RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

The brain today: neuroscience and the education of neurodivergent minds

O cérebro na atualidade: neurociência e educação de mentes neurodivergentes

El cerebro en la actualidad: neurociencia y educación de mentes neurodivergentes

Arthur Coradini Pin – Doctoral student in Educational Sciences at Christian Business School (CBS), United States. E-mail: coradini88@gmail.com. Lattes CV: http://lattes.cnpq.br/4985175886145524
Institutional address: 7345 W Sand Lake Rd, STE 210, Office 512, Orlando, FL 32819, United States.
2026

Abstract:
Arthur Coradini Pin dismantles the illusion that learning depends on a standardized brain structure. By investigating the intersection between neurobiology and educational practice, drawing on the principles of inhibitory control and cognitive flexibility proposed by Adele Diamond (2013), this work reveals how the traditional educational system, by insisting on models of uniformity, blocks the development of minds that process the world at different frequencies. The author presents an in-depth, well-grounded analysis of how autism, ADHD and dyslexia function as unique neural architectures, offering a technical guide to transforming learning environments into spaces for high cognitive performance aligned with the management of mental load (Sweller, 1988).
The book goes beyond diagnosis by offering targeted neuroeducation strategies that respect students' biological timing, sensory regulation and motivational circuits, also drawing on the principles of multimodal instructional design (Mayer, 2014). Through a continuous transition between scientific evidence and practical application, Arthur Coradini Pin demonstrates that academic success and the expression of human potential arise from intelligently adapting the environment rather than correcting the individual. This is a rigorous invitation to educators, therapists and families who wish to abandon the pedagogy of exclusion and embrace an approach focused on diversity as the true driving force behind innovation and practical ingenuity.

Resumo:
Arthur Coradini Pin desmantela a ilusão de que a aprendizagem depende de uma estrutura cerebral padronizada. Ao investigar a intersecção entre neurobiologia e prática educativa, ancorando-se nos princípios de controle inibitório e flexibilidade cognitiva propostos por Adele Diamond (2013), a obra revela como o sistema educacional tradicional, ao insistir em modelos de uniformidade, bloqueia o desenvolvimento de mentes que processam o mundo sob frequências distintas. O autor apresenta uma análise densa e fundamentada sobre como o autismo, o TDAH e a dislexia operam como arquiteturas neurais únicas, oferecendo um guia técnico para transformar ambientes de ensino em espaços de alta performance cognitiva alinhados à gestão da carga mental (Sweller, 1988).
A leitura transcende o campo do diagnóstico ao oferecer estratégias cirúrgicas de neuroeducação que respeitam o tempo biológico, a regulação sensorial e os circuitos motivacionais do estudante, amparando-se também nos princípios de design instrucional multimodal (Mayer, 2014). Através de uma transição contínua entre a evidência científica e a aplicação prática, Arthur Coradini Pin demonstra que o sucesso acadêmico e a expressão do potencial humano não surgem da correção do indivíduo, mas da adaptação inteligente do meio. Este é um convite rigoroso para educadores, terapeutas e familiares que desejam abandonar a pedagogia da exclusão e abraçar uma abordagem focada na diversidade como o motor real de inovação e genialidade prática.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Resumen:
Arthur Coradini Pin desmonta la ilusión de que el aprendizaje depende de una estructura cerebral estandarizada. Al investigar la intersección entre la neurobiología y la práctica educativa, apoyándose en los principios de control inhibitorio y flexibilidad cognitiva propuestos por Adele Diamond (2013), la obra revela cómo el sistema educativo tradicional, al insistir en modelos de uniformidad, bloquea el desarrollo de mentes que procesan el mundo en frecuencias distintas. El autor presenta un análisis profundo y fundamentado sobre cómo el autismo, el TDAH y la dislexia funcionan como arquitecturas neuronales únicas, ofreciendo una guía técnica para transformar los entornos de enseñanza en espacios de alto rendimiento cognitivo alineados con la gestión de la carga mental (Sweller, 1988).
La lectura trasciende el ámbito del diagnóstico al ofrecer estrategias precisas de neuroeducación que respetan el ritmo biológico, la regulación sensorial y los circuitos motivacionales del estudiante, apoyándose también en los principios del diseño instruccional multimodal (Mayer, 2014). A través de una transición continua entre la evidencia científica y la aplicación práctica, Arthur Coradini Pin demuestra que el éxito académico y la expresión del potencial humano no surgen de corregir al individuo, sino de adaptar inteligentemente el entorno. Esta es una invitación rigurosa a educadores, terapeutas y familiares que desean abandonar la pedagogía de la exclusión y adoptar un enfoque centrado en la diversidad como el verdadero motor de la innovación y la genialidad práctica.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Contents

Synopsis
Chapter 1: fundamentals of cognition and the functioning brain
Chapter 2: processing patterns: an analysis of typical brains
Chapter 3: mapping neurodivergence: autism, ADHD and dyslexia
Chapter 4: specialized neural architectures: the mechanisms of each profile
Chapter 5: limitations of the traditional school model in addressing neurodivergence
Chapter 6: neuroplasticity and the potential for change throughout life
Chapter 7: neuroeducation practices grounded in scientific evidence
Chapter 8: the impact of the environment and sensory experience on cognition
Chapter 9: neural circuits of emotion and motivation in learning
Chapter 10: practical perspectives: stories of neurodivergent students
Chapter 11: neurobiological challenges on the path to diagnosis and equity
Chapter 12: toward education centered on diversity
Conclusion
References
Biography

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 1: fundamentals of cognition and the functioning brain

The architecture of the mind begins in a microscopic event of surgical precision. When learning occurs, the brain not only stores information, it permanently changes its physical topography through the creation and strengthening of synaptic connections, corroborating the premise that structural plasticity is the foundation of cognitive change (CANDEL, 2021). Imagine the neuron as a processing unit that needs to communicate with its neighbors to build a complex thought. This communication occurs in the narrow space of the synaptic cleft, where electrical signals are converted into chemical messengers whose efficiency defines the consolidation of new skills (LENT, 2010).

Neural plasticity acts as the mechanism of adjustment of this system. It responds to repetition and emotional impact, forcing the brain to decide which communication routes deserve to be preserved and which ones can be discarded or neglected (SCHNEIDER, 2018). The synaptic strengthening, known as long-term potentiation, is the process by which neurons that fire together connect with greater strength, resembling the opening of a trail in a dense forest paved by the constant repetition of neural activity (BLISS; LOMO, 1973). The first step is difficult and takes effort, but as the journey becomes frequent, the path becomes natural.

Memory is not a static file located on an isolated shelf. It arises from the integration of different brain regions that activate in unison to give meaning to an experience. The consolidation of this information depends on a continuous dialogue between the hippocampus, responsible for initial coding, and the cortex, where knowledge is permanently stored (SQUIRE, 2004). During this process, information is refined and stabilized, transforming from a labile and vulnerable memory into something integrated into the long-term data base of the individual. Failure in consolidation does not indicate intellectual incapacity, but only a temporary misfit in the cadence with which these systems communicate.

In this scenario, neurotransmitters act as regulators of learning intensity. Substances such as dopamine function as a reward sign that marks the event as important, signaling to the brain that that synaptic path should be prioritized and sustaining cognitive engagement (SCHULTZ, 2015). The lack of adequate regulation of these substances profoundly alters the way attention is maintained and how cognitive effort is invested. It is not just a matter of will or focus, but a chemical orchestration that supports the brain's ability to remain engaged in a stimulus (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). When brain chemistry favors stability, memory consolidation becomes a fluid process. When there are variations in this balance, learning requires different strategies to achieve the same goal.

Brain development crosses biological windows of opportunity, known as critical or sensitive periods. At these times, the brain demonstrates an exceptional opening to sculpt connections in specific areas, such as language processing or sensory development (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). After these intervals, plasticity does not disappear, but the way the brain absorbs new information becomes more selective and dependent on circuits already established to save metabolic energy (DEHAENE, 2012). Understanding these mechanisms is the first step towards respecting individual rhythms, recognizing that each mind operates under distinct biological pressures. Learning is a continuous construction, shaped by a chemical infrastructure that, far from being a fixed destination, is a dynamic system in constant reformulation before the demands of the environment. The challenge is not to alter the brain so that it fits an external pattern, but to use this inherent flexibility to provide the necessary support for the effective consolidation of new networks. Each strengthened connection represents a real gain in the autonomy of the individual, proving that the biological basis of learning is, above all, an invitation to explore potentials that have not yet been fully mapped.

The integration of sensory, motor and cognitive information does not occur in an isolated central command, but through a distributed network that covers vast extensions of the cerebral cortex. When an individual observes an object and decides to interact with it, the brain simultaneously mobilizes visual areas in the occipital lobe, motor planning centers in the frontal lobes and parietal association areas that process the spatial location. The coherence of this phenomenon depends on the temporal synchrony of these regions, operating in an analogous manner to an orchestra where different instruments must play at the exact time for the melody of perception to make sense (DAMASIO, 1994). If there is a delay in communication between visual processing and motor control, the world experience loses its fluidity and becomes fragmented.

