspective, there is no doubt that policy makers, organisations and individuals need to gain a new insight into workplace diversity. Current uncertainties around the globe reinforce the argument that addressing diversity and equality issues can have a powerful positive impact upon organisational life. Failure to fully understand and most importantly explain diversity and equality related matters it is most likely to influence organisation’s ability to the changing employment relationships. Highlighting key issues without actions reflects a more cosmetic rather than deep-rooted changes as to how diversity is understood. There is no denial that organisations need to meet their legal duties. Nonetheless, organisations should provide learning opportunities to support management for driving progress, which is not limited to specialist understanding of diversity issues, but extends to an understanding of the broader business case arguments for diversity and develop knowledge and expertise in change individual attitude. We hope that we can generate positive action in enabling managers to understand and support employees who are experiencing any form of unseen social stigmas and inequalities in the workplace. Building management commitment and accountability is key in any successful diversity policy implementation.

**The business ethics case**

We now turn to discuss specific aspects of ‘hidden inequality’ which while falling outside the protection of legislation provided by the Equality Act 2010. We do not discuss them in any order of perceived importance but have highlighted several areas including dietary requirements for either health or religious reasons; to disclose (or not) neurodiversity or sexuality; and covert gender, age and flexible working discrimination. Many organisations and managers provide a literal application of the Act without extending it further to include all employees not just those with ‘protected characteristics’ none the less organisations and managers must act to address ethical deficiencies. While certain aspects – for example, gender identity, sexuality, religion, age, neurodiversity – are ‘protected characteristics’ the onus is on the individual to disclose their existence to their manager or organisation and that the onus for taking any action under the remit of the Act lies with the individual thus providing a costly burden, both financial and emotional, to that person.

Despite the shift in thinking, the current legislative framework has achieved little change in improving organisational justice (Ahmed 2007). Legislation plays a key role for tackling unfair discrimination and deliver the progress that is needed to create an inclusive society (Özbilgin et al. 2008). Physical and emotional effects have not been fully addressed at organisational level. Anecdotal evidence leads to the argument that current management practices (appraisal, performance management, wellbeing) are not in line with the principles and perspective of diversity. Of course, large organisations might be more proactive in establishing appropriate practices, however there is a lack of a generic framework to provide guidance and actions for different organisations. This is interesting argument as organisations have now been encouraged to effectively address their moral and strategic obligations through the development of explicit strategies to valuing individual differences at organisational level (CIPD 2012).

Understanding individual’ specific needs contribute towards a creating ‘positive’ culture that promotes efficiency and organisational justice (Niederle et al. 2013). In theory, managing diversity means enabling every member of the organisation to perform work tasks by satisfying specific needs. In practice, there is no single approach that organisations can adopt to eradicate discrimination (Kumra and Manfredi 2012), especially in relation to hidden inequality and social stigmas. To achieve that changing organisational knowledge and awareness is essential in addressing discrimination and leveraging employee differences to benefit the organisation. This is because 83% of organisations in the UK had an articulated diversity strategy, however most covered only the basic legal requirements and had not implemented improvement actions (CIPD 2012). Factors like organisational size, individual capabilities, time, resources and knowledge might prevent many organisations from identifying and addressing any discriminatory practices amongst individuals especially where there is no specific legal requirements. In essence, organisational inaction to provide an inclusive working environment to all employees create an ethical dilemma about current management practices and the rationale around the need to develop progressive working places.

Diversity actions to the management of the condition in the workplace should be able to address hidden assumptions and ignorance barriers moving away from a ‘box ticking’ exercise (Greene and Kirton 2011). Awareness of employee ‘special’ needs is now a strategic imperative in contemporary organisations (Bezrukova et al. 2012) with the capability to respond more effectively and the need to conform social norms and avoid stigmatisation. It is not a legal requirement or a moral obligation to understand the changing workforce, but a requisite for any successful work strategy (Kumra and Manfredi 2012). There is a disconnect between the legal expectations and moral obligations. Evidence, as detailed above suggest that there is a lack of knowledge that leads to instances of bullying, stigmatisation and of social exclusion; and, that these run counter to policies and practice of ensuring dignity for all at work.

