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**Objectives:** Maximizing the learning potential of each student is the cornerstone of education. However, there is no linear formula, especially for students with exceptionalities. To students with intellectual disability (ID), education means more than academic success; it also means acquisition of daily living skills which has implications for independence and quality of life in adulthood. Their abilities to receive information across modalities (i.e., sensory processing) contribute to how well can they learn; for example, listening to teachers’ verbal instructions (i.e., auditory), or reading notes on blackboard (i.e., visual). With improved understanding of their sensory processing, the gateway at which information is received, it is possible to tailor the delivery of education for optimal learning outcome. Hence, the current study aims to characterize how students with ID receive information by characterizing their sensory processing and learning outcomes.

**Method:** Thirty-nine students, *Mage* = 14.93 (1.07), *Nmale* = 22, with Wechsler FSIQ lower than 70 were administered selected subtests of Wechsler Individual Achievement Test – 3rd Edition (WIAT-III). In order to resemble everyday classroom teaching (i.e., verbal instructions) and considering their difficulty to perform complex academic tasks, four subtests were selected to measure their learning outcomes: (i) Receptive Vocabulary, (ii) Oral Discourse Comprehension, (iii) Word Reading, and (iv) Math Fluency – Addition. Their sensory processing was assessed in the Short Form of Sensory Profile – 2nd Edition (SP-2), completed by their parents. Four multiple regression analyses were performed with each analysis includes one learning outcome and four types of sensory processing in SP-2.

**Results:** Among the four analyses for learning outcomes, one significant prediction was found in receptive vocabulary. Not only does sensory processing significantly correlate with receptive vocabulary (Sensitivity: *r* = -.424, *p* = .004; Seeking: *r* = -.527, *p* <.001; Registration: *r* = -.385, *p* = .008; Avoiding: *r* = -.302, *p =* -.302), it also accounts for 28.7% of variance in receptive vocabulary performance, *R2* = .287, *F* (4, 34) = 3.428, *p* = .019. Specifically, sensory seeking behaviors significantly and negatively predict receptive vocabulary (*β* = -1.30, *p* = .045). In other words, receptive vocabulary performance of students with ID reduces by 1.3 standard score for each increased point of seeking behavior.

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Students endorsed with sensory seeking are marked by their active approach to seek stimulation, as well as their need to receive intense and/or prolonged information. Given the inverse relationship between seeking and receptive vocabulary, seeking behaviors of students with ID should be capitalized by providing congruent sensory information. For example, their learning environment and instructions should be flooded with related information. This ensures the information they seek are channeled to teaching, which also ensures over-learning, an evidence-based teaching strategy for students with ID. In order to match the classroom environment with the teacher’s delivery, floating classroom routine may be a solution (e.g., each classroom dedicated to a subject and students switch rooms for classes). Other educational implications, secondary findings about sensory differences among students with ID, and possibility to develop learning profile by sensory processing are further explored.
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