This orchestration depends on bundles of nerve fibers that function as high-speed highways, connecting hemispheres and distant areas. The efficiency of transmission in these pathways, often coated with myelin to ensure the speed of the signal, determines the cognitive agility of a subject (DEHAENE, 2012). In complex learning situations, such as the development of reading, this integration reaches its peak. The brain needs to decode visual symbols, convert these signals into corresponding sounds, access semantic meaning, and articulate the motor response required for speech or writing. This task requires the brain to recruit neural networks scattered throughout its architecture, transforming a simple sensory input into an elaborate cognitive response.

Plasticity, although essential, is only the means by which these networks are consolidated. What defines the real competence of a neural system is its ability to manage background noise during integration (BADDELEY, 2007). The brain is constantly being bombarded by sensory stimuli that have no immediate relevance to the task being performed. The mechanism responsible for filtering this excess of information and allowing focal networks to remain active is one of the most critical foundations of functional intelligence. Without active inhibition of irrelevant stimuli, the main neural network would suffer interference, making the integration of sensory information an exhaustive and ineffective task.

It is in the orchestration between sensory input and the response that the profile of each mind begins to outline. Some brain systems demonstrate a remarkable ease in integrating auditory and visual stimuli concomitantly, while others favor specific sensory routes, adapting the construction of knowledge to this preferred path. This variation in network architecture does not imply dysfunction, but reveals that brain topography is plastic enough to accommodate different processing strategies. When the school or learning environment ignores this distribution of networks, it often imposes a unique model of integration that can be incompatible with the way the brain of certain individuals naturally organizes their perception.

The processing of information gains solidity when the individual manages to connect the new data to its basis of prior knowledge, a process called semantic coding (VYGOTSKY, 1978). The brain not only records facts; it actively searches for anchor points in existing neural networks. If the new information finds a well-structured network, integration is rapid and consolidation becomes lasting. When information is presented in isolation, without this web of connections, the brain faces difficulties to keep it available, leading to forgetfulness or superficiality in learning. Therefore, effective cognition depends less on the capacity of gross absorption and more on the ability of the system to weave relationships between what is already known and what is being processed at the present time.

The neural architecture thus reaffirms its dynamic nature. Each learning attempt activates a specific network that, when repeated, becomes more efficient in internal communication. In time, what began as a conscious effort to integrate vision, movement and meaning becomes an automatic and intuitive process (ANDERSON, 1982). This transition from deliberate activation to subconscious fluidity is the triumph of network consolidation. The human brain, in its incessant search for energy saving and effectiveness, specializes in these integration routes, allowing the individual to release cognitive capacity for more complex challenges, sustaining the continuous growth of mental skills throughout life.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Human learning architecture is sensitive to biological chronology. The brain is not a static structure that maintains the same capacity for absorption and transformation throughout all the decades of life. There are temporal windows, scientifically called critical and sensitive periods, which define moments of maximum plasticity for specific functions. During early childhood, the central nervous system operates in an exceptional state of readiness for the acquisition of fundamental skills, such as maternal language phonetics or fine visual acuity. The brain, at this stage, acts as a sponge that rearranges its circuits in direct response to the environment. This is not a conscious choice of the individual, but a biological imperative that dictates the ease with which new networks are woven.

The closure of these critical periods does not mean the end of the ability to learn, but inaugurates a distinct stage of operation. When the basic circuits are established, the brain moves to a more efficient form of processing, based on the consolidation and specialization of the pathways that have been intensely used. It is as if the construction of the foundations of a building was replaced by the maintenance and decoration of specific rooms. The adult brain still modifies its topography, but this change requires a greater investment of attention and emotional engagement, because the neural system prioritizes the stability of existing networks to save metabolic energy.

The concept of a sensitive period reveals, therefore, that education needs to be adjusted to the stage of development of the nervous system. Trying to teach complex abilities long before biological readiness can be ineffective and frustrating for the child, just as insisting on standardized methods after consolidation of certain neural pathways ignores cortex maturity. Learning in adults, although more selective, gains depth through association, while in childhood it depends on pure and repeated sensory exposure. The recognition of these stages allows educators and therapists to align their expectations to the physiological reality of the student, focusing on strengthening the connections that the moment of life favors.

This transition between high malleability phases to skills refinement is what explains the variation in lifelong learning agility. Neuroscience suggests that as we get older, myelination of brain circuits reduces the speed of signal dispersion, making communication between neurons more precise, but also more rigid. To maintain the ability to acquire new knowledge, the brain uses the recruitment of higher-order cognitive areas. Instead of relying solely on crude sensory plasticity, adults use memory strategies and logical reasoning to compensate for the need to shape new neural pathways. This is the foundation of late neuroplasticity: the ability to reorganize through conscious thinking and intention.

Understanding these biological cycles brings a direct practical consequence for inclusion. When an individual has a neurodivergent development, the closure or opening of these critical periods may follow an atypical chronology. The brain may remain in a phase of high sensory receptivity for longer or present an early maturation peak in specific areas. By ignoring these temporal differences, the educational system ends up imposing a unique rhythm, generating a disconnect between the challenge presented and the biological capacity of the student at that time. The true effectiveness in teaching consists in diagnosing which window the student's brain is in and adapting the stimulus to find the path of less resistance, allowing the plasticity still available to be directed precisely.

Learning is ultimately the result of an interaction between genetic heritage, the subject's stimulation history and the architecture of the networks he built along these development windows. The contemporary challenge is not to force the brain to learn as if it were always a child, nor to accept the rigidity of the adult as an insurmountable limit, but to explore the windows of opportunity that remain open. At each stage of life, the nervous system offers a different gateway to knowledge. Those who learn to identify these biological openings can sustain cognitive development far beyond statistical predictions, transforming the brain itself into a tool that refines itself as time passes, regardless of chronological age.

When the pace of biological development differs from the expected average, the traditional school structure often becomes an insurmountable obstacle. The discrepancy between the neural maturity of a student and the cognitive demands imposed by the curriculum generates a systemic failure. In cases of neurodivergence, such as ADHD or dyslexia, the child may have the necessary skills for learning, but the process of maturation of circuits crucial for the regulation of attention or phonological processing occurs under a proper schedule (BARKLEY, 1997; SNYDERMAN, 2019). When the pedagogical environment does not recognize this temporality, the student's nervous system enters a state of chronic stress, blocking the consolidation of memory and impairing the ability to integrate information.

The practical application of neuroscience in the classroom begins with the flexibility of timeframes. If a student demonstrates an enlarged plasticity window for visual processing, but presents a delay in maturation of motor inhibition circuits, the focus should be shifted. Instead of demanding a sitting and static behavior that the brain is not yet physically equipped to sustain, therapeutic and curricular intervention should allow the information to be accessed through more accessible sensory pathways. Replacing a purely expository class with tasks that use visual support and object manipulation is not a concession, but a technical adjustment to bypass a development bottleneck.

Successful intervention strategies treat the classroom as an adaptation laboratory. Teachers who understand the biological basis of learning observe, for example, that cognitive fatigue in students with different sensory profiles occurs differently. While the class can keep the attention in a silent reading task for thirty minutes, the brain of a dyslexic student, when performing the same effort, consumes a significantly higher amount of glucose and synaptic effort, due to the need for neural compensation to decode symbols. In these cases, effective school management is not increasing task time, but fragmenting the content into smaller blocks with sensory regulation intervals, allowing neural networks to stabilize before a new information input cycle.

The transition to an efficient educational model requires that the diagnosis of development divergence is never read as a limitation sentence, but as an instruction manual for learning design. When the physical environment, such as lighting or acoustic organization, ignores the needs of a hypersensitive nervous system, the student spends most of his energy on filtering, leaving little resource for the processing of pedagogical content. Adjusting the environment means reducing the superfluous processing load, allowing cerebral plasticity to be directed towards the central educational goal. The support, therefore, is a traffic facilitator, ensuring that the important neural signal is not lost in noise.

In therapeutic and school contexts, monitoring should focus on the effectiveness of compensation networks. When the brain does not use the conventional path to a skill, it creates fascinating shortcuts through other cortical areas. A student with challenges in auditory processing can develop an extraordinary ability of spatial or visual perception. The high performance interventions are those that identify these shortcuts and reinforce them, using the strengths of the individual to anchor the learning of competencies where he presents the greatest difficulty (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). By allowing the child or young person to use their own preferred circuits to solve problems, the teacher transforms a possible academic failure into a process of building autonomy.