The blurring of the boundaries between the public and private spheres can lead to stigmatisation (Goffman 1963, p. 9) defined as the ‘situation of the individual who is disqualified from full social acceptance’, in other words potentially those who feels excluded from organisational functions in some way because of their dietary requirements (whether for religious or medical reasons). Goffman goes on to add that the bearer (of the stigma) must have a concern for what others think about their condition and thus ‘internalise the social norms to which they fail to conform’ (Perez 2014, p. 1) highlighting both the psychological and sociological aspects of stigmatisation. Perez (2014, p. 2) critiques Goffman’s focus on emphasising the stigmatised rather than those who are stigmatisers, ‘framing individuals as victims and stripping them of agency rather than drawing attention to the broader structural concerns that lead to stigmatisation’

**Concluding Remarks**

Throughout this review, we have expounded on the many and intricate ways in which ‘hidden’ inequalities are entrenched in the workplace. Despite legislation designed to prevent the occurrence of discrimination (cf. Sex Discrimination Act 1975; Equal Pay Act 1970; Equality Act 2010 to name the key ones which affect our area of study) it is clear that ‘hidden’ inequalities are firmly embedded within organisational practices and even policies. While we acknowledge deficiencies within the legal framework as we discussed in the introduction, we reiterate that it is not entirely to blame for the continued existence of unequal treatment at work as it does provide a framework of analysis and mechanism for challenging its perpetuation. The review shows the need to ‘look below the surface’ of what is considered accepted practice in employment to examine ‘where’, ‘how’ and ‘why’ inequalities continue despite increased awareness of issues surrounding diversity and inclusion and the positive steps taken by many organisations in terms of developing an increasingly diverse workforce and the attendant benefits it brings.

Key to the discussions is the notion of ‘cosmetic treatment’ of fundamental and underlying principles surrounding diversity issues. We question whether the ‘hard’ law approach in the United Kingdom (UK) means that organisations put in place an equality and diversity policy in order to meet the legal requirements, but without a true commitment to integrate true equality for all employees. Thus, we argue are failing their moral and ethical obligations to provide an inclusive working environment. Without an explicit intention on the part of employers’ it cannot become custom and practice. We argue that all too frequently organisations pay ‘lip service’ to issues of equality and diversity without any meaningful intention to assimilate them into everyday practices. True change and progress can only be achieved through attracting the ‘hearts and minds’ of all individuals and not purely from a legislative perspective.

Our aim at the outset of this review was to highlight areas of inequalities which fall outside of legal and policy protection but exist ‘under the surface’ of organisational life yet which are very real to those who are subject to the resulting exclusion, bias and discrimination. Evaluation shows it is time to bring to the surface the need to enhance awareness amongst individuals and provide more educational opportunities not only to understand the meaning of differences, but also to change individuals’ system thinking. We also believe that training is not the answer to all diversity and equality issues in the workplace. Socially constructed views emended in our society and old fashion thinking around equality of individuals requires progressive educational interventions, with an emphasis on ethical practices. There is not an escape route in dealing with current hidden inequalities as organisational practices should change to address future work trends. The Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development highlights the need for organisations and HR professionals to look beyond “fads or fashions” around the future of work, and ensure employees’ voices are heard in a world of increased automation and volatility. In this case, the voices of individuals of all walks of life should be concerned equally.

There are three key areas to consider in the future. First, we need to explore and understand how dominant discourses within the literature exert an institutional power on the rhetoric and practice of diversity training, related to the multifaceted social constructs of diversity. Second, we have to evaluate whether diversity training is being seen as a possible solution to address discrimination and social differences within the organisation, and how organisation can identify and address ‘hidden’ inequality in the workplace. Third, we need to identify and assess any different training practices that all allow individuals to critically evaluate, debate and assess the impact of their own beliefs, values and prejudices. There is no doubt that various training models and frameworks are available for organisations. Nevertheless, we argue the need to evaluate further diversity and equality issues existing as a complex ethical web with threads that relate to personal cognitive maps of the knowledge producers. Finally, we need to evaluate the wider moral and ethical implications of management inaction in addressing differences with an emphasis on the ‘hidden’ aspects of personal differences.
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