



Survey results April 2024

Uncharted Territory

1. **Introduction**
2. **Methodology**
3. **Key findings**
4. **Findings**

Respondents by occupation

Respondents by neurotype

Language preferences

Identifying as disabled based on neurotype

Identifying as disabled on any other basis

Discrimination in legal education and training

Provision of reasonable adjustments in legal education and training

Disclosing neurodivergence in legal education and training

Requesting reasonable adjustments in legal education and training

Discrimination in the legal sector

Provision of reasonable adjustments in the legal sector

Disclosing neurodivergence in the legal sector

Requesting reasonable adjustments in the legal sector Perceptions of neuroinclusivity in legal education and training Perceptions of neuroinclusivity in the legal sector

5. **Discussion**
6. **Next steps**

Introduction

Neurodiversikey® is an award-winning non-profit organisation dedicated to making the legal sector and justice system neuroinclusive. Neurodiversikey®'s work focuses on education, training, and awareness raising. Amongst other things, neurodiversikey® aims for a legal sector representative of those it serves, and therefore sees neurodiversity and neuroinclusion as access to justice issues.

Despite growing interest in neurodiversity and neuroinclusion, there has not been any data collected beyond the wider category of disability. Neurodiversikey® has identified a dearth of evidence which it seeks to address with its two unprecedented surveys. Existing research has highlighted the difficulties disabled people face in the legal sector but has not explored neurodivergence.

This report is based on the results of neurodiversikey®'s two unprecedented surveys, open to neurodivergent law students and legal professionals respectively. Neurodiversikey® intends to use the results of the surveys to direct its work and to catalyse change across the legal sector.

Methodology

Two separate surveys were conducted: the neurodivergent law student survey and the neurodivergent legal professional survey. Neurodivergent law students and legal professionals in England and Wales were asked to participate in the surveys to help us build a better picture of neurodiversity and neuroinclusion in law. Participation was anonymous and self-diagnosis was accepted.

Both surveys were made up of 14 identical core questions. All questions were short multiple choice. The law student survey's introductory question asked for confirmation of enrolment as a law student in England/Wales. The legal professional survey's introductory questions asked for confirmation of training/practising as a legal professional in England/Wales, and branch of the profession.

The introductory questions on neurotype and occupation were the only questions which allowed respondents to type an answer (if they selected 'other'). All of the core questions' answers were prepopulated. The only question to allow selection of multiple answers was the introductory question asking for confirmation of neurotype(s), all other questions required one answer only. Questions were split into sections and displayed one section at a time. All questions were mandatory.

The surveys were conducted online and were shared across neurodiversikey®'s social media and website. Neurodiversikey® also sent the surveys by email to relevant organisations. The surveys opened on 12 February 2024 and were initially due to close 13 March 2024. The surveys were extended multiple times to finally close on 10 April 2024 to maximise the number of responses.

One respondent in the law student survey specified 'Specific Learning [Difference]' as their neurotype. SpLD is not a neurotype but an umbrella term encompassing for example dyscalculia, dysgraphia, dyslexia, dyspraxia. We did not remove this response as it is still relevant without knowing the respondent's specific SpLD(s). We removed all mental health conditions and all irrelevant conditions/disabilities. Where respondents specified their neurotype as 'Asperger's', 'ADD', or similar, we re-categorised into the appropriate neurotypes, in this instance autism and ADHD respectively. In the legal professional survey, we removed all responses from non-legal professionals e.g. social worker. We re-categorised branches of the profession such as 'solicitor advocate', 'in-house solicitor' under 'solicitor.'

Despite receiving 257 responses, there are some groups which remain underrepresented, and the results therefore have limitations. We have not explored the potential impact of multiple neurodivergence on the results.

Law student survey introductory questions

Q1 Please confirm you are currently enrolled as a law student in England or Wales.

Q2 Please select your neurotype(s).

Legal professional survey introductory questions

Q1 Please confirm you are either a trainee or practising legal professional in England or Wales.

Q2 Please select your branch of the legal profession.

Q3 Please select your neurotype(s).

The core questions

Q1 What is your language preference when talking about neurodivergence?

Q2 Do you identify as disabled* on the basis of your neurotype(s)?

Q3 Do you identify as disabled* on any basis other than your neurotype(s)?

Q4 Have you ever experienced discrimination on the basis of your neurotype(s) in legal education/training?

Q5 Have you ever been refused (or otherwise not provided) reasonable adjustments in respect of your neurotype(s) in legal education/training?

Q6 Have you ever not disclosed your neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training?

Q7 Have you ever not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training?

Q8 Have you ever experienced discrimination on the basis of your neurotype(s) in the legal sector?

Q9 Have you ever been refused (or otherwise not provided) reasonable adjustments in respect of your neurotype(s) in the legal sector?

Q10 Have you ever not disclosed your neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector?

Q11 Have you ever not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in the legal sector?

Q12 To what extent do you agree with the following statement? "Legal education/training is neuroinclusive."

Q13 To what extent do you agree with the following statement? "The legal sector is neuroinclusive."

*respondents were provided the Equality Act 2010 definition of disability.