The implementation of this approach requires a paradigm shift on the part of educators and health professionals. It is necessary to abandon the belief that learning must follow a unique and homogeneous path. Science shows us that the brain is a structure of extreme functional creativity. When we respect biological time and adapt the environment, we allow opportunity windows to be optimized, regardless of whether they are synchronized with the school calendar. Each adjustment in the teaching method is actually a recognition of the complexity of neural architecture that, when properly supported, reveals a learning potential that rigid structures

usually ignore. Success here is not measured by compliance with a pattern, but by the extent of the full functionality of each neural system.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 2: processing patterns: an analysis of typical brains

The development of the prefrontal cortex constitutes the apex of human biological maturation, acting as the silent conductor who governs the orchestra of cognition. Unlike other brain regions that consolidate early to manage immediate sensory and motor functions, the prefrontal cortex goes through a refining process that extends to the beginning of adulthood. This region, located just behind the forehead, houses executive functions, responsible for articulating sustained attention, strategic planning and inhibition of irrelevant impulses (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). When this structure operates within conventional parameters, it gives the individual the ability to isolate a task from environmental noise, keeping the focus necessary to complete an objective even in the face of external distractions.

The relationship between the prefrontal cortex and sustained attention is not static, but dynamic. In a typical brain, executive control functions as a selective filter that decides which stimuli deserve the consumption of neural energy and which should be discarded (BADDELEY, 2007). This mechanism allows, when reading a book or attending a class, the brain ignores the temperature of the environment, the noise distant from a conversation or light physical discomfort, focusing exclusively on the processed information. The efficiency of this filter depends on the synaptic maturation that occurs throughout youth, allowing the person to transit from erratic attention, characteristic of childhood, to a deliberate and persistent management of cognitive resources themselves (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015).

Failure or latency in this maturation process becomes the reference point to identify deviations. When the prefrontal cortex does not fully assume its regulatory role, the individual loses the ability to prioritize tasks. The focus becomes hostage to stimuli of greater sensory intensity, and not of greater logical relevance (BARKLEY, 1997). It is common to observe, in learning environments, the difference between the brain that maintains the line of reasoning for long periods and the one that constantly interrupts the flow to capture new peripheral information. While the first uses the prefrontal cortex to keep the goal highlighted in the working memory, the second suffers from a fragmentation of the experience, where each new stimulus competes on an equal footing with the previous one.

Executive control is also manifested through emotional regulation and the ability to postpone gratification, which are determining factors for success in long-term goals. The child and adolescent with the typical development prefrontal cortex learn, through constant environmental and social feedback, that inhibition of impulsive behaviors results in more consistent rewards. This learning is not merely behavioral, it is biological. The brain reinforces

neural pathways that facilitate self-control, making concentration effort a habit, rather than an exhaustive internal negotiation (SCHULTZ, 2015).

As the years progress, the maturation of this frontal area consolidates the ability to move between different levels of abstraction. The individual becomes able to anticipate consequences, correct thinking routes in real time and organize complex information sequentially. This sequence is the basis of structured logical thinking (ANDERSON, 1982). The clarity with which a neurotypical person reports a fact or solves a problem is a direct reflection of this prefrontal organization that sequences ideas, discarding what is superfluous and linking what is essential.

The understanding of this mechanism explains why many educational strategies, based on linearity and prolonged focus, are so effective for the majority of the population. They presuppose a brain with a fully functioning prefrontal cortex capable of sustaining attention and managing cognitive effort on demand (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). When we observe the behavior of a student who maintains constant engagement, we are seeing the visible result of a neural network that, under the prefrontal command, allocated its resources efficiently, ignored unnecessary interferences and maintained the course of learning. Recognizing this pattern is the fundamental step to understand that when a student does not achieve this performance, the challenge is not necessarily in the lack of will or intellectual capacity, but in the architecture of a regulatory system that has not yet found its tune or that has a distinct maturation rhythm than the educational system conventionally expects.

The functioning of the neurotypical brain rests on a highly refined ability to process information sequentially. This ability allows the individual to decompose complex tasks in manageable stages, structuring the thought so that each piece of knowledge fits the previous one (DEHAENE, 2012). When reading a text, for example, the conventional reader does not absorb the content as a single mass of stimuli, but decodes symbols into words, words in sentences and phrases into integrated concepts. This logical chain is maintained by working memory, which retains the previous information while processing the new one, ensuring a fluid continuity that sustains reasoning. The failure to maintain this logical sequence is what often differentiates the performance of minds with different architectures, where processing can occur in a fragmented or simultaneous manner, without the linearity expected by the standard pedagogical model.

Multisensory integration completes this process, acting as a mechanism for validating reality (DAMASIO, 1994). When a typical individual learns something new, his brain crosses data from different sensory channels to form a robust representation. If learning involves oral

instruction, the system processes speech cadence, voice tone and visual signals of the interlocutor almost instantly. This information converges into areas of cortical association that transform scattered stimuli into a coherent mental map. This integration is so automatic that it often becomes invisible to the subject himself, which explains why most people have difficulty understanding why another mind could encounter obstacles in what appears to be a direct reception of data. For the typical brain, the world is a continuous flow where the senses align naturally to serve the purpose of understanding.

The efficiency of this system is intrinsically linked to how sensory stimuli are filtered at the entrance. The ability to ignore background noise or light variation is vital to maintain focus on the task's sequential track (BADDELEY, 2007). This filter, mediated by executive functions that organize attention, acts as a barrier to protection against information overload. When multisensory processing is balanced, the brain is not lost in the multiplicity of signals, but extracts from each one only what is relevant to the ongoing goal. Typical children learn to identify this relevance through constant reinforcements, adjusting their sensory filters as they understand the context of social and academic expectations. Learning, in this scenario, is a selective pruning exercise: discarding the irrelevant to preserve the clarity of logical chaining.

The practical application of this model is visible in teaching methods that use step by step as a fundamental pillar. Curriculum structures that fragment the content, requiring the student to complete one cycle before starting the next, depend on the premise that the brain has a natural tendency to sequential organization (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). This form of teaching, although effective for the majority, reveals its rigidity when confronted with minds that process information in a holistic or parallel way. Where the educational system sees the need for a unique path to ensure retention, the mind that does not follow this pattern feels numbed by the artificiality of rhythm.

It is precisely in this boundary between the automatism of sequential processing and the need for cognitive flexibility that the distinction between neurotypical and neurodivergent brains becomes more evident (SNYDERMAN, 2019). While the conventional brain finds comfort in predictability of a well-defined sequence, diverse minds can perceive the same information as isolated elements that require extra assembly effort. Knowledge about how most organize their thought flows serves, therefore, as a diagnostic tool for educators. By understanding that linearity is a biological construction and not a universal absolute, it becomes possible to identify the exact moment when the pedagogical structure ceases to be an aid and becomes a barrier, forcing a processing pattern that not all neural architecture is designed to perform. Careful observation of these mechanisms allows education to leave the field of

assumption and enter the field of clinical and pedagogical precision, respecting the actual biological variations that make up human intelligence.

The effectiveness of conventional learning is also based on a silent biological gear: the circadian rhythm. The neurotypical brain does not maintain the same readiness for processing complex information over the course of 24 hours of the day. There is a natural oscillation in the surveillance and cognitive clarity that accompanies hormonal secretion and body temperature, creating windows of opportunity for retaining new knowledge (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). In the early morning hours, increased cortisol levels signal to the body a state of alert readiness, favoring tasks that require sustained cognitive effort, such as solving logical problems or memorizing structured data.

This biological cadence dictates the standard school time, where the contents of higher intellectual demand are reserved for the morning period. The central nervous system, aligned to this cycle, manages to keep the prefrontal cortex active and focused, taking advantage of the moment of greater efficiency of the neurotransmitters responsible for attention (LENT, 2010). When the typical student submits to this routine, he is not only following a schedule rule, but attuning his own biology to the task requirement. Learning flows more easily because the internal architecture of the brain, at this moment, is prepared for the energy expenditure that the consolidation of information requires.

Sustained attention, however, is not a phenomenon of continuous intensity. It operates in ultradian cycles, periods of high concentration that alternate with brief pauses in neural activity. In a brain that follows typical development, the individual is able to monitor this cycle, adjusting its focus intensity or allowing for short moments of decompression before resuming the effort (BADDELEY, 2007). This automatic adjustment is actually a preservation mechanism: the brain recognizes when the exhaustion of attention resources approaches and reacts by reducing the reception of irrelevant stimuli to ensure the integrity of the learning process. This is why the class model fractionated into timed blocks works so well, because it respects this natural oscillation of the human focus, preventing early cognitive fatigue.

