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Diversity is a foundational topic in psychology, and APA recommends that diversity is covered across the psychology curriculum. Neuroscience courses face challenges with incorporating diversity-related topics owing to the historical lack of neuroscience research that focuses on diversity and the restricted range of diversity-related topics that neuroscience is typically associated with (i.e., health and disability status). This may limit students’ learning of neuroscience’s contributions towards understanding diversity. We review some specific examples of diversity-related topics that can be incorporated into neuroscience courses. These examples have been selected to include topics across the three major content domains of neuroscience (cellular/molecular, neuroanatomy/systems, and cognitive/behavioral), as well as across multiple diversity-related topics. Neuroscience instructors can use these examples to incorporate greater coverage of diversity-related topics within their courses and/or as points of inspiration for their own curricular additions. Providing systematic coverage of diversity-related topics in neuroscience courses highlights the ways neuroscience advances our understanding of human diversity and contributes to the educational objectives of psychology and neuroscience programs.
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Diversity is conceptually rooted in the expression of differences, including those that might exist on the human, sociocultural, sociohistorical, and sociopolitical levels (American Psychological Association, 2013). This definition can also be expanded into more specific diversity-related topics such as “race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity and immigration status, and social class, among other sociocultural differences and distinctions” (APA, 2013, p. 12). The APA Principles for Quality Undergraduate Education in Psychology includes among its recommendations that “faculty ensure that diversity issues are carefully considered and infused throughout the curriculum” (American Psychological Association, 2011, p. 10), even in programs that have a stand-alone course on diversity (APA, 2013). Coverage of diversity-related topics in all courses, including biological psychology and neuroscience courses, is thus an essential feature of an education in psychology and/or neuroscience.

As a subfield of psychology (as well as other academic disciplines), neuroscience has historically faced challenges associated with diversity (along with psychology curriculums in general; Stoloff et al., 2010). Until recently, neuroscience research has rarely had a direct focus on topics of diversity, and this has influenced which people have become neuroscience researchers. In Lauer (2020)’s report on R01 award rates from 2011-2015, research assigned to the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities had the lowest overall award rate (9.1%) of the 23 institutes/centers identified (the National Institute on Aging was ranked 8th lowest with an award rate below 15%). In a study of the 2011-2015 fiscal year Type 1 (New) and Type 2 (Renewal) R01 applications, those from African American/Black scientists were skewed towards topics that were usually funded at a significantly lower rate than the National Institutes of Health (NIH) average, including topics connected with health disparities and patient-focused interventions (Hoppe et al., 2019). Taken together, these reports suggest that research on diversity-related topics (especially those with connections to minority health and aging) is less often funded, which can marginalize the careers of researchers who have specific interests in these topics. This may be one of many factors that accounts for previously reported NIH racial funding gaps in which African American/Black scientists receive lower rates of funding than White scientists (Ginther et al., 2011; Hoppe et al., 2019; Erosheva et al., 2020).

Additionally, Dworkin et al. (2020) examined authorship in top neuroscience journals and observed a gender imbalance until approximately 2015 in which papers with men listed as first and last authors appeared higher than those that included women in first and/or last authorship positions. Leaders in our field have expressed a commitment towards promoting and expanding diversity of researchers, boards, and reviewers to confront these challenges (Cell Editorial Team, 2020; Jones-London, 2020; Society for Neuroscience, 2020).

The diversity-related topics of race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity and immigration status, and social class (APA, 2013) and sex are rarely given priority when provisioning content in neuroscience courses (see Kerchner et al., 2012 for a listing of representative core competencies and basic knowledge topics in neuroscience). Instructional choices might reflect teachers’ desires to promote a sense of belonging or basic competency in their students by emphasizing the acquisition of basic content knowledge. Similarly, when diversity-
related topics are covered in neuroscience, there may be a bias in which the most common or directly relatable diversity-related topics are selected, such as “health and disability status” (which is closely related because of neuroscience’s focus on neurological disorders and psychopathologies) and “age” (which is closely related because of neuroscience’s focus on development and dementia). In APA’s 2014 report aimed at strengthening the core of introductory psychology courses, diversity-associated topics within the biological domain are most commonly aligned with “health and disability status” (p. 34), which supports this topic’s close relation with neuroscience. While it may be true that some courses align with some diversity-related topics especially well, we suggest that the same principles motivating the APA recommendations for a distribution of diversity coverage across courses in the curriculum might also apply to covering diversity-related topics throughout each course. Neuroscience should contribute to an understanding of human diversity that includes health and disability status, but also moves beyond that specific topic area, extending the literature that has emerged in recent years on diversity and neuroscience education (Linden and Wright, 2017; Linden et al., 2020; Neuwirth et al., 2021; Penner et al., 2021; Roth and Gavin, 2021).