Key findings

We received 257 valid responses across both surveys: 74 (28.8%) law students, 183 (71.2%) legal professionals.

97 (37.7%) of respondents were multiply neurodivergent.

Neurotype prevalence ranked as expected (from most to least prevalent): ADHD, autistic, dyslexic, dyspraxic, dyscalculic, dysgraphic.

46.7% of respondents had no language preference when talking about neurodivergence, and there was no significant difference between identity-first and person-first language.

Just 58.8% of respondents identified as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).

22.4% of respondents identified as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s).

8 respondents who did identify as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s) did not also identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).

47.4% of respondents have experienced discrimination on the basis of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training, increasing to 64.1% for dyslexic legal professionals.

39.6% of respondents have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

70.5% of respondents have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training, rising to 80% for dyslexic legal professionals.

68% of respondents have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training, rising to 68.9% for autistics.

51.4% of respondents have experienced discrimination on the basis of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector, rising to 84.2% for dyspraxic legal professionals.

42% of respondents have been refused reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector, rising to 69.2% of dyscalculics.

76.1% of respondents have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector, rising to 81.9% of ADHD legal professionals.

76.3% of respondents have not requested reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector, rising to 87.2% of ADHDers.

Of 254 respondents just 2% completely agreed that legal education/training is neuroinclusive. 66.1% either mostly or completely disagreed.

Of 74 law students, not one completely agreed that legal education/training is neuroinclusive.

Of 257 respondents 1 (0.4%) completely agreed that the legal sector is neuroinclusive. 74% either mostly or completely disagreed.

Of 74 law students, not one completely agreed that the legal sector is neuroinclusive.

Findings

Respondents by occupation

We received 257 valid responses across both surveys. 74 (28.8%) of whom were law students, and 183 (71.2%) legal professionals. Of the legal professionals, 27 (14.8%) were trainees and 156 (85.2%) practising.

The legal professionals included:

- 30 (16.4%) barristers (including 3 trainees).
- 113 (61.7%) solicitors (including 14 trainees).
- 1 (0.5%) member of the judiciary.
- 4 (2.2%) legal executives (including 1 trainee).
- 26 (14.2%) paralegals (including 8 trainees).
- 9 (4.9%) 'other' legal professionals (including 1 trainee).

We expected to see more law student responses than legal professional responses. All branches except solicitors were underrepresented. Trainees were underrepresented across the profession.

Responses across surveys by occupation

Law student	Legal professional		
	Trainee	Practising	Total
74	27	156	183
Total respondents across surveys: 257			

Legal professional responses by branch of profession

	Barrister	Solicitor	Judiciary	Legal Exec	Paralegal	Other*	Total
Practising	27	99	1	3	18	8	156
Trainee	3	14	0	1	8	1	27
Total	30	113	1	4	26	9	183

*Other included: risk and compliance roles; foreign qualified lawyers; legal coordinators; legal and compliance roles; costs lawyers; and all other legal professionals.

Respondents by neurotype

97 (37.7%) of all respondents were multiply neurodivergent (selected more than one neurotype). This explains the total prevalence of neurotypes being higher than the total number of respondents.

Of 257 respondents:

- 162 were ADHD.
- 121 were autistic.
- 17 were dyscalculic.
- 2 were dysgraphic.
- 57 were dyslexic.
- 28 were dyspraxic.

ADHD was the most prevalent neurotype, and dysgraphic the least (excluding SpLD). No respondent selected dysgraphia alone. There were no dysgraphic law students.

The neurotypes ranked equally in terms of prevalence across both surveys (excluding SpLD). They ranked as expected from most to least prevalent:

1. ADHD
2. Autistic
3. Dyslexic
4. Dyspraxic
5. Dyscalculic
6. Dysgraphic

The prevalence ranking was replicated in the barrister and solicitor groups, with minor deviation across the paralegal, legal executive, and 'other groups, likely due to small sample size.

The prevalence of multiple neurodivergence varied between law students (40.5%) and legal professionals (36.6%).

Responses across surveys broken down by occupation

	Law Student	Legal Professional	Total
ADHD	54	108	162
Autistic	28	93	121
Dyscalculic	4	13	17
Dysgraphic	0	2	2
Dyslexic	16	4	57
Dyspraxic	8	20	28
SpLD	1	0	1
Multiply neurodivergent	30	67	97

Legal professional responses by branch of profession

	Barrister	Solicitor	Paralegal	Legal Ex	Judiciary + Other
ADHD	17	66	17	1	7
Autistic	14	62	11	3	3
Dyscalculic	3	6	3	0	1
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	0
Dyslexic	7	28	4	0	2
Dyspraxic	5	9	4	0	1

Judiciary is included under Other to avoid identification.

Language preferences

We asked: *“What is your language preference when talking about neurodivergence?”*

Available answers:

- Identity-first language e.g. I am autistic; they are dyslexic; dyscalculic people; ADHDers.
- Person-first language e.g. I have autism; they have dyslexia; people with dyscalculia; people with ADHD.
- I do not have a preference.
- Prefer not to answer.