The comfort that the neurotypical student finds in the conventional school environment comes, to a large extent, from this rhythmic predictability. Knowing exactly how long you should sustain the attention and when you will have the next rest interval reduces the anxiety load and allows for a strategic allocation of energy. When the brain realizes that the end of the focus cycle is near, it is able to mobilize an extra completion effort, an anticipation mediated by the maturation of the prefrontal areas that regulate the perception of time and future rewards (SCHULTZ, 2015). This alignment between biological rhythm and external demands creates a

positive feedback cycle, where success in the task reinforces concentration behavior, making the learning process a consolidated biological habit.

On the other hand, this rhythmic stiffness can become a friction point for brains that do not follow the same cadence. When the circadian rhythm of the individual is displaced or when the ultradian cycle of care operates at different frequencies, the effort to adapt to the school schedule ceases to be an aid and becomes a severe obstacle (BARKLEY, 1997). The student who needs more time to get into a deep focus state, or who reaches his alert peak at times of the day ignored by the traditional grid, experiences the school as a succession of disagreements. The system, designed for the average, assumes that all brains share the same internal clock and the same energy curve.

When observing the academic performance, the attentive educator needs to distinguish between the failure of understanding and rhythmic discoordination. Often, what seems uninterested or unable to follow the flow of the class is just the manifestation of a brain whose readiness cycle does not coincide with the time of the given content. The understanding that rhythm is a fundamental biological variable allows a pedagogical approach that, instead of demanding forced compliance, seeks ways to make the delivery of knowledge more flexible (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). Identifying these deviations in the regulation of care cycles is not only a diagnostic exercise, but the basis for building environments where the intellectual potential of each individual can be exercised in their own time, away from the pressure of a biological compass that does not belong to them.

The consolidation of any learning pattern in the neurotypical brain ultimately depends on a biological mechanism of constant validation that we call feedback. When a child or an adult performs a task and receives a clear signal of correctness, the nervous system not only records the information, it marks that neural path with a chemical signature of value. This phenomenon is the basis for the transition between conscious cognitive effort and intuitive mastery (ANDERSON, 1982). The brain, as a plastic entity, constantly seeks to optimize its energy consumption, and the reward acts as the exchange currency that signals to the prefrontal cortex that that specific sequence of thought is efficient and deserves to be replicated in future circumstances (SCHULTZ, 2015).

Neural feedback acts almost as a thermostat that calibrates the accuracy of synaptic connections (CANDEL, 2021). Imagine a student solving a multiple-step mathematical problem. With each small conclusion reached, there is a controlled release of chemical messengers that reinforce the focus and continuity. This biological reward doesn't have to be an external award or a school note. The simple pleasure of cognitive closure, the feeling that a

piece of the puzzle fit perfectly in place, is enough to trigger the satisfaction circuits. This process stabilizes sustained attention, because the brain realizes that maintaining the focus brings a measurable benefit in terms of clarity and reduction of uncertainty.

It should be noted, however, that the reward system also has a role of curation. He is responsible for discarding mental strategies that did not lead to the expected result or that demanded a prohibitive energy cost (SCHULTZ, 2015). In neurotypical development, this selectivity allows a person to refine his ability to learn to learn. By mistaking a logical trajectory, the brain receives negative feedback that, contrary to what can be imagined, is fundamental to success. It inhibits the use of that specific neuronal route, forcing the system to explore new alternatives until it finds the trail of least resistance. This fine adjustment, operated by the dynamics of reward and correction, is what makes conventional learning such a fluid process and, for the external observer, so natural.

The practical consequence of this architecture is an almost automatic inclination to structures that offer predictability. If the educational environment presents a challenge, requires an answer and immediately returns feedback, the neurotypical brain enters an optimized flow state. He understands the rules of the game. Motivation, therefore, is not a personality trait or an innate disposition, but a reflection of the integrity of these feedback circuits (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). When learning is well aligned with biological maturation, the intrinsic reward of the task is sufficient to maintain persistence even in activities of low immediate stimulation.

However, this dependence on clear and sequential feedback is also the source of the greatest weaknesses of the traditional model. When the teaching structure becomes excessively abstract or when the interval between action and reward increases too much, the feedback system fails. The neurotypical brain, accustomed to a specific validation cadence, loses the path of attention (BADDELEY, 2007). He begins to seek stimuli in the environment that can supply the lack of clear returns, which is often interpreted as a deviation of focus or lack of engagement. The school, by not understanding that the structure of the task itself must contain the feedback, ends up breaking the biological rhythm that supports the student's interest.

Recognizing this mechanism is essential for those who seek to understand the distinction between brains. Learning in typical brains is essentially a continuous dialogue between the intention and response of the world. If the answer is ambiguous or absent, neural plasticity does not find the necessary incentive to consolidate the new information (CANDEL, 2021). On the other hand, when the environment is adjusted to provide short, accurate and consistent feedback with the individual's thought sequence, the effectiveness of learning multiplies. This biological

basis demonstrates that pedagogical effectiveness depends not only on the content, but on the ability of the system to integrate the student's neurological response in real time, closing the cycle that transforms effort into consolidated knowledge. By mapping this dependence on rewards and feedback, we reveal the invisible foundation on which the cognitive competence that society conventionally expects from its individuals is built.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 3: mapping neurodivergence: autism, ADHD and dyslexia

The architecture of the autistic brain reveals a unique processing economy, where the integration of stimuli occurs under premises distinct from those found in typical cognition. While most nervous systems prioritize the immediate filtering of information to keep the focus on immediate social or environmental relevance, the autistic mind often keeps sensory input channels wide open (BARKLEY, 1997). This phenomenon does not translate into a failure to capture, but into a data management that processes peripheral details, textures, light variations and sound frequencies with the same intensity dedicated to a central object of attention. The result is a mosaic of perceptions where the usual hierarchy between background and figure often dissolves, requiring of the individual a constant cognitive effort to organize the excess of information that arrive simultaneously (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015).

This difference in sensory processing has profound implications in the way the autistic builds his world. The difficulty of filtering background noise means that harmless stimuli for others can, for the autistic brain, occupy a prominent place that competes with the ongoing task. This characteristic is often interpreted by external observers as inattention or resistance, but what actually occurs is an overload of information that has not been discarded early by the brain (BADDELEY, 2007). The autistic brain, in this context, acts as a system that tries to process the totality of the raw data captured by the organs of meaning, without the energy saving that social automation provides for neurotypicality.

With regard to social integration, the difference in processing is manifested through a more literal and sometimes fragmented analysis of language and conventions. The typical brain uses intuitive shortcuts to decode implicit intentions, reading the tone of voice, body posture, and cultural context automatically. The autistic individual, by not depending on these same neural shortcuts, tends to process the components of communication as isolated parts of a whole, which makes interaction a complex analytical exercise (ANDERSON, 1982). When an autistic person needs to understand an irony, for example, he does not access the immediate social sense instinctively; he decodes the terms and opposes them to the actual physical context, seeking a coherent logic that allows for understanding. What for some is a social automatism, for the autistic brain is a task that requires the same energy demanded by the resolution of a technical problem.

The integration of information into different modalities, such as sound and image, also follows unconventional paths. In many autistic structures, there is a more evident dissociation between what is seen and what is heard, hindering the automatic synchrony necessary for the

agile interpretation of fast social scenes (DAMASIO, 1994). This characteristic explains why noisy and motion-filled environments cause accelerated cognitive fatigue. The mind needs processing intervals to stabilize the flow of information entering without proper screening. Consequently, autism should be understood as a variation in the organization of neural networks that, instead of seeking speed in social response, privileges precision in detailed analysis and the integrity of crude information.

This fundamental distinction helps to deconstruct the view of deficit. When we think of autism, we should see the brain as a processor that prioritizes fidelity to the captured data rather than inference based on previous contexts (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). If the typical pattern is that of a system that seeks quick conclusions to optimize group survival, the autistic pattern is that of a system that takes time to consolidate the complexity of the world around it. By removing the stigma of failure and focusing on processing mechanics, the adaptation needs become clear, respecting the time and the way these minds organize the vast amount of information that the environment presents to them every second. The focus on regulating the sensory environment, before any behavioral intervention, is the immediate practical consequence of this perspective, ensuring that the autistic brain does not need to waste its cognitive capacity trying to suppress an excess of information that it itself is designed to capture and process.

When we shift our eyes to attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder, the architecture of brain processing finds a distinct dynamic from that observed in the autistic spectrum. If there the central issue lies in the management of a constant flow of information, here the challenge lies in the economy of dopamine and the support of neural circuits that require a specific level of stimulus to remain active (SCHULTZ, 2015). The ADHD brain operates under a chemistry that favors the search for novelty and the high sensory impact. The reward system, mediated by the availability of dopamine in synapses, does not function as a gear that is satisfied with the completion of gradual or routine tasks. For this brain, attention is not a stable resource, but a variable that oscillates according to the emotional intensity or the degree of novelty that the activity offers.