The purpose of this manuscript is to present instructors with examples of topics that can be covered across neuroscience courses that have connections with the many diversity-related topics identified by the APA (2013): race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity and immigration status, and social class. We also include sex as an additional diversity-related topic when selecting examples. We focus here on content rather than methods because previous reports (e.g., Kite and Littleford, 2015) have detailed recommendations on effective teaching practices for diversity education. Our objective is not to overview all potential diversity connections appropriate for neuroscience courses, but rather to underscore some choice examples specifically distributed across the three major content areas of neuroscience (cellular/molecular, neuroanatomy/systems, and cognitive/behavioral) and the different diversity-related topics identified in APA (2013).

CELLULAR/MOLECULAR NEUROSCIENCE EXAMPLES

Cellular Reproduction, Telomeres, and Biomolecular Diversity

Telomerase is an enzyme implicated in preserving healthy cellular reproduction by maintaining chromosomal telomere (protective end caps on DNA) length during cell replication (Vaiserman and Krasnienkov, 2021). The embryonic brain contains high telomerase levels that becomes restricted only to stem cells and neuronal progenitors by adulthood, with changes in telomerase levels associated with shortened telomere length, cellular senescence, and degenerative aging disorders (Zhang et al., 2014; Liu et al., 2018).

This topic connects with the diversity-related topics of age and race, emphasizing the contribution of diverse psychosocial and environmental experiences to psychobiological development at the molecular level. In both humans and non-human animals, life-time psychosocial and environmental stressors may accelerate biological aging through changes in telomerase activity and alteration of telomere length, as measured in peripheral samples (e.g., buccal swabs) and in the brain (Asok et al., 2014; Starkweather et al., 2014; Rentscher et al., 2020). Among African Americans, increases in experiences of racial discrimination are associated with more rapid shortening of telomere length, suggesting that the psychosocial stress associated with discrimination contributes to more rapid biological aging (Lee et al., 2017; Chae et al., 2020). Furthermore, even though many racial/ethnic mental health disparities identified in young and middle-aged adults do not dissipate in old age, research examining life course epidemiology (i.e., how experiences earlier in life scaffold later life health) often neglects racial diversity as a moderating factor (Ferraro et al., 2017) and subsequently disregards its impact on healthy cellular aging. Observed differences in cellular/molecular processes could be used to frame discussion surrounding the implications of neglecting diversity-related factors in research on accelerated biological aging and racial health disparities.

See Supplemental Materials for an example exercise on cellular reproduction, telomeres, and biomolecular diversity.

Eugenics

Eugenics expanded the scope of genetics beyond the nucleus and to the level of societies. Francis Galton, a historical figure and proponent of eugenics, described the term as, “the science which deals with all influences that improve the inborn qualities of a race; also with those that develop them to the utmost advantage” (Galton, 1904, p. 1). During the 20th century, the scope of eugenics extended beyond the so-called “scientific” foundations of Galton into a movement that endorsed practices of sterilization and even euthanization of individuals with undesirable characteristics under the aim of enhancing human heritability (Pernick, 1997). This movement’s impact was especially strong in the United States, and later in Nazi Germany: over 400,000 individuals suffered eugenic sterilization across these two countries alone, and if we consider eugenics as a precursor to the Holocaust the toll in human lives surpasses six million (for a review, see Liscum and Garcia, 2022).

Covering the topic of eugenics provides an opportunity to examine how the extrapolation of basic scientific knowledge (genes and heritability) can lead to racial discrimination, mistreatment, and oppression of individuals of certain ethnic identities or religious affiliations. It can also be expanded further into the diversity-related topic of health and disability status, as per its connections with genetic screening and in-vitro fertilization. A foundational paper by Galton (1904) can be first examined for the purpose of defining and framing the misguided aims of the eugenics movement. Critical review of this manuscript might be followed by Glass and Stern (1986), a history on the scientific community’s response to eugenic propaganda in the early 20th century, Billings et al. (1992), who describe the impacts of genetic discrimination, and Resnik (1997), who discusses genetic inequalities and identifies human genetic engineering as a form of eugenics.
The learning objectives associated with such a review might include a better understanding of the role of genes in cell biology (as it applies to cognitive/behavioral development), as well as the importance of challenging theories and the way science is applied outside of the laboratory. The fact that genetics’ role in characterizing diversity across some dimensions (e.g., health and disability status) presents as less socially charged than the history of genetics in the sociocultural domain may also represent a point of discussion.