Of 255 respondents:

- 46.7% had no language preference.
- 27% preferred person-first language.
- 26.3% preferred identity-first language.

The majority having no preference was unexpected. The difference between preference for person-first and identity-first is not significant. However, these results contrast with existing research suggesting a preference for identity-first language amongst the neurodivergent community. One reason for this difference could be the influence of the legal sector and the law’s reliance on the medical model, and therefore person-first language.

ADHDers were more likely to have no preference.

Autistics were more likely to prefer identity-first language, confirming existing research.

Dyscalculics were more likely to have no preference.

Dysgraphics were more likely to have no preference.

Dyspraxics were more likely to prefer person-first language.

Both law students and legal professionals were more likely to have no preference.

Barristers were approximately twice as likely to prefer person-first language over both preferring identity-first language and having no preference. This is the opposite of the general trend across surveys where having no preference was almost twice as likely as preferring person-first or identity-first language.

Responses across surveys

	Person-first	Identity-first	No preference	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	69	67	119	2	257
ADHD	54	40	67	1	162
Autistic	20	52	49	0	121
Dyscalculic	4	4	8	1	17
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	15	15	26	1	57
Dyspraxic	10	8	9	1	28
SpLD	0	0	1	0	1

Law student responses

	Person-first	Identity-first	No preference	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	19	20	35	0	74
ADHD	18	13	23	0	54
Autistic	1	17	10	0	28
Dyscalculic	2	0	2	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	5	4	7	0	16
Dyspraxic	4	2	2	0	8
SpLD	0	0	1	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Person-first	Identity-first	No preference	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	50	47	84	2	183
ADHD	36	27	44	1	108
Autistic	19	35	39	0	93
Dyscalculic	2	4	6	1	13
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	10	11	19	1	41
Dyspraxic	6	6	7	1	20

Legal professional responses

	Person-first	Identity-first	No preference	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	50	47	84	2	183
Barrister	15	7	8	0	30
Solicitor	25	30	56	2	113
Judiciary	0	1	0	0	1
Paralegal	9	4	13	0	26
Legal exec	1	0	3	0	4
Other	1	4	4	0	9

Identifying as disabled based on neurotype

We asked: *"Do you identify as disabled* on the basis of your neurotype(s)?"*

**For the purposes of this question, we use the Equality Act 2010 definition: A person has a disability if: (a) they have a physical or mental impairment, and (b) the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on P's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

Of 245 respondents:

- 58.8% identified as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).
- 41.2% did not identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).

With the exception of dyscalculia, all neurotypes were associated with being more likely than not to identify as disabled on the basis of neurotype(s).

Law students were 2.1 times more likely than not to identify as disabled on the basis of neurotype(s).

Legal professionals were 1.2 times more likely than not to identify as disabled on the basis of neurotype(s).

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	144	101	12	257
ADHD	93	62	7	162
Autistic	65	49	7	121
Dyscalculic	7	10	0	17
Dysgraphic	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	32	23	2	57
Dyspraxic	21	5	2	28
SpLD	1	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	48	23	3	74
ADHD	37	16	1	54
Autistic	17	10	1	28
Dyscalculic	2	2	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	10	6	0	16
Dyspraxic	6	1	1	8
SpLD	1	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	96	78	9	183
ADHD	56	46	6	108
Autistic	48	39	6	93
Dyscalculic	5	8	0	13
Dysgraphic	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	22	17	2	41
Dyspraxic	15	4	1	20

Identifying as disabled on any other basis

We asked: *"Do you identify as disabled* on any basis other than your neurotype(s)?"*

**For the purposes of this question, we use the Equality Act 2010 definition: A person has a disability if: (a) they have a physical or mental impairment, and (b) the impairment has a substantial and long-term adverse effect on P's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

Of 246 respondents:

- 77.6% did not identify as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s).
- 22.4% identified as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s).

This trend is seen across the neurotypes, with the exception of dysgraphia (50:50 split), likely due to its small sample size.

Law students were 3 times more likely than not to not identify as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s).

Legal professionals were almost 4 times more likely than not to not identify as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s).

Of the 17 law students who identified as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s), 6 did not also identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).

Of the 38 legal professionals who identified as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s), 2 did not also identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s).

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	55	191	11	257
ADHD	37	117	8	162
Autistic	29	88	4	121
Dyscalculic	6	11	0	17
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	2
Dyslexic	15	40	2	57
Dyspraxic	11	17	0	28
SpLD	0	1	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	17	51	6	74
ADHD	13	37	4	54
Autistic	7	19	2	28
Dyscalculic	2	2	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	6	9	1	16
Dyspraxic	2	6	0	8
SpLD	0	1	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	38	140	5	183
ADHD	24	80	4	108
Autistic	22	69	2	93
Dyscalculic	4	9	0	13
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	2
Dyslexic	9	31	1	41
Dyspraxic	9	11	0	20

Discrimination in legal education and training

We asked: *"Have you ever experienced discrimination on the basis of your neurotype(s) in legal education/training?"*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 232 respondents:

- 47.4% have experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.
- 52.6% have not experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

63.6% of dyslexics have experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

42.9% of law students have experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

57.1% of autistic law students have experienced discrimination in legal education/training.