This search for stimulus is, at its root, a biological strategy of self-regulation. When the proposed task lacks urgency or an immediate challenge factor, dopaminergic signaling levels fall, making the focus maintenance a strenuous exercise (BARKLEY, 1997). It's like the brain is in a constant state of waiting, waiting for a signal that justifies the full mobilization of its executive resources. In environments that require sequential and linear processing, individuals with ADHD often find themselves in an internal conflict, where the desire to follow the protocol collides with the physiological need to find a source of interest that restores neurochemical

balance. This attentional oscillation does not represent an absence of capacity, but a peculiar way to direct cognitive energy to what is perceived as relevant or urgent.

When analyzing the dynamics of attentional regulation, we observed that the hyperactive brain does not fail to concentrate, but rather to select the concentration target under social convention criteria. While the typical brain can inhibit external impulses to meet distant goals, the mind with ADHD finds greater effectiveness when feedback is immediate and when the task requires a quick and dynamic response (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). Hyperfocalization, a common phenomenon in these people, is the thorough proof that, when interest and chemistry align, the attentional maintenance capacity exceeds, in intensity and depth, the average found in other neurological patterns. The individual becomes, in these moments, a high performance executioner capable of ignoring the world around for the chosen task.

What is often confused with disorganization or lack of constancy is the manifestation of a system that prioritizes agility in the exchange of contexts. To maintain engagement, this brain needs to move between different focuses, avoiding the stagnation that occurs when the dopamine level is not renewed (SCHULTZ, 2015). The cost of this alternation is the difficulty in sustaining tasks that require a long process of silent maturation, because neurological architecture is designed for movement. When the work or learning structure ignores this need for stimulus and immediate reward, the individual is compelled to seek this satisfaction on his/her own, which may result in the search for distractions or the exploration of peripheral paths that the educational or professional system ignores.

Understanding this dynamic is essential to remove the stigma of disability and recognize that ADHD profoundly changes the way motivation translates into action. The search for stimulus is the motor that drives the mind, not a character deviation or a focus defect. By integrating this understanding into the way we build our routines, we allow the brain with ADHD to use its plasticity to create its own management systems, which include short periods of high intensity followed by active pauses or the division of great goals into micro targets that ensure constant release of reward (CANDEL, 2021). Recognizing the need for a differentiated stimulus is, therefore, the first step to transform a processing system that seems chaotic at first sight into a high-efficiency mechanism, capable of performing complex tasks with an energy that few other neurological patterns can mobilize with such readiness. The challenge ceases to be like forcing the brain to adapt to standardized rhythms and becomes like drawing an environment where this search for movement becomes a productive asset.

Dyslexia presents a distinct cerebral topography, where the complexity of written language finds processing paths that differ substantially from the standard route. While conventional reading is often perceived as a unique act, it requires the rapid integration of two fundamental systems: the ability to decompose graphemes in sound units, called phonological processing, and the ability to recognize visual patterns in an automated way (DEHAENE, 2012). In the dyslexic brain, this union of forces occurs under a neurological dynamics that prioritizes holistic or visual processing to the detriment of sequential phonological decoding. The difficulty lies not in intelligence or the ability to understand narratives, but in the efficiency of the bridge between the printed symbol and the corresponding phoneme.

This discrepancy in phonological processing creates a bottleneck in fluidity. The typical reader, after a brief period of learning, automates grapheme-phoneme conversion, releasing the resources of the prefrontal cortex for the deep interpretation of the text (LENT, 2010). The dyslexic brain, on the other hand, remains engaged in a conscious decoding effort for much longer. Each new word acts as an obstacle that requires a detailed analysis, a piece by piece check, draining the cognitive energy that should be directed to the meaning of the content. What seems slow in the act of reading is, in reality, a deep analytical processing, where the mind refuses to ignore any detail of the structure of the sign.

From the point of view of neural architecture, this condition reveals that lateralization and connections between the temporoparietal and occipitotemporal regions have less robust activation patterns for the specific phonological pathway (SNYDERMAN, 2019). This means that when finding a word, the dyslexic brain often seeks alternative ways to identify meaning, more frequently resorting to direct visual areas and semantic associations. The result is a processing style that favors the overall view, contextual analysis and spatial creativity. It is therefore common for individuals with dyslexia to be easy to perceive complex patterns or to see solutions that escape the reader that is attached to the linear and normative sequence of symbols.

Visual perception is also affected by this neurological variation, not by a failure of acuity, but by a different modulation in the way the nervous system organizes the entry of spatial information. The common confusion between mirrored letters, such as b and d, stems from the absence of a rigid lateral dominance for the processing of symbols, a process that most conventional brains stabilize early (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). For the dyslexic child or adult, the graphic symbol does not carry, from the first contact, a unique and absolute direction. It is a form that occupies space, and the mind needs a specific training to label this orientation

consistently. When the school environment forces linear repetition without recognizing that the processor architecture is different, it creates an unnecessary frustration barrier.

This difference in phonological and visual processing has practical consequences that go beyond the initial academic performance. The professional and daily life of those who have a dyslexic mind reflects the adaptation to a world that values the speed of reading rather than the depth of analysis. However, when it is understood that this condition represents a neural specialization for tasks that require three-dimensional thinking or nonlinear connections, dyslexia ceases to be a hindrance to become a specific lens of action in the world (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). The processing challenge is real and requires compensatory strategies, such as the use of support technologies or multisensory methods, but the final result is a thought that, because it is less dependent on the rigidity of the written standard, is often more capable of building original syntheses.

The valorization of this brain pattern requires the learning system to abandon the belief that phonological fluidity is the only marker of intellectual proficiency. The dyslexic brain operates at a higher energy cost during reading, but compensates for this load with a higher ability to maintain attention in information systems that do not strictly depend on coded verbal language. The inclusion of this way of processing language is, therefore, the acceptance that the domain of writing is only one of the many possible ways for the construction of knowledge, and that the initial technical difficulty is only a detail in the organization of a system that, in many other instances, demonstrates singular efficiency and creativity.

In addition to these manifestations, the spectrum of neurodivergence covers other processing architectures that, although often labeled only by the difficulty they impose on school tasks, reveal distinct patterns of brain organization. Dyscalculia, for example, should not be confused with an inability to understand logic or a deficit in general intelligence. The dyscalculic brain operates with a weakness in the mental representation of the magnitude and quantitative relationship between the numbers (DEHAENE, 2012). While most neurotypical minds develop an almost automatic numerical intuition capable of estimating quantities or understanding decimal progression as a physical extension, the dyscalculic individual deals with a disconnection between the numeral symbol and the reality it describes. It is as if the bridge that connects the concept of abstract quantity to its symbolic representation was unstable, requiring the individual a constant translation effort that consumes vital cognitive resources.

The complexity of this neural pattern goes beyond simple confusion with arithmetic operations. It implies a difficulty in sequential ordering events or structuring spatial data that depend on metric accuracy (ANDERSON, 1982). When this cerebral variation is understood as

a different way of dealing with the concept of measurement, it is no longer a stigma of mathematical inability. The challenge lies in the fact that the modern world is structured over the constant metric. Adaptation requires that visual and tactile support methods be offered, allowing the brain to bypass the failure in numerical intuition through tools that anchor the concept of quantity in a concrete and predictable sensory experience.

Similarly, dyspraxia reveals a peculiar neurobiological organization focused on fine motor control and the planning of motion sequences. The dyspraxic brain faces a challenge in signaling neural networks responsible for planned motor coordination (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). What for many is an automated movement, such as writing, dressing or manipulating tools, becomes for the dyspraxic an exercise that requires conscious attention and deliberate effort of each muscle fiber. It is not a physical weakness or a muscle development failure, but a latency in the processing of motor intention and in the precise execution of the sequence commanded by the motor cortex. The mind needs a greater amount of time and effort to translate the mental plane into physical action, which can lead to an early exhaustion in daily activities.

The sensory experience of these individuals is also often modulated by a hypersensitivity or hyposensitivity to proprioceptive stimuli, which is the sense of body position in space (DAMASIO, 1994). The dyspraxia mind needs more intense sensory feedback to understand the exact location of its members, which explains the propensity for uncoordinated movements or a constant perception of imbalance. By recognizing this mechanism, the intervention ceases to be focused only on repetitive coordination exercises and begins to contemplate the regulation of the environment to provide the necessary support that the nervous system seeks to stabilize its body perception. The objective is to reduce the processing load required by the simple act of inhabiting the body itself, releasing energy so that the individual can devote himself to high complexity cognitive activities.

Finally, sensory processing disorders are a category that permeates many other profiles, but which in isolation demonstrates how the nervous system organizes the entry of crude information from the world. For these minds, neural screening of visual, auditory or tactile stimuli does not work under the logic of conventional selective filtering (BADDELEY, 2007). The brain can interpret an ambient noise as a highly relevant event, or feel the texture of a tissue as an invasive and painful stimulus. In these cases, there is no deficiency in data capture, but a failure in selective inhibition of what is irrelevant. The system is continuously in a state of maximum alert, treating the insignificant detail with the same urgency as a real danger.