Eugenics can be connected more specifically with neuroscience through the genetic basis of brain development, an important area of evolutionary, comparative, and developmental psychobiology that explores the various genetic mechanisms that may contribute to neurological development (Gómez-Robles et al., 2015; Franchini, 2021). Changes in typical gene activity can result in various intellectual disorders like Down's syndrome, Fragile X syndrome, or Rett syndrome. Due to advancements in genetic screening technology, atypical psychobiological development associated with common genetic disabilities can be screened for during the preimplantation stage of invitro fertilization and/or prenatal periods of fetal development (Vermeesch et al., 2016; Sousa and Monteiro, 2022). These advancements have led to renewed discussion regarding the ethics of targeting and eliminating a population based on their genetic background or subsequent phenotypical characteristics (McCabe and McCabe, 2011; Thomas and Rothman, 2016). The culture and identity associated with intellectually disabled groups has a history of oppression and mistreatment from the government, scientific, and medical communities with eugenic efforts justified as a mechanism of advancing humanity’s genetic fitness (Grenon and Merrick, 2014; Yakushko, 2019; Ilyes, 2020). Genetic sequencing and evaluation of the phenotypic variations observed within genetic disorders like Fragile X syndrome can inform our understanding of typical development as well as other disabilities that present high phenotypic variations such as autism spectrum disorder (ASD), with research efforts aimed at developing gene therapies (Hampson et al., 2019; Shitik et al., 2020; Weuring et al., 2021). However, better understanding the genetic foundations of brain disorders might also increase the frequency of encountering ethical dilemmas associated with screening: for example, over the last two decades, specific genes have been linked to cerebral palsy (Fahey et al., 2017), a congenital disorder first characterized in the late 19th century (Panteliadis et al., 2013). These continuing challenges can be identified to promote discussion of the implications of screening for disabilities on the suppression of disadvantaged communities and cultures, potentially perpetuating discriminatory perinatal practices and impeding advancements in neurotherapeutic technologies.

**Dendritic Morphology, Health, and Aging**

Student instruction on cellular morphology may include an overview of the basic components of multipolar neurons, including the soma, dendrites, and axon. As students begin to understand the properties of the neuron and to draw connections between structure and function, there are opportunities to explore how differences in dendritic morphology might correspond with differences in cellular activity and individual health outcomes, especially at the intersection of the diversity-related topics of age and health and disability status.

Psychopharmacology is an area of neuroscience that incorporates both clinical and molecular approaches to understanding and ultimately treating psychological disorders. There is evidence to suggest that anti-depressive medication contributes to adaptive changes in dendritic morphology as a neurohistochemical mechanism of the treatment (Andrade and Rao, 2010; Pillai et al., 2012; Amellem et al., 2017). However, as patients age, these types of structural contributors to neuroplasticity show decline in their form and function (relative to younger subjects) in regions like the hippocampus, prefrontal cortex, and amygdala—regions implicated in depressive disorders (Leuba, 1983; Jacobs et al., 1997; Dickstein et al., 2013). Overall, dendritic spine density and size are reduced with aging which may lead to a general reduction in excitatory synaptic signaling in older neurons (Huang et al., 2020). Aging, however, may also result in cortical patterns of dendritic morphology similar to that observed in depression, such as dendritic regression in the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex but dendritic expansion in the amygdala (Dickstein et al., 2013; Sotoudeh et al., 2020; Gramuntell et al., 2021). Collectively, these studies highlight how aging, depression, and pharmacological treatment may be associated with changes in dendritic morphology.

This topic also lends itself well to introducing discussion regarding the effects of ageism in medical research and treatment. The molecular contributions to successful treatment of mood disorders are still poorly understood and most clinical drug trials exclude elderly/geriatric patients (Parikh, 2000; Zulman et al., 2011; Kuchel, 2019). Excluding older patients from clinical studies perpetuates a failure to account for age-related differences in neurological structure that may be important in determining a drug’s clinical effectiveness and may contribute to the slower/lower effectiveness of many antidepressants in older populations (Reynolds et al., 1996; Grigoriadis et al., 2003; Calati et al., 2013).

See Table 1 for more example topics and source materials in the cellular/molecular content domain.

**NEUROANATOMY/SYSTEMS**

**NEUROSCIENCE EXAMPLES**

**Historical Foundations of Neuroanatomy and Racism**

The history of studying neuroanatomy is characterized by using comparative studies to establish links between physiology and psychology. This has been marked with significant misinformation including racist, classist, and sexist interpretations of anatomical findings, thus connecting with the diversity-related topics of race, social class, and sex (as well as age).

J. W. Papez (most famous for his early characterization of the limbic circuits) attempted to correlate brain size and cortical gyrification with general intelligence, suggesting that
increased gyrification of specific subregions was positively associated with intelligence (Sabin, 2020). Papez’s conclusions were published and provided “experimental” evidence to support claims of intellectual inferiority based on socioeconomic status, race, and ethnicity (as reported in Sabin, 2020). His reports lacked any causal relationships to support his claims, with subsequent reports suggesting that although positively correlated, local gyrification accounts for little intellectual variance (Gregory et al., 2016), and relative gyrification actually decreases with age (Gregory et al., 2016; Cao et al., 2017).

Gyrification can be both positively and negatively associated with several of Papez’s social-cultural factors, depending on mediating factors like the stage of development when the brain is measured. In low socioeconomic groups, fetal gyrification is increased while juvenile gyrification is decreased (Jednoróg et al., 2012; Lu et al., 2021); however, growing up with high socioeconomic stress (i.e., urban vs. suburban) is not associated with levels of adult gyrification (Besteher et al., 2017). This comparison of historical and modern literature emphasizes how bigotry can influence scientific reporting and emphasizes the importance of proper hypothesis testing and ethical interpretation of data.

**Neuroplasticity**

The brain is shaped by experience (especially during development) and remains sensitive to the environment...
changes associated with the expression of mental illness (Kloet, 1989; Fuchs and Flügge, 1998), and cellular structural hippocampal neuron structure and function (Joels and De Zeeuw, 1994), as well as the impacts of the stress response in the development of metabolic syndrome (Rosmond, 2005), and broad engagement with diversity-related topics. Neuroplasticity can connect with health and disability status when exploring remapping of the cortex in, for example, amputees (e.g., Elbert et al., 1994), the visually impaired (e.g., Ferreira et al., 2017), and the hearing impaired (e.g., Retter et al., 2019). It can also be used to highlight the importance of early-life experiences (e.g., Wiesel and Hubel, 1977), stimulation of the nucleus basalis (auditory cortex; Kilgard and Merzenich, 1998), and finger amputation (somatosensory cortex; Weiss et al., 2000). Cortical remapping is thought to be the mechanism of recovery following treatments that involve visual perception of non-existent limbs, such as mirror box therapy (Tsao et al., 2016). These studies highlight that the brain is shaped by experience, and our diversity of experiences must lead to cortical maps that are themselves diverse and specific to individuals. In this respect, neuroplasticity connects with diversity in the broadest sense in that it describes differences among people.

Neuroplasticity is also associated with the more specific diversity-related topics outlined in APA (2013). Neuroplasticity can connect with health and disability status when exploring remapping of the cortex in, for example, amputees (e.g., Elbert et al., 1994), the visually impaired (e.g., Ferreira et al., 2017), and the hearing impaired (e.g., Retter et al., 2019). It can also be used to highlight the importance of early-life experiences (e.g., Wiesel and Hubel, 1977), stimulation of the nucleus basalis (auditory cortex; Kilgard and Merzenich, 1998), and finger amputation (somatosensory cortex; Weiss et al., 2000). Cortical remapping is thought to be the mechanism of recovery following treatments that involve visual perception of non-existent limbs, such as mirror box therapy (Tsao et al., 2016). These studies highlight that the brain is shaped by experience, and our diversity of experiences must lead to cortical maps that are themselves diverse and specific to individuals. In this respect, neuroplasticity connects with diversity in the broadest sense in that it describes differences among people.

Stress can also function as a foundation for broad engagement with a large range of diversity-related topics, including opportunities to engage with some of the rarer topics in neuroscience research such as race, culture, gender identity, sexual orientation, national identity, social class, and religious affiliation. With each of these topics, individuals with marginalized identities have historically undergone exposure to real (or perceived) threat, unpredictability, discrimination, inequity, and/or social isolation. Some examples of discussion topics include the effects of stress on aging-related cognitive decline in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) older adults (Correro and Nielson, 2020), physical health in LGBT individuals (Lick et al., 2013), cognitive impairment among racial minorities (Forrester et al., 2019; Stinchcombe and Hammond, 2021), and mental health in individuals with autism (Botha and Frost, 2020). Early-life adversity can lead to long-standing epigenetic changes in the BDNF gene, as well as others (for a review, see Roth and Sweatt, 2011). This establishes another downstream consequence of environmental stress applicable to chronically oppressed populations, and it may be worth discussing whether there is a genetic dimension to the cycle of poverty. In general, establishing a connection between the perception of environmental stressors and activation of the hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal axis grants opportunities to explore the immediate biological changes and long-term physiological outcomes experienced by people who have been disproportionately subjected to stress throughout history.

See Table 2 for more example topics and source materials in the neuroanatomy/systems neuroscience content domain.

**COGNITIVE/BEHAVIORAL NEUROSCIENCE EXAMPLES**

**Social Neuroscience**

At the intersection between neuroscience and social psychology, researchers are interested in examining the biological mechanisms of topics such as theory of mind, empathy, and social decisions (for a review, see Singer, 2012). Findings in this field have expanded our...
### Table 2. Examples of diversity-related topic connections in neuroanatomy/systems neuroscience. Diversity-related topics selected from: race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity, and social class (adapted from APA, 2013), as well as sex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Topic</th>
<th>Diversity-Related Topics</th>
<th>Example Source Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain structure</td>
<td>Age, Health and disability status, Sex, Social Class</td>
<td>Pfefferbaum et al. (1994); Bishop and Wahlsten (1997); Salat et al. (2004); Raz and Rodrigue (2006); Leonard et al. (2008); Jednoróg et al. (2012); Luby et al. (2013); Brito and Noble (2014); Ruigrok et al. (2014); Noble et al. (2015); Gregory et al. (2016); Besteher et al. (2017); Cao et al. (2017); Farah (2017); Rezzani et al. (2019); Spreng and Turner (2019); Lu et al. (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroplasticity, development, and injury</td>
<td>Age, Ethnicity, Health and disability status, Race</td>
<td>Wiesel and Hubel (1965); Hubel et al. (1977); Fox (1992); Elbert et al. (1994); Flor et al. (1995); Weiss et al. (2000); Zhang et al. (2001); Arango-Lasprilla and Kreutzer (2010); Wittenberg (2010); Tsao et al. (2016); Ferreira et al. (2017); Retter et al. (2019); Makin and Flor (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The stress response</td>
<td>Age, Gender identity/expression, Health and disability status, Race, Religious affiliation, Sex, Sexual orientation, Social class</td>
<td>Sapolsky (1999); Nichols et al. (2001); McEwen (2005); Rosmond (2005); Lick et al. (2013); Lehrner et al. (2014); McEwen (2017); Forrester et al. (2019); Correrio and Nielson (2020); Flentje et al. (2020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding of social behaviors by highlighting some of the biological mechanisms that correspond with prejudices, biases, and how we view people who are different from us. Social neuroscience connects with the diversity-related topics of race, ethnicity, and age.

Exposure to other-race individuals impacts the organization of the brain and affects our perception of non-familiar people. Like other systems, social recognition systems can be altered with experience and change over the course of the lifespan. During infancy, facial recognition accuracy and activity in fusiform face area (FFA) is similar between own- and other-race faces, however by adulthood both recognition accuracy and FFA response is increased for own-race faces (Lei et al., 2020; Golarai et al., 2021). Childhood exposure to other races can eliminate cross-race effects (i.e., changes in recognition ability based on viewer-subject race) on facial recognition, but there is a sensitive period that closes during adolescence (about 12 years old; McKone et al., 2019) during which this exposure is beneficial.

There are significant social outcomes associated with the development of this system; theoretical explanations of the cross-race effect suggest that impoverished cognitive processing of other races stem from lack of significant social contact with those groups (Brigham et al., 2007; McKone et al., 2019), connecting with the topic of neuroplasticity. Understanding how early experiences influence the maturation of social recognition systems can inform discussions regarding the impact of previous interracial experiences on implicit racial/ethnic biases in adulthood.

### Neuroscience and the Legal System

Jones (2013) highlights a newly emerging applied domain of neuroscience within the legal system, where an understanding of the brain both resolves old issues (e.g., using fMRI to facilitate diagnosis of criminals entering an insanity plea) and poses new ones (e.g., if a participant in a crime takes a drug that has been shown to impair memory). Understanding brain function has direct relevance in appraising legal topics, such as decision-making and memory, as well as the operations of the judicial system.

Decision-making can be altered under threatening conditions, and activity in emotion-associated brain regions and systems can influence decision-making (Bechara et al., 1999; Bechara and Damasio, 2005; Ohira et al., 2013). This has special relevance when considered in the context of appraising individuals, such as law enforcement officers or soldiers, who are forced to respond under uncertain conditions and when facing either real or perceived threats.

Memory is also an important topic area in the legal domain because of retention and retrieval processes that are invoked during questioning and examination of witnesses. Consolidation and reconsolidation require protein synthesis, and memories that have been recently retrieved may be especially vulnerable to disruption for several hours (Nader et al., 2000; Schafe and LeDoux,
2000). Additionally, stress has different effects on memory consolidation (enhancement) and retrieval (impairment; Roozendaal, 2002), which has direct implications for eyewitnesses who are subjected to stress immediately after witnessing a crime or prior to retrieval. Additionally, memory processes may interact with social cognition effects previously described; cross-race effects and racial biases further diminish reliability of eyewitness testimony and increase racial inequities in criminal justice (Brigham et al., 2007; Vitriol et al., 2019). This topic is thus connected with diversity-related topics such as race and ethnicity, and when considering broader applications of law (such as appraising the decision-making abilities of individuals under the influence of drugs or suffering from drug addiction) there are further connections with the diversity-related topic of health and disability status.

Course topics might explore how the cross-race effect and variations in lineup protocols (e.g., single vs. multiple retrieval/consolidation sessions) alter declarative eyewitness recognition memory using research involving subject lineups (e.g., Wells et al., 2015; Vitriol et al., 2019). See Supplemental Materials for an example exercise on declarative memory and eyewitness testimony.

Neurotypicals, Neurominorities, and Neurodiversity

Neuroscience aims to both describe the normal function of the brain and characterize the nature of brain dysfunction giving rise to disorders such as Parkinson’s, Alzheimer’s, epilepsy, and schizophrenia. These disorders are often introduced as variations of normal activity: for example, the dopamine hypothesis of schizophrenia suggests that the illness is caused by overactivation of some dopamine receptors, suggesting that there is a level of dopamine activity that is effective for brain function and that level is exceeded in schizophrenics. While it may be common to explain divergences in this way, neuroscience instructors are presented with the unique opportunity to discuss and challenge the concept of “neurotypical” vs. “neurodivergent” brains.

Walker (2013) addressed the categorization of “normal” vs. “non-normal” brains, claiming that this characterization is scientifically unsound and socially destructive in much the same way that a contrast between “transgender” vs. “normal” might be perceived different than “transgender” vs. “cisgender”. Challenging the pathology paradigm, Walker recommends the use of “neurotypical”, “neurodiversity”, and “neurominority” as part of a new vocabulary to avoid automatic judgments of abnormality that emerge in the common vernacular.

“Neurotypical” is a term with foundations in the literature on ASD that has been used to identify individuals who are “typically developing” (e.g., Sasson et al., 2017) or “nonclinical” (e.g., Di Martino et al., 2009), which is to say, individuals that have not been diagnosed with ASD. Walker (2013) identifies that this term refers to members of the “dominant neurological group” without calling those group members “normal” (which reinforces privilege associated with membership in that group). In this sense, using the term “neurotypical” can be similarly useful for offering comparisons between dominant and nondominant neurological groups without imparting the privilege inherent in the term “normal”. For example, if discussion of an experiment was introduced as a comparison of neural activity in dyslexic patients vs. neurotypical individuals, this framing identifies the relevant comparison groups without further marginalizing those suffering from dyslexia.

The term “neurominority” can simply refer to people who are not neurotypical without pathologizing those individuals (Walker, 2013). Examples of neurominorities include individuals with dyslexia, ASD, developmental coordination disorder, neurological illness, and brain injury (Doyle, 2020), which demonstrates how this term can be applied across developmental and non-developmental dimensions. The term “neurominorities” has the benefit of being neutral and statistically grounded (Doyle, 2020), as well as non-pathologizing (Walker, 2013).

“Neurodiversity” could be interpreted in the most literal sense as differences in brains/nervous systems. Walker (2013) defines it as “the diversity among minds”, which aligns with this definition while also emphasizing the cognitive functions of the nervous system. The range of conditions that have been used under the umbrella term of neurodiversity ranges from depression to Tourette’s Syndrome (doe, 2020), which demonstrates how the term has been applied broadly. Importantly, like the other terms discussed in this section, it is non-pathologizing and avoids the generation of prejudice that comes from identifying something as “flawed” (Krcek, 2013). in the context of the ASD literature, however, this term’s meaning must be considered and is essential for its proper usage.

Neurodiversity as a term has its roots in the neurodiversity movement. This movement emphasizes acceptance of the differences among individuals’ brains and an appreciation and respect for neurological diversity on the same level as other forms of diversity, such as sex, sexual orientation, and race (Ortega, 2009; Krcek, 2013). The term itself implicitly acknowledges how neurodiversity provides benefits to societies in the same sense that biodiversity provides benefits to ecosystems (Doyle, 2020). For these reasons, the term neurodiversity is beneficial when contextualizing differences in peoples’ neurology or abilities but should not be used simply as a substitute for the word “neuropathology”.

Where does neurodiversity fall among our more specific diversity-related topics? We propose that the closest alignment is with health and disability status specifically because the use of the term has been expanded beyond the ASD community to describe differences in mental health (Doyle, 2020). Using this term only to identify brain differences as sources of disability, however, would be incomplete and contrary to its origins. The very need for a term such as neurodiversity raises questions about the stigmatization of dysfunction within the nervous system (including discussion of whether “disfunction” is an appropriate term in all cases, or when/where the term “disability” is appropriate vs. marginalizing). This subject thus invites opportunities for critical thinking about the utility of labels in biology, neuroscience, and psychology, especially when it comes to characterizing differences associated with health and disability status.
As highlighted in this section, some of the commonly used descriptors in our field, including “abnormal”, “normal”, “better”, and “worse” are worth revisiting for the sake of reducing the further marginalization of minority groups, and for the sake of accuracy. “Normal” carries privilege, and the outcome of the continued use of the term is the legitimization and reinforcement of that privilege. As a matter of accuracy, what may be “normal” in one specific situation, national context, or ethnic culture may not be “normal” in another. The same applies when using terms such as “better” or “worse” to describe elements of the nervous system, thoughts, or behaviors, which may vary a great deal across sociocultural environments without conferring universal benefits or harms. Increasing the use of the terms “typical” and “minority” and empirically accurate and non-privileged descriptors for performance and physiology such as “high” and “low”, will help scientists and educators to support student development towards understanding the necessity of diversity in the global neuroscientific enterprise.

See Table 3 for more example topics and source materials in the cognitive/behavioral neuroscience content domain.

EXPERIENCES WITH INCORPORATION OF DIVERSITY-RELATED TOPICS AND STUDENT FEEDBACK

The purpose of this manuscript has been to identify some choice examples of connections between neuroscience and the diversity-related topics identified in the APA (2013): race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity and immigration status, and social class, in addition to the diversity-related topic of sex. Enhancing the incorporation of diversity-related topics will be an ongoing process that will be unique for each instructor in accordance with their own instructional models, classroom environments, and institutional support. The following is a summary of experiences with/student feedback regarding the incorporation of diversity-related topics in neuroscience courses, offered with the hope that it may provide guidance for those engaged in course adaptations and development.

In terms of course planning, it has been beneficial to emphasize connections with diversity-related topics throughout the term, compared with planning coverage of diversity-related topics within a single day or week. This design philosophy is theoretically grounded in the recommendations of APA (2011), as well as Kite and Littleford (2015), who identify that diversity should be incorporated as a topic throughout the curriculum. The reasons for doing so, which include better understanding human behaviors and normalizing education about marginalized groups (Kite and Littleford, 2015), are also valid when considering content coverage in a single course (see Supplemental Materials for an example 12-week schedule for an introductory neuroscience course).

Major integrative assignments (e.g., end-of-the-semester term papers, group projects) that offer opportunities to explore neuroscience’s contributions towards understanding diversity have proven effective. The weight of these assignments can emphasize the significance of understanding diversity and diversity-related topics as a major aim in neuroscience and might further motivate students to be attentive towards those connections throughout the term. An example of an assignment that could accomplish this would be a term paper that allows students to identify and explain connections among various concepts throughout the course and some of the diversity-related topics identified in APA (2013).

There are clear benefits to offering opportunities for students to engage with diversity-related topics in a way that respects their individual interests and motivations. Students might be hesitant to publicly identify or contribute their perspectives on diversity-related topics for a variety of reasons, including personal privacy. Additionally, it is important to recognize how the changes in the educational landscape during the COVID-19 pandemic might influence students’ willingness to contribute publicly, especially in online courses and/or recorded classrooms because of the visibility and permanency of those contributions. Even as instructors work towards normalizing and building classroom environments that support effective conversations about diversity-related topics, it can be beneficial to offer student-focused opportunities for engagement in non-public venues. Perhaps this will make discussion in public settings more common; it is essential, however, to maintain respect for student privacy and growth throughout this process. It is our hope that greater incorporation of diversity-related topics as core content in the curriculum will continue to make space for these public and private contributions.

Student feedback to these implementations has been positive. One of the authors includes, in their introductory neuroscience course, an opportunity for students to watch a pre-recorded interview with a neuroscientist from a historically underrepresented demographic describing her experience in the field. This has received favorable responses from students, who have used this as an opportunity to reflect upon their own identities and experiences with diversity-related challenges. Student feedback can also be interpreted through their behaviors, such as voluntary assignment selections and the substance of their written submissions. When examining these responses broadly, it appears that students in the introductory neuroscience course less frequently selected assignments specifically framed as focusing on diversity-related topics (e.g., an essay on racial justice, which accounted for 21% of essay topic selections in a retroactive examination of the fall 2020, spring 2021, and fall 2021 semesters). Students still often touched on diversity-related topics in the context of the assignments they more frequently chose to complete (e.g., an essay on the COVID-19 pandemic, which accounted for 50% of essay topic selections across the same three semesters). This suggests that students have an interest in examining diversity-related topics in neuroscience courses, even when they are not identifying diversity as the specific focus of their All domains of psychology and neuroscience should contribute to student education on diversity. Across the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Topic</th>
<th>Diversity-Related Topics</th>
<th>Example Source Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social neuroscience</td>
<td>Ethnicity, Race</td>
<td>Singer (2012); Tetlock et al. (2013); McCutcheon et al. (2018); Influs et al. (2019); McKone et al. (2019); Golarai et al. (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience and the legal system</td>
<td>Health and disability status</td>
<td>Jones (2013); Jones et al. (2013); Meynen (2013); Jones et al. (2014); Meixner (2015); Petoft (2015); Aono et al. (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurotypicals, neurominorities, and neurodiversity</td>
<td>Gender identity/expression, Health and disability status, Sexual orientation</td>
<td>Ortega (2009); Krcek (2013); Walker (2013); Egner et al. (2019); Doyle (2020); Doyle and McDowall (2021); Walker and Raymaker (2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology and health disparities</td>
<td>Ethnicity, Health and disability status, Race</td>
<td>Brosschot et al. (2006); Freedenthal (2007); Williams and Mohammed (2009); Jackson et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status and developmental neuroscience</td>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>Noble et al. (2005); Farah et al. (2006); Noble et al. (2007); Raizada et al. (2008); Hackman and Farah (2009); Hackman et al. (2010); Lipina and Posner (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging, memory, and cognition</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Cabeza et al. (1997); Cabeza et al. (2002); Cappell et al. (2010); Stemmer (2010); Metzler-Baddeley et al. (2011); Pascual-Leone et al. (2011); Tomasi and Volkow (2012); Mander et al. (2013); Gutchess (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex and gender in cognitive neuroscience</td>
<td>Age, Ethnicity, Gender identity/expression, Health and disability status, Sex, Social class</td>
<td>Hausmann and Güntürkün (2000); Parsons et al. (2005); Hausmann et al. (2009); Miller and Cronin-Golomb (2010); Lei et al. (2012); Christov-Moore et al. (2014); Levine et al. (2016); Jäncke (2018)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Examples of diversity-related topic connections in cognitive/behavioral neuroscience. Diversity-related topics selected from: race, ethnicity, gender identity/expression, sexual orientation, age, religious affiliation, health and disability status, national identity, and social class (adapted from APA, 2013), as well as sex.

three major content domains of neuroscience (cellular/molecular, neuroanatomy/systems, and cognitive/behavioral), there are many opportunities to provide course content that addresses the spectrum of diversity-related topics identified by the APA (2013). Distributing coverage of diversity-related topics in this manner both enhances the quality of neuroscience education and helps students recognize the depth of neuroscience’s contributions to the understanding of human diversity.
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