49.4% of legal professionals have experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

64.1% of dyslexic legal professionals have experienced discrimination in relation to their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	110	122	4	21	257
ADHD	69	71	3	19	162
Autistic	56	56	2	7	121
Dyscalculic	8	6	1	2	17
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	35	20	1	1	57
Dyspraxic	15	12	1	0	28
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	30	40	1	3	74
ADHD	22	28	1	3	54
Autistic	16	12	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	1	2	0	1	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	10	6	0	0	16
Dyspraxic	3	5	0	0	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	80	82	3	18	183
ADHD	47	43	2	16	108
Autistic	40	44	2	7	93
Dyscalculic	7	4	1	1	13
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	25	14	1	1	41
Dyspraxic	12	7	1	0	20

Provision of reasonable adjustments in legal education and training

We asked: *“Have you ever been refused (or otherwise not provided) reasonable adjustments in respect of your neurotype(s) in legal education/training?”*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 202 respondents:

- 39.6% have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.
- 60.4% have not been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

61.5% of dyscalculic respondents have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

42.4% of law students have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

38.2% of legal professionals have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

64.3% of dyslexic law students have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

60% of dyscalculic legal professionals have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training.

44.9% of autistic legal professionals have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in legal education/training.

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual Respondents	80	122	4	51	257
ADHD	47	76	4	35	162
Autistic	43	54	1	23	121
Dyscalculic	8	5	0	4	17
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	25	26	0	6	57
Dyspraxic	9	17	0	2	28
SpLD	0	1	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual Respondents	28	38	1	7	74
ADHD	20	26	1	7	54
Autistic	12	16	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	2	1	0	1	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	9	5	0	2	16
Dyspraxic	3	4	0	1	8
SpLD	0	1	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	52	84	3	44	183
ADHD	27	50	3	28	108
Autistic	31	38	1	23	93
Dyscalculic	6	4	0	3	13
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	16	21	0	4	41
Dyspraxic	6	13	0	1	20

Disclosing neurodivergence in legal education and training

We asked: *“Have you ever not disclosed your neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training?”*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 234 respondents:

- 70.5% have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

73.6% of ADHDers have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

71.4% of dyslexics have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

67.9% of autistics have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

64.4% of law students have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

73.3% of legal professionals have withheld disclosure of their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

Dyslexic legal professionals were 4 times more likely than not to not disclose their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training, 80% of whom answered ‘yes’.

ADHD legal professionals were 3.6 times more likely than not to not disclose their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	165	69	2	21	257
ADHD	106	38	2	16	162
Autistic	74	35	1	11	121
Dyscalculic	11	4	0	2	17
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	0	2
Dyslexic	40	16	0	1	57
Dyspraxic	14	12	0	2	28
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	47	26	1	0	74
ADHD	35	18	1	0	54
Autistic	17	11	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	3	1	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	8	8	0	0	16
Dyspraxic	3	5	0	0	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	118	43	1	21	183
ADHD	71	20	1	16	108
Autistic	57	24	1	11	93
Dyscalculic	8	3	0	2	13
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	0	2
Dyslexic	32	8	0	1	41
Dyspraxic	11	7	0	2	20

Requesting reasonable adjustments in legal education and training

We asked: *"Have you ever not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training?"*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 228 respondents:

- 68% have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.
- 68.6% of ADHDers answered 'yes' (2.2 times more than 'no').
- 68.9% of autistics answered 'yes' (2.2 times more than 'no').

67.1% of law students have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

75% of autistic law students answered 'yes' (3 times more than 'no').

68.4% of legal professionals have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

75% of dyslexic legal professionals answered 'yes' (3 times more than 'no').

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	155	73	1	28	257
ADHD	96	44	1	21	162
Autistic	73	33	1	14	121
Dyscalculic	7	8	0	2	17
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	38	18	0	1	57
Dyspraxic	16	12	0	0	28
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	49	24	0	1	74
ADHD	35	18	0	1	54
Autistic	21	7	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	3	1	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	8	8	0	0	16
Dyspraxic	3	5	0	0	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	106	49	1	27	183
ADHD	61	26	1	20	108
Autistic	52	26	1	14	93
Dyscalculic	4	7	0	2	13
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	30	10	0	1	41
Dyspraxic	13	7	0	0	20

Discrimination in the legal sector

We asked: *"Have you ever experienced discrimination on the basis of your neurotype(s) in the legal sector? For example in: recruitment, work experience, competitions run within the legal sector, the workplace."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of all 220 respondents:

- 51.4% have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

72% of dyspraxics have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

54% of dyslexics have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

56.2% of autistics have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

Fewer law students (31%) experienced discrimination in the legal sector than legal professionals (58.2%).

Autistic law students were just as likely to answer 'yes' as 'no'.

84.2% of dyspraxic legal professionals have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

62.8% of ADHD legal professionals have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

57.9% of dyslexic legal professionals have experienced discrimination in the legal sector.

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	113	107	8	29	257
ADHD	70	63	7	22	162
Autistic	59	46	3	13	121
Dyscalculic	8	9	0	0	17
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	27	23	3	4	57
Dyspraxic	18	7	1	2	28
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	17	38	4	15	74
ADHD	11	28	4	11	54
Autistic	11	11	0	6	28
Dyscalculic	1	3	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	5	7	1	3	16
Dyspraxic	2	4	0	2	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	96	69	4	14	183
ADHD	59	35	3	11	108
Autistic	48	35	3	7	93
Dyscalculic	7	6	0	0	13
Dysgraphic	1	0	0	1	2
Dyslexic	22	16	2	1	41
Dyspraxic	16	3	1	0	20

Provision of reasonable adjustments in the legal sector

We asked: *"Have you ever been refused (or otherwise not provided) reasonable adjustments in respect of your neurotype(s) in the legal sector? For example in: recruitment, work experience, competitions run within the legal sector, the workplace."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 204 respondents:

- 42% have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector.

69.2% of dyscalculics have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector. (2.3 times higher than those who answered 'no').

32.1% of law students have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector.

48.2% of legal professionals have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector.

50.6% of ADHD legal professionals have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in the legal sector.

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	86	119	5	47	257
ADHD	55	66	5	36	162
Autistic	48	53	1	19	121
Dyscalculic	9	4	0	4	17
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	21	29	1	6	57
Dyspraxic	9	14	1	4	28
SpLD	0	1	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	18	38	2	16	74
ADHD	14	26	2	12	54
Autistic	9	13	0	6	28
Dyscalculic	3	0	0	1	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	6	9	0	1	16
Dyspraxic	1	5	0	2	8
SpLD	0	1	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	68	81	3	31	183
ADHD	41	40	3	24	108
Autistic	39	40	1	13	93
Dyscalculic	6	4	0	3	13
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	15	20	1	5	41
Dyspraxic	8	9	1	2	20

Disclosing neurodivergence in the legal sector

We asked: *"Have you ever not disclosed your neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector? For example in: recruitment, work experience, competitions run within the legal sector, the workplace."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 248 respondents:

- 76.1% have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

81.3% of dyscalculics have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector (4.3 times more than those who answered 'no').

76% of ADHDers have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector (3.2 times more than those who answered 'no').

75.6% of autistics have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector (3.1 times more than those who answered 'no').

61.8% of law students have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

63.3% of ADHD law students have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

79.4% of legal professionals have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

81.9% of ADHD legal professionals have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector (4.5 times more than those who answered 'no').

79.3% of autistic legal professionals have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector (3.8 times more than those who answered 'no').

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	185	63	0	9	257
ADHD	117	37	0	8	162
Autistic	90	29	0	2	121
Dyscalculic	13	3	0	1	17
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	0	2
Dyslexic	40	16	0	1	57
Dyspraxic	15	10	0	3	28
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	42	26	0	6	74
ADHD	31	18	0	5	54
Autistic	17	10	0	1	28
Dyscalculic	4	0	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	8	7	0	1	16
Dyspraxic	1	5	0	2	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	143	37	0	3	183
ADHD	86	19	0	3	108
Autistic	73	19	0	1	93
Dyscalculic	9	3	0	1	13
Dysgraphic	1	1	0	0	2
Dyslexic	32	9	0	0	41
Dyspraxic	14	5	0	1	20

Requesting reasonable adjustments in the legal sector

We asked: *"Have you ever not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in the legal sector? For example in: recruitment, work experience, competitions run within the legal sector, the workplace."*

Available answers:

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer
- Not applicable

Of 240 respondents:

- 76.3% have not requested reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

4 times as more dyslexics answered 'yes' (80%) than 'no' (20%). This was replicated across both the law student and legal professional surveys.

3.3 times more autistics answered 'yes' (76.7%) than 'no' (23.3%).

3.2 times more ADHDers answered 'yes' (87.2%) than 'no' (24.5%).

70.1% of law students have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in legal education/training.

4.4 times more autistic law students answered 'yes' (81.5%) than 'no' (18.5%).

4 times more dyslexic law students answered 'yes' (80%) than 'no' (20%).

78.6% of legal professionals have not requested reasonable adjustments to avoid discrimination in the legal sector.

4.1 times more ADHD legal professionals answered 'yes' (80.2%) than 'no' (19.8%).

Responses across surveys

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	183	57	1	16	257
ADHD	113	36	1	12	162
Autistic	89	27	1	4	121
Dyscalculic	11	3	0	3	17
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	44	11	0	2	57
Dyspraxic	3	3	0	2	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	47	20	0	7	74
ADHD	32	16	0	6	54
Autistic	22	5	0	1	28
Dyscalculic	3	0	0	1	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	12	3	0	1	16
Dyspraxic	3	3	0	2	8
SpLD	1	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Yes	No	Prefer not to answer	N/A	Total
Individual respondents	136	37	1	9	183
ADHD	81	20	1	6	108
Autistic	67	22	1	3	93
Dyscalculic	8	3	0	2	13
Dysgraphic	0	2	0	0	2
Dyslexic	32	8	0	1	41
Dyspraxic	15	4	0	1	20

Perceptions of neuroinclusivity in legal education and training

We asked: *"To what extent do you agree with the following statement? "Legal education and training is neuroinclusive." For the purposes of this question "neuroinclusive" means: welcoming, supportive, accommodating and understanding of all neurotypes."*

Available answers:

- Completely agree
- Mostly agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Mostly disagree
- Completely disagree
- Prefer not to answer

Of 254 respondents:

- 2% completely agreed.
- 14.2% mostly agreed.
- 16.1% either mostly or completely agreed.
- 17.7% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 41% mostly disagreed.
- 25.2% completely disagreed.
- 66.1% either mostly or completely disagreed.

Of 74 law students, not one completely agreed.

20.3% of law students mostly agreed.

12.2% of law students neither agreed nor disagreed.

47.3% of law students mostly disagreed.

20.3% of law students completely disagreed.

67.6% of law students either completely or mostly disagreed.

Of 180 legal professionals, 3 (1.7%) completely agreed.

11.7% of legal professionals mostly agreed

20% of legal professionals neither agreed nor disagreed.

38.3% of legal professionals mostly disagreed.

27.2% of legal professionals completely disagreed.

65.6% of legal professionals either mostly or completely disagreed.

Responses across surveys

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	64	104	45	36	5	3	257
ADHD	47	69	23	19	1	3	162
Autistic	30	46	22	19	4	0	121
Dyscalculic	3	10	3	0	1	0	17
Dysgraphic	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dyslexic	11	27	14	5	0	0	57
Dyspraxic	5	11	7	5	0	0	28
SpLD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	15	35	9	15	0	0	74
ADHD	11	26	6	11	0	0	54
Autistic	8	12	3	5	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	4	8	3	1	0	0	16
Dyspraxic	1	2	4	1	0	0	8
SpLD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	49	69	36	21	5	3	183
ADHD	36	43	17	8	1	3	108
Autistic	22	34	19	14	4	0	93
Dyscalculic	2	7	3	0	1	0	13
Dysgraphic	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Dyslexic	7	19	11	4	0	0	41
Dyspraxic	4	9	3	4	0	0	20

Perceptions of neuroinclusivity in the legal sector

We asked: *"To what extent do you agree with the following statement? "The legal sector is neuroinclusive." For the purposes of this question "neuroinclusive" means: welcoming, supportive, accommodating and understanding of all neurotypes."*

Available answers:

- Completely agree
- Mostly agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Mostly disagree
- Completely disagree
- Prefer not to answer

Of 257 respondents:

- Just 1 (0.4%) completely agreed.
- 9.4% mostly agreed.
- 9.7% either mostly or completely agreed.
- 16.3% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 43.6% mostly disagreed.
- 30.4% completely disagreed.
- 74% either mostly or completely disagreed.

Of 74 law students, not one completely agreed.

12.2% of law students mostly agreed.

14.9% of law students neither agreed nor disagreed.

54.1% of law students mostly disagreed.

18.9% of law students completely disagreed.

73% of law students either mostly or completely disagreed.

Of 183 legal professionals, 1 (0.5%) completely agreed.

8.2% of legal professionals mostly agreed.

16.9% of legal professionals neither agreed nor disagreed.

39.3% of legal professionals mostly disagreed.

35% of legal professionals completely disagreed.

74.3% of legal professionals either mostly or completely disagreed.

Responses across surveys

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	78	112	42	24	1	0	257
ADHD	54	71	25	12	0	0	162
Autistic	35	54	17	14	1	0	121
Dyscalculic	6	7	3	1	0	0	17
Dysgraphic	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Dyslexic	17	29	9	2	0	0	57
Dyspraxic	6	12	9	1	0	0	28
SpLD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Law student responses

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	14	40	11	9	0	0	74
ADHD	9	29	9	7	0	0	54
Autistic	9	13	2	4	0	0	28
Dyscalculic	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
Dysgraphic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dyslexic	4	9	2	1	0	0	16
Dyspraxic	1	1	6	0	0	0	8
SpLD	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

Legal professional responses

	Completely disagree	Mostly disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly agree	Completely agree	Prefer not to answer	Total
Individual respondents	64	72	31	15	1	0	183
ADHD	45	42	16	5	0	0	108
Autistic	26	41	15	10	1	0	93
Dyscalculic	6	3	3	1	0	0	13
Dysgraphic	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Dyslexic	13	20	7	1	0	0	41
Dyspraxic	5	11	3	1	0	0	20

Discussion

Respondents by occupation

We received 257 valid responses across both surveys: 74 (28.8%) law students, 183 (71.2%) legal professionals.

We expected more law students than legal professionals. There may have been a number of contributing factors to receiving fewer law student than legal professional responses which we can only speculate on. There could have been an issue of reach, for example, universities' reluctance to share the survey with students, but we also know that many individuals are not identified as neurodivergent until well after they have completed their education.

Barristers were underrepresented as expected. We expected this as the bar's interest in and support for neurodiversity has grown more slowly than the solicitor branch of the profession. This could in part be due to law firms typically having better resources and dedicated HR and DEI teams, as well as the solicitor branch having a wider range of internal and external staff networks dedicated to minoritised groups such as neurodiversity and/or disability.

Respondents by neurotype

Neurotype prevalence ranked as expected per the general population (from most to least prevalent): ADHD, autistic, dyslexic, dyspraxic, dyscalculic, dysgraphic. This suggests that the results are accurate in terms of relative prevalence of the neurotypes despite probable underrepresentation of the less common neurotypes. It also suggests that the neurotypes are distributed similarly across legal education, training, and practice as in the general population.

Language preferences

46.7% of respondents had no language preference when talking about neurodivergence, and there was no significant difference between identity-first (26.3%) and person-first language (27.1%).

Autistic respondents were most likely to prefer identity-first language (43%), with no preference following closely behind (40.5%), and finally person-first (16.5%). The disparity between preference for identity-first and person-first was greatest amongst autistic law students, 60.7% of whom preferred identity-first language compared to the 3.6% who preferred person-first language.

Autistic legal professionals were most likely to have no preference (41.9%) but still preferred identity-first (37.6%) over person-first (20.4%) language. This supports existing research suggesting autistic people prefer identity-first language.

Surprisingly, identity-first language was consistently and markedly the least likely preference of ADHDers, overall (24.8%), amongst law students (24.1%), and amongst legal professionals (25.2%).

These results were unexpected as they do not reflect the preferences of the wider neurodivergent community (identity-first), but may be a reflection of the neurodiversity movement still being fairly new to the legal community. Given the now long-established autistic rights movement formed the basis of and heavily influenced the neurodiversity movement, which both reject the medical model of disability, it is unsurprising that autistic respondents consistently and strongly prefer identity-first language over person-first. Language preference may also be influenced by the prevalent language used by the wider legal profession and the law itself. For example, medicolegal terminology is person-first and based on the medical model of disability.

From these results we can see language preference is not universal amongst law students and legal professionals, and can vary widely both within and between neurotypes. It is therefore important to remain flexible with language and respect individuals' personal choices. Over time, we would expect to see a growing preference for identity-first over person-first with the growth of the neurodiversity movement.

Identifying as disabled based on neurotype

41.2% of respondents did not identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s), yet this was not reflected in the number of 'not applicable' responses for the questions on discrimination, reasonable adjustments, and disclosure, suggesting that neurodivergent people may still meet the legal criteria for disability whether or not they identify as such.

This conflict between self-identity and legal status may pose barriers to seeking, accessing, and being recognised as requiring support,

accommodation, and inclusion. The responses for the question on provision of reasonable adjustments confirm that at least some neurodivergent people do request them even if they do not identify as disabled. However, it is also possible that neurodivergent people who do not identify as disabled are discouraged by the language from enforcing or accessing what they are legally entitled to per their 'disability' rights.

These results suggest that the Equality Act 2010 definition of disability leaves much to be desired in the context of neurodivergence. This conflict of disability as social identity and legal status puts non-identifying neurodivergent individuals in a difficult position of having to choose between identifying as disabled to receive for example the necessary reasonable adjustments, or going without.

We would like to see neurodivergence separated from but included alongside disability in DEI efforts across legal education, training, and practice. For example, in Diversity Equity Inclusion monitoring, forms for reasonable adjustments/support, and the associated processes and policies. The surveys were conducted because there is no data specific to neurodivergent individuals in legal education, training and practice beyond wider disability. These results only highlight the need for that distinction, not only for specificity, but to avoid missing out a section of the neurodivergent community.

Identifying as disabled on any other basis

Fewer identified as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s) than expected, especially considering 58.8% identified as disabled based on their neurotype(s). We would expect more given the high co-occurrence of neurodivergence with a number of conditions which for many are disabilities. However, this could be explained by many of these co-occurrences commonly going undiagnosed.

Interestingly 8 respondents who identify as disabled on any basis other than neurotype(s) did not also identify as disabled on the basis of their neurotype(s). This suggests that at least for this minority, not considering neurodivergence disability is not due to an absolute rejection of disability, whether as social identity or legal status.

Discrimination in legal education and training / the legal sector

The survey results demonstrate pervasive discrimination against neurodivergent people across all neurotypes. Although 58.2% of legal professionals experienced discrimination in the legal sector, it is clear that discrimination against neurodivergent individuals starts before even entering the legal profession, with 47.4% of respondents experiencing discrimination in legal education/training. This discrimination presents additional barriers not only to entering the profession but succeeding and fulfilling full potential in legal education/training and the legal sector. The effects of discrimination are likely not restricted to careers but also individuals' personal lives.

The percentage of respondents who reported experiencing discrimination is lower than expected which could be for a number of reasons. For example, individuals may avoid discrimination by only disclosing their neurotype(s)/requesting reasonable adjustments when they are confident it is safe to do so, which may then make them less likely to experience discrimination. Discrimination may have been underreported due to different understandings of what constitutes discrimination, as we did not provide respondents with a definition. Additionally, more subtle examples of discrimination may not have been recognised as such.

Provision of reasonable adjustments in legal education and training / the legal sector

39.6% of respondents have been refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training. Rising to 42.4% of law students This not only puts neurodivergent individuals at a substantial disadvantage at the legal education/training stage, but has the potential to negatively impact their careers from recruitment onwards. In the legal sector, 42% of respondents reported being refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments, rising to 48.2% of legal professionals. Comparing the results across surveys, it appears that entering legal practice is not a protective factor but actually associated with increased risk of being refused or otherwise not provided reasonable adjustments in respect of neurotype(s).

Disclosing neurodivergence in legal education and training / the legal sector

Concerningly, the vast majority of respondents have not disclosed their neurotype(s) to avoid discrimination in both legal education/training (70.5%) and the legal sector (76.1%). The reluctance to disclose suggests that educational, training, and working environments are not safe (or conducive to feeling safe) to disclose neurotype(s), and the presence of deep rooted and widespread discrimination, supported by the high percentages of respondents who reported experiencing discrimination on the basis of their neurotype(s) in legal education/training (47.4%) and the legal sector (51.4%). Non-disclosure may also suggest previous negative experiences with disclosure such as discrimination. The results suggest the consequences of disclosure outweigh the benefits.

Requesting reasonable adjustments in legal education and training / the legal sector

The proportion of respondents who have not requested reasonable adjustments in legal education/training (68%) and in the legal sector (76.3%) far outweighs those who did not report doing so. The same conclusions can be drawn as from the results on non-disclosure of neurotype(s). As with non-disclosure, these results suggest the consequences of requesting reasonable adjustments outweigh the benefits. This is emphasised by the fact that reasonable adjustments are designed to level the playing field. The negative consequences of requesting reasonable adjustments must then be substantial if remaining at a disadvantage is preferential.

Perceptions of neuroinclusivity in legal education and training / the legal sector

Of 254 respondents 16.1% either mostly or completely agreed that legal education/training is neuroinclusive, including just 5 (2%) who completely agreed. Most law students and legal professionals believe legal education/training is mostly or completely neuroexclusive.

Of 257 respondents 9.7% either mostly or completely agreed that the legal sector is neuroinclusive, including just one person (0.4%) who completely agreed. The vast majority (74%) of law students and legal professionals believe that the legal sector is mostly or completely neuroexclusive.

This poses real issues for the recruitment, retainment, and progression of neurodivergent people in law, threatening a loss of talent.

The very low number of responses across both surveys for 'completely agree' and 'mostly agree' for both legal education/training and the legal sector point to their neuroexclusivity. The only conclusion is that neurodivergent people are not "welcom[ed], support[ed], accommodat[ed] and underst[ood]". Not one law student completely agreed that either legal education/training or the legal sector is neuroinclusive. The next generation of neurodivergent legal professionals is under no illusion, which begs the question of whether this will deter aspiring legal professionals altogether, resulting in a loss of talent.

General comments

The results of the surveys suggest neurodivergent individuals are subjected to negative experiences and treatment throughout legal education/training and the legal sector irrespective of their particular neurotype(s), occupation, or branch of the profession. What is patently clear is that discrimination and the fear of discrimination are a problem throughout legal education, training, and the legal sector. Responses from legal professionals and law students demonstrate this is a long-term issue in need of stamping out, not least because it necessitates masking/camouflaging out of safety, which can be detrimental to mental health – an already hot topic in law.

The results overall portray a sorry situation in need of immediate, meaningful action. The high number of respondents who fear discrimination is warranted given the extent of discrimination reported across the surveys. Neurodivergent people should be able to be their authentic selves in legal education, training and practice, and access what they are entitled to without fear of the repercussions.

The many issues highlighted raise questions over the risks to the neurodivergent community of a justice system reliant on neuroexclusive legal education, training, and practice.

Next steps

Neurodiversikey® will use the results of the surveys to direct its work. It is evident from the results that neurodivergent people are being let down at every opportunity, and that further investigation into neurodiversity and neuroinclusion in legal education, training and practice is required. We will also seek to address the widespread discrimination experienced by neurodivergent people through mandatory education, training, and awareness raising.

Additionally, we will employ the results to inform neuroinclusion efforts and improve protections, processes and practices for neurodivergent people.

Neurodiversikey® intends to commission further, improved, research, both into the issues raised and those yet to be uncovered which might include:

- Neurodivergence prevalence in the legal sector and legal education/training.
- Whether disability identity has any impact on disclosure, adjustments, inclusion.
- Whether, and if so, how, discrimination impacts legal career entry, progression, retainment.
- The perspectives of the 'discriminators' to better understand how we can combat discrimination and neuroexclusion in law.

We plan to conduct annual surveys to use as a benchmark for progress across legal education, training, and practice. We would like to see improved data and DEI monitoring e.g. through mandatory neurodiversity/neuroinclusion data and DEI monitoring.

Neurodiversikey® intends to engage with the relevant regulatory and professional bodies in order to effect change across law for neurodivergent people. Despite the surveys' somewhat narrow focus on neurodivergent law students and legal professionals, it is clear the issues raised are not isolated. The issues will no doubt impact neurodivergent clients and all other neurodivergent persons otherwise engaging with the legal sector, justice system, and legal education/training.