Understanding these neural patterns as structural variations, and not as systemic failures, alters the paradigm of how society, education and work should welcome the individual. When

we stop demanding standardization and recognize that each brain has its own energy saving and a unique way of prioritizing data entry, we open the way for an inclusion that respects biology (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). The success in integrating these minds does not depend on the suppression of their differences, but on the creation of conditions that allow the brain to operate without the chronic weariness of forced adaptation to a norm that is strange to it. The future of human cognition depends, essentially, on this transition: on the futile attempt to homogenize into mastery in the management of neurological diversity.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 4: specialized neural architectures: the mechanisms of each profile

The neural architecture of the autistic brain is not organized around a single hierarchical command center, but through a distributed processing network that privileges local analysis to the detriment of long-range integration (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). When we examine the brain topography of an individual within the spectrum, we find hyperconnectivity in the regions that process sensory data and specific details, working almost as high resolution sensors that operate in isolation and intensely. This strong local integration mechanism allows a clear perception of tiny patterns, textures and variations in the environment that would go unnoticed in a nervous system focusing on rapid synthesis (ROSE; MEYER, 2002).

This specialization in short circuits occurs at the expense of a differentiated global connectivity, where long-distance neural roads, responsible for connecting distant areas of the brain to generate a comprehensive and contextual interpretation of reality, have a distinct traffic velocity (ANDERSON, 1982). In a typical brain, the nervous system performs a constant pruning of connections to favor efficient communication between distinct lobes, facilitating social intuition and reading implicit nuances. In the autistic brain, the conservation of shorter and more local synaptic paths keeps the focus on the integrity of the raw data. The result is not a deficiency in cognitive capacity, but an energy saving focused on the deep processing of discrete information units (BADDELEY, 2007).

This dynamic explains why environments loaded with multiple simultaneous stimuli become exhaustive for the autistic individual. While the neurotypical brain masks background noise and filters the irrelevant to maintain the coherence of the social scene, the autistic neural system continues to process each element individually. Attention is therefore a resource allocated with surgical precision, but suffering from overload when the requirement is the rapid synthesis of multiple social contexts that change each second (BARKLEY, 1997). There is no blockage for learning or understanding, there is only one distinct path to the construction of knowledge: detail is the foundation upon which the whole is sustained, and not something that can be discarded in favor of a hasty overview.

When this mechanism is understood, the common educational failure becomes evident. Traditional methods are based on a synthesis pedagogy, requiring the student to ignore the detail to extract a moral or general rule instinctively (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). For the autistic mind, this requirement creates a neurological conflict, because the natural process of your brain is precisely the exhaustive exploration of the components. Efficacy in teaching and social integration therefore depends on an adjustment that validates this local connectivity. Instead of

forcing a generalization that is lost in abstraction, the ideal pedagogical strategy is echoed by allowing reasoning to be built from the constituent parts until the formation of the final concept, respecting the neural signature that privileges analytical rigor.

This connectivity pattern also offers clues about exceptional skill in areas that require recognition of complex patterns and logical consistency, such as programming, system analysis or rigorous scientific research. The same characteristic that makes the processing of an intuitive social interaction a challenge requires, on the other hand, a structured and predictable database to flourish (SCHULTZ, 2015). The autistic brain needs no less stimulation, but an environment that understands its preference for logical organization and depth. By recognizing that information integration is done by shorter and more efficient paths, a door is opened for teaching methods that use detail as a lever for the domain of complex competencies, transforming what was seen as a processing disadvantage into an incomparable analytical precision tool.

When we turn our attention to attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder, the neurological landscape changes. Unlike the search for analytical rigor of the autistic brain, the dopaminergic system in ADHD operates under a logic of economics and demand for stimuli that fundamentally alters the ability to sustain the focus on tasks that need immediate gratification (SCHULTZ, 2015). Dopamine is not just a chemical messenger; it acts as the fuel that signals the relevance and value of an action within the executive circuits of the brain. In a neurotypical system, this neurotransmitter is released in a regulated manner during the execution of projects, maintaining motivation at stable levels even when the task is arduous or prolonged (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007).

In the ADHD brain, the efficiency of this regulation process is significantly lower. There is a chronic difficulty in maintaining adequate levels of dopamine and noradrenaline available in the synaptic cleft, which makes the neural system especially thirsting for novelty, challenge or urgency (BARKLEY, 1997). In this context, attention becomes an extremely volatile resource, subordinated to the ability of each activity to capture the individual's interest through a constant flow of rewarding stimuli. When the environment does not provide this load of immediate interest, the neural network experiences a cognitive emptying, a kind of biological boredom that is not the result of disinterest or laziness, but of a real failure in the signaling of reward necessary for the maintenance of mental effort.

This mechanism helps to understand the phenomenon of hyperfocus, which actually represents the moment when dopamine reaches ideal levels due to the highly stimulating nature of activity (SCHULTZ, 2015). In these situations, the brain operates with higher efficiency and

speed than in many systems considered typical. The problem arises exactly when external demand does not coincide with the centers of intrinsic interest. The task that requires long-term organization, planning or execution, but that does not offer the necessary sensory or emotional feedback, often collapses due to the inability of the chemical self-regulation system to sustain engagement. Noradrenaline, next to dopamine, plays a crucial role in modulating awakening and focus, and its inefficiency in signaling causes trivial distractions to gain a dismal weight, diverting the attentional flow to any new stimulus that promises a dopaminergic discharge (LENT, 2010).

The educational and professional implication of this neural profile is profound and often neglected by methods based only on willpower or linear discipline. To hope that a brain whose reward architecture works by peaks and valleys can maintain a rigid constancy in monotonous workflows is to ignore the biological basis of motivation (BADDELEY, 2007). The structure of success for this mind lies not in the imposition of a single and inflexible structure, but in the fragmentation of great goals in short and stimulating cycles that ensure the constant shooting of dopamine, turning the long term into a succession of fast and tangible victories.

The search for stimuli, often interpreted as deviation or lack of control, is actually an attempt at biological self-sufficiency (BARKLEY, 1997). The individual actively seeks what his own system cannot maintain internally effectively. When the environment offers a scenario of high demand, interactivity and immediate feedback, attentional regulation stabilizes. The understanding of this chemical dynamics removes the moral weight that historically falls on those who possess this architecture. The challenge is not to cure a way of being, but to construct contexts that dialogue with this need for stimulation. The motivation here should not be seen as something that is evoked by duty, but as a chemical process that needs to be managed through concrete environmental variables. From this perspective, ADHD reveals to be a mind designed for agility and rapid response, capable of processing massive volumes of information when the chemistry of the environment and that of the system itself are aligned. The focus on regulation, not correction, is the pillar that supports the full use of this potential.

Dyslexia removes the attentive observer from the simplistic idea that reading would be a purely linguistic ability. When the dyslexic brain faces a sequence of characters, the neural orchestra that should automate the decoding of visual symbols enters a peculiar processing state (DEHAENE, 2012). The anatomical basis of this experience rests on an atypical connectivity in the temporoparietal circuits, regions in charge of translating the grapheme into its corresponding sound unit. In a typical system, the ventral pathway, or via quick reading, establishes an almost instantaneous bridge between the visual perception of the sign and its

stored meaning. In the dyslexic brain, this neural highway has a denser and faster traffic, forcing processing to seek alternative pathways (SNYDERMAN, 2019).

These secondary neural pathways, mostly located in frontal regions and in the right hemisphere, do not have the same specialization for reading fluidity, which explains the colossal cognitive energy spent on each line of text (LENT, 2010). The challenge is not in the absence of intelligence or in the failure of semantic understanding, but in the metabolic cost of decoding. While the typical reader automates the transposition of graphic signals into sound, the dyslexic reader remains attached to the stage of attentional analysis of each segment. The effort is genuinely physical and neural, because the brain tries to compensate for the lack of a direct pathway with a massive recruitment of areas that, in other contexts, would be responsible for working memory or the spatial visual processing of complex objects (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015).

The altered phonological processing is therefore a consequence of this specific topography. The difficulty in segmenting words into phonemes, or smaller sounds, reveals that the dyslexic brain organizes language in a less fragmented and more holistic way (DEHAENE, 2012). This is an important inflection point in the understanding of the profile: the resistance to the phonic method, when applied inflexibly, occurs because the dyslexic brain often perceives the word as a complete visual object, a pictorial whole, and not as a collage of discrete sounds. To force sound decomposition into a system that naturally seeks the broad visual pattern is like asking a musician to analyze the individual vibration of each note of a complex chord while trying at the same time to maintain the melody.

The neuroanatomical base of dyslexia also reveals a lower activation in the left temporoparietal region, specifically in the visual area of word form. This sector is the command center that should trigger the instant recognition of familiar terms, allowing reading to flow without the need for internal spelling (LENT, 2010). When this center does not fire with the required precision, the brain needs to resort to the neural network in charge of speech articulation, which explains why many dyslexics feel the need to pronounce, even if only mentally or in whispers, every word during reading. They are literally using the speech motor network to compensate for the gap in the direct visual perception network.

Recognizing this mechanics requires a change in the approach to writing learning. The method based on repetitive memorization of isolated syllables ignores the nature of dyslexic neural architecture (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). A more effective strategy leverages the strength of global visual processing, using resources that allow the brain to anchor the meaning before sound decomposition. When understanding that the dyslexic neural topography favors the shape

and pattern, it can be implemented the use of visual supports, adapted sources and strategies that reduce the load on phonological working memory.

This variation in brain connectivity, which makes reading a laborious and slow process, is the same mechanism that often allows the dyslexic individual a superior spatial perception and a capacity to solve problems through unconventional angles (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). When dealing with written language as if it were a three-dimensional puzzle instead of a linear logical sequence, the dyslexic brain exercises a compensatory plasticity. The problem is not the inability to learn, but the incompatibility between a system designed for the global analysis of forms and a teaching system that requires sequential phonological automation as a sine qua non condition. Dyslexia, seen from the inside, is proof that language can be processed by neural routes much more diverse than those described in traditional pedagogy manuals. Respect for this unique neural architecture requires that the school and the professional environment stop treating reading as a test of fine motor skill or sound readiness, becoming accepted as a tool that needs to be translated into the native codes of each mind.

Sensory sensitivity, often relegated to a secondary plane as a mere side effect of neurological conditions, is, in fact, a fundamental variation in the architecture of data input processing (BADDELEY, 2007). In a standard nervous system, the brain operates under a constant filtering economy, deciding in milliseconds what deserves conscious focus and what should be discarded as irrelevant noise. For the neurodivergent individual, this automatic sieve often has different mesh, allowing frequencies of stimuli, textures, light variations or sound amplitudes to be processed with the same intensity as high priority data (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). This is not a regulatory failure, but a divergence in the sensitivity of peripheral sensors that feed the cortex, transforming environments that would be neutral to many in spaces of exhaustive cognitive demand.

The amplified sensory perception acts as an amplifier of constant gain, where elements of everyday life, such as the almost imperceptible tinnitus of a fluorescent lamp or the friction of certain fabric plots against the skin, gain a disproportionate neural prominence (DAMASIO, 1994). When the nervous system receives this information with the same vivacity, the processing load overloads the centers responsible for selective attention. The brain, trying to give meaning to a massive input of raw data without efficient mediation of the typical filter, mobilizes energy resources that would be directed to complex learning or social interaction. This is the core of sensory conflict: the energy that should be spent on abstraction or creativity is consumed in maintaining homeostasis in the face of an environment that does not respect the limits of processing this profile.

This dynamic is especially visible in autism, where the local hyperconnectivity mentioned above translates the sensory stimulus into a high-fidelity experience that the brain insists on detailing (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). While most people ignore environmental noise to concentrate on a conversation, the autistic brain records and decodes each acoustic layer simultaneously. The exhaustion that follows does not stem from an inability to understand the context, but from the biological cost of processing a quantity of sensory information that, for the neurotypical system, simply does not exist. Adaptation, therefore, should not seek the suppression of this sensitivity, but the creation of environmental niches that limit sensory pollution, allowing the acuity of processing to turn to intellectual production rather than defense against the environment.

In the context of ADHD, sensitivity to stimuli manifests itself under another aegis, often oscillating between the search for sensory hypersensitivity, which triggers the desired dopaminergic release, and the aversion to chaotic stimuli that further divide attention (SCHULTZ, 2015).

If a low-stimulation environment can generate cognitive emptying, a space with excess visual or disorganized noise acts as a barrier that prevents the consolidation of working memory (BADDELEY, 2007). The mind with ADHD, in its effort to find the ideal flow, often floats between the desire for a vibrant environment and the need for isolation to avoid attentional kidnapping by trivial stimuli. Sensory processing here is a tool to modulate the state of awakening, functioning as a thermostat that the individual tries to constantly adjust to keep the operating system running at optimal levels of readiness.

In dyslexia, atypical visual processing overflows from the reading task to an amplified spatial perception that, although confers advantages in areas such as architectural thinking or solving complex problems, creates challenges in environments loaded with abstract symbols (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). Sensitivity to visual patterns and movements causes the dyslexic brain to perceive inconsistencies in the environment that go unnoticed by others, becoming a valuable tool for analysis in design and strategy contexts. However, the cost of this sensitivity is the ease with which the neural system tires in the face of monotonous visual textures or overloaded information systems of text, which require forced and unnatural segmentation for its cognitive structure.

Understanding these variations means recognizing that the design of work and learning spaces, when thought only for a statistical average, neglects the diversity of how sensory information is filtered and integrated (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). The environment that promotes productivity for a sensory profile is often the same as paralyzing the other, not on the

whim of the individual, but by distinct requirements imposed by the architecture of their reception systems. When designing contexts that allow the control over sensory input, the focus of the adaptation effort is shifted to the use of cognitive potential. Neurodivergence requires, fundamentally, environments that dialogue with their specific neural signatures, because only thus the amplified sensitivity can be transmuted from an overload source to a competitive advantage of perception and analysis. The logical conclusion is that intelligence, in its various forms, flourishes where the environment does not impose the cost of a constant struggle against the sensory configuration itself.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 5: limitations of the traditional school model in addressing neurodivergence

The conventional school chronology imposes an artificial compass, a metric dictated more by the logistic organization of institutions than by the metabolic requirements of learning (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). When the signal rings, it not only ends an activity, it interrupts the flow of a mind that may have reached the summit of its intellectual engagement (BADDELEY, 2007). For the neurodivergent brain, this temporal rigidity acts as a deregulator of delicate systems, because the transition capacity between intense focus and dispersion required by the next task does not occur with the fluidity that the academic system assumes to be universal (BARKLEY, 1997). There is a cruel asymmetry between the processing pace required by the curriculum, which advances linearly and relentlessly, and the internal reality of those who need distinct time windows to consolidate new information (ROSE; MEYER, 2002).

This mismatch creates silent strain. While the neurotypical student uses the structure of the class as a scaffolding, the student with a different processing profile feels the same structure as a straitjacket (SNYDERMAN, 2019). The rhythm imposed disregards the learning plateaus where the brain, far from being idle, is dedicated to the complex task of integrating concepts, associating new data with previous knowledge and filtering background noise (DAMASIO, 1994). When the bell dictates the abrupt change of theme, this student's neural system is forced to abandon an unfinished construction, which often results in a profound cognitive disorganization (LENT, 2010). Learning, which should be a coherent accumulation process, becomes a series of loose fragments, disconnected from the student's functional reality.

This imposition of an external speed also ignores fluctuations in response latency, a vital biological mechanism for understanding (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). Teachers used to the traditional model interpret prolonged pause as disinterest or lack of preparation, when, in fact, the student may be in a process of high load decoding (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). The expectation of an immediate response acts as a barrier that prevents the completion of reasoning circuits, generating an emotional pressure that disables the cortical areas responsible for reflective thinking (SCHULTZ, 2015). The child or the young, constantly feeling under the scrutiny of an invisible chronometer, begins to develop compensation strategies, such as masking, which consume an immense amount of mental energy, leaving little room for the real acquisition of knowledge (BADDELEY, 2007).

The rigidity of deadlines and the succession of materials without time for proper neural metabolism end up transforming the educational environment into a mechanism of exclusion by exhaustion (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). At each forced transition, a layer of anxiety is placed

on cognitive capacity, weakening working memory and hindering data recovery at evaluation times (BARKLEY, 1997). The system, by prioritizing the mechanical efficiency of the school calendar over the individual dynamics of each brain, ends up underestimating the intelligence of those operating at different frequencies (DEHAENE, 2012). This systematic failure is not only a problem of pedagogy, it is a structural barrier that ignores the biology of cerebral plasticity, because the consolidation of learning requires, above all, the time required for synapses to be strengthened under conditions of emotional security and absence of artificial temporal pressures (LENT, 2010).

When the environment does not allow variation, it invalidates the cognitive development process itself (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). A brain that needs more time to process information is not an incapacitated brain, it is a brain that works with a high-resolution architecture, where each data requires a more robust connection before it is integrated into the central system (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). By neglecting this fundamental characteristic and demanding the same processing rhythm for all, the school ignores the very logic of neurobiology, punishing those who need a slower path to achieve a deeper understanding (DAMASIO, 1994). This model not only stops teaching, it hurts the intellectual self-esteem of students who, in a context of authentic rhythm, would be perfectly able to move through complex concepts with elegance and precision.

The chronological rigidity of educational institutions operates on a silent and dangerous assumption: that the human brain, regardless of its internal architecture, is always ready for the immediate transition between tasks (BADDELEY, 2007). This expectation, however, is violently shocked against the neurobiological nature of minds whose mechanisms of emotional regulation and processing of social information do not operate according to the standard manual (SCHULTZ, 2015). While the school environment requires automatic adherence to unwritten codes of conduct, such as the visual contact maintained, the quick reading of nuances in the teacher's intonation or the spontaneous understanding of the hierarchy among colleagues, the neurodivergent student is in a state of constant cognitive effort to decipher these same clues (BARKLEY, 1997).

For a brain whose processing is guided by details or a dopaminergic regulation of search for specific stimuli, implicit social expectations function as a permanent background noise that consumes precious resources (SCHULTZ, 2015). The student is not only trying to learn the content of the matter, but is simultaneously devoting a significant portion of his energy to social navigation (LENT, 2010). It's like he's operating a heavy operating system while trying to run a complex application in the foreground. Each interaction in the corridor, each interpretation of

a colleague's gesture and every attempt to adapt the posture to what the group expects requires a brain computing that should be automatic, but for many, it is revealed to be a conscious and extremely exhaustive process (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015).

This demand for continuous emotional and social regulation is often confused with lack of focus or disinterest (POSNER; ROTHBART, 2007). It happens that the brain that needs to consciously monitor whether it is smiling at the right time or whether its intensity of voice is adequate to the environment loses the ability to consolidate theoretical knowledge (BADDELEY, 2007). When the school imposes that the student should be socially integrated even before being cognitively welcomed, it establishes an insurmountable entry barrier. The requirement for constant reading of non-verbal signals acts as a form of internal surveillance, draining the energy levels necessary for the maintenance of working memory (BARKLEY, 1997). The result is what we observed in several cases of school fatigue, where the individual, after hours of apparent compliance, experiences a deep exhaustion when returning home, unable to perform any other intellectual task.

The impact of this goes beyond fleeting fatigue. The child or young person who realizes that their social adaptation effort is never enough to achieve the fluidity of their peers begins to develop a self-perception of inadequacy (DAMASIO, 1994). The school environment, by rewarding those who naturally read these clues effortlessly, punishes, even indirectly, those whose neurological circuits are occupied with other forms of perception and processing (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). This dynamic creates an emotional tension that crystallizes into chronic stress. The nervous system, in a constant state of social alert, releases cortisol at levels that inhibit cerebral plasticity, making learning itself much more difficult than it would be in an environment where the social cost of presence was reduced (LENT, 2010).

By ignoring the hidden cognitive burden of social interactions, the school fails to recognize that the intelligence and competence of a neurodivergent student may be camouflaged by this perfect storm of peripheral demands (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). We are not just talking about an academic difficulty, but about a systematic erosion of self-confidence. The need to mask the processing difficulties to appear neurotypical during the classroom creates a hiatus between who the student is and who he feels he needs to be to survive the school day (BADDELEY, 2007). This duality, maintained for hours on end, generates a distancing from the creative and intellectual potential itself.

Changing this reality requires understanding that social competence, as well as learning a language or abstract concept, does not occur uniformly (DEHAENE, 2012). While some students absorb the standards of conduct by osmosis, others need an explicit teaching or an

environment that allows self-regulation without the scrutiny of the group (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). When the school insists on treating social compliance as a prerequisite for access to the curriculum, it will continue to exclude minds that have a unique analytical capacity, but that simply were not designed for constant public performance. The real inclusion involves disarming these implicit traps, allowing the brain to dedicate its energy, before spending it on simulation of normality, for the exercise of curiosity and the real construction of knowledge. The system that requires the mask as a passport for learning ends up ignoring the genuine face of talents that, under different conditions, would be the architects of tomorrow's knowledge.

The gap between the intellectual potential of a student and the result recorded in a standardized evaluation is one of the cruelest symptoms of the current educational system (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). When the school converts learning into a series of timed tests, formulated based on the average of a neurotypical brain, it ceases to measure the ability to understand and begins to measure the individual's resistance to a specific output model (BADDELEY, 2007). For the neurodivergent mind, the role that requires the choice between pre-established alternatives or the writing of a text under temporal pressure represents a barrier that distorts, rather than revealing, the domain of knowledge (SNYDERMAN, 2019).

Standardized evaluation presupposes linearity in the recovery of information that many brains do not have (DEHAENE, 2012). While a neurotypical profile can access facts in a direct way, such as those who remove an object from an organized shelf, an atypical functioning brain often retrieves information through complex associative routes (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). For these students, a concept is not an isolated unit, but the knot of a vast network of sensory, emotional and logical associations (DAMASIO, 1994). When a test requires a specific and decontextualized response, the student is forced to prun this network, to abandon the context that gives meaning to knowledge, and to conform his thinking to a format that he simply does not inhabit. The failure that appears in the final note does not stem from the ignorance of matter, but from the impossibility of translating a multidimensional thought into a two-dimensional feedback.

In addition to format limitation, there is the issue of performance anxiety, which, for nervous systems already under load, functions as a trigger for cognitive block (BARKLEY, 1997). The anticipation of a test, with all its burden of social expectations and fear of comparison, activates brain areas related to stress that compete directly for the resources of working memory (LENT, 2010). At the moment the paper is delivered, the logical reasoning capacity can be compromised by cortisol, preventing the student from demonstrating what, in an environment of less pressure, he would be able to explain with clarity and depth (DAMASIO,

1994). The system, by ignoring this biological vulnerability, confuses a failure in the execution of the task with a failure in the seizure of the content, perpetuating the cycle of insecurity that prevents the student from recognizing his own intellect.

The fixation by a single method of evaluation ignores the fact that intelligence is expressed in multiple ways (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). There are students whose ability to analyze shines in practical projects, in oral discussions or in solving complex problems that require side thinking, but who get lost in the translation to the response sheet (SNYDERMAN, 2019). When the institution insists that only one path of demonstration of knowledge is valid, it sentences those who possess the most creative and heterodox minds to invisibility. The cost of this standardization is high: not only the loss of talents that discourage themselves in the face of the impossibility of being understood, but the development of an aversion to the learning environment, which becomes seen as a place of judgment rather than a space of discovery.

To transform this reality, it is necessary to question the very purpose of the evaluation in the school environment (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). If the goal is learning, the measurement should be flexible enough to accommodate neurological diversity. This requires the system to accept that a student can demonstrate his understanding of a physical phenomenon through a model, a detailed verbal explanation or a practical application, rather than limiting success to a multiple choice test. When the evaluation becomes a conversation about what was learned, rather than a conformity check, the neurodivergent student finds a space to integrate his knowledge authentically.

True inclusion demands recognition that the accuracy of a brain is not linked to the speed or standardization of its output (BADDELEY, 2007). By diversifying the ways to verify progress, education is not facilitating the way, but ensuring that the obstacle is the intellectual challenge of discipline itself, not the structure of proof (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). When the evaluation ceases to be an exclusion funnel, it becomes a diagnostic tool for the student himself, helping him to identify how his thinking is organized and where his greatest fortresses are. Breaking with the tyranny of feedback is to give permission for diverse minds to stop just surviving the curriculum and begin to flourish from their own powers, freeing themselves from the narrative of the failure that the traditional school imposes on those who simply process the world in a different light.

The structural failure of the traditional school is not limited to the inadequacy of its metrics, but lies in the creation of an environment that systematically delegitimizes the cognitive effort of the neurodivergent student (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). When a system exclusively rewards the speed of data recovery and formal compliance, it deliberately ignores

the phenomenology of atypical learning (DEHAENE, 2012). For many, knowledge is not organized linearly or hierarchically, but emerges through a web of associations that, although rich, do not have shortcuts to conventional test formats (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). This unlinking between the nature of the student's thinking and the structure of his measurement generates a phenomenon of helplessness learned, where the student, realizing that his best performance is not captured by the academic sieve, gradually disables his natural curiosity.

The emotional distress resulting from this failure has practical consequences that manifest far beyond the classroom (DAMASIO, 1994). The individual who spends years being evaluated by a ruler who does not measure the extent of his domain, but only the speed of his/her submission to the protocol, ends up internalizing the perception of incompetence. This chronic stress situation changes the physiology of learning (LENT, 2010). Under the pressure of short deadlines and the constant threat of error, the limbic system takes control, inhibiting the prefrontal cortex, the area in charge of superior executive functions (SCHULTZ, 2015). In practical terms, this means that, at the critical moment of the test, the student loses access to long-term memory circuits (BADDELEY, 2007). The following low note is not a reflection of forgetfulness or lack of preparation, but a biological response to an environment that was intentionally designed to disable analytical thinking.

This process of exhaustion is accelerated when the system requires the student to compensate his neurological difference through a camouflage effort (BARKLEