Is Sensory Seeking Real? What the Research Actually Says

By Heidi Merricks, DNP, RN Med Ed Juris

If your child crashes into the couch on purpose, chews on everything, spins until you'd be sick, climbs what shouldn't be climbed, and seems *calmer* after doing all of it you may have heard the term **sensory seeking**. And if you've repeated that term at a school meeting, you may also have heard some version of: *"He's fine here." "She just needs to try harder." "That's not really a diagnosis."*

So is it real? Yes. Here's what the research actually supports including the parts that are still honestly debated.

What sensory seeking is

Sensory seeking means a child actively craves and creates intense sensory input movement, deep pressure, crashing, chewing, touch. In the framework most pediatric occupational therapists use (**Dunn's Sensory Processing Framework**, Dunn, 1997, 2001), it works like this: some children's nervous systems have a *high threshold* ordinary input barely registers. A child who doesn't register enough input doesn't just sit there under-stimulated. He goes and gets more. The seeking is the child's own attempt to regulate.

That last part matters: on this model, the behavior isn't defiance or poor discipline. It's a regulation strategy which is why giving the input *on purpose* (scheduled movement breaks, heavy work, deep pressure) usually reduces the disruptive version of the same behavior.

It's in the diagnostic manual

Sensory reactivity is written into the **DSM-5** diagnostic criteria for Autism Spectrum Disorder (Criterion B4) covering over-reactivity, under-reactivity, and unusual sensory interests, the category that includes craving movement and pressure, excessive touching, and fascination with movement. Sensory seeking isn't a casual label someone invented on the internet. It sits inside the formal diagnostic criteria.

It's also measurable. The **Sensory Profile** and **Sensory Processing Measure** standardized, validated tools used in school and clinic evaluations score seeking and under-responsivity directly. If your child's evaluation includes one of these, those scores are data, not opinion.

What the studies found

- **Ben-Sasson and colleagues (2009)**, reviewing studies of sensory symptoms in autism in a

meta-analysis, found sensory differences are significantly more common in autism than in typical development with some of the *largest* effects in the under-responsivity/seeking domain.

- **Tomchek & Dunn (2007)** found significant differences between children with and without autism across sensory domains, including seeking/under-responsivity items.
- **Baranek and colleagues (2006)** documented distinct sensory patterns including hyporesponsiveness and seeking using direct observation, not just parent report.
- **Miller, Schoen, and colleagues** measured children's *physiological* responses (electrodermal reactivity an autonomic nervous system measure) and found atypical responses to sensory input at the body level, not just in observed behavior. In other words: it's not only something adults notice. It's something instruments can measure.

The honest limits because you deserve those too

- The *explanation* (neurological thresholds, arousal set points) is a well-supported model, not settled neurology. No scan or blood test diagnoses sensory seeking; it's identified through validated questionnaires and observation.
- Whether sensory-based *therapies* work is a separate question from whether the behavior pattern exists and that evidence is mixed. The **American Academy of Pediatrics (2012)** advised caution about sensory integration therapies and recommended monitoring their effects; a later randomized trial (**Schaaf et al., 2014**) found gains on individualized goals. Reasonable professionals disagree about treatment. They do not disagree that the seeking pattern is real and measurable.
- The same behavior can mean different things in different children. A seeking interpretation should rest on *your child's own* evaluation data which is exactly why the scores in that evaluation report matter.

If a school dismisses it, try this

1. **Point to the data, not the label.** "His Sensory Processing Measure scored in the Definite Dysfunction range for proprioception and vestibular processing" lands differently than "he's a sensory seeker."

2. **Connect behavior to function.** Schools respond to impact: what happens to attention, task completion, and safety *after* the child gets movement input and what happens when he doesn't.

3. **Ask for the pattern in writing.** If the behavior "doesn't happen at school," ask what data supports that, and share what you track at home. Behavior across settings is supposed to be part of the picture.

The bottom line

Sensory seeking is a documented, measurable pattern defined in the OT literature, recognized in the DSM-5, and confirmed in study after study. Your child isn't broken, and you aren't imagining it.

When you understand what the research says, you can walk into the next meeting with evidence instead of just worry.

If your child's evaluation mentions sensory scores you don't fully understand, that's exactly the kind of record Med Ed Juris reviews translating evaluations and IEPs into plain language and a clear plan. Learn more at med-ed-juris.com.

References

- American Academy of Pediatrics (2012). Sensory integration therapies for children with developmental and behavioral disorders. *Pediatrics*, 129(6), 1186-1189.
- American Psychiatric Association (2013). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (5th ed.).
- Baranek, G. T., et al. (2006). Sensory Experiences Questionnaire: Discriminating sensory features in children with autism and developmental delays. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 47(6), 591-601.
- Ben-Sasson, A., et al. (2009). A meta-analysis of sensory modulation symptoms in individuals with autism spectrum disorders. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50(1-2), 1-11.
- Dunn, W. (1997). The impact of sensory processing abilities on the daily lives of young children and their families: A conceptual model. *Infants & Young Children*, 9(4), 23-35.
- Dunn, W. (2001). The sensations of everyday life: Empirical, theoretical, and pragmatic considerations. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 55(6), 608-620.
- Schaaf, R. C., et al. (2014). An intervention for sensory difficulties in children with autism: A randomized trial. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 44(7), 1493-1506.
- Schoen, S. A., Miller, L. J., Brett-Green, B. A., & Nielsen, D. M. (2009). Physiological and behavioral differences distinguish children with sensory modulation disorder. *Frontiers in Integrative Neuroscience*, 3, 11.
- Tomchek, S. D., & Dunn, W. (2007). Sensory processing in children with and without autism spectrum disorder. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 61(2), 190-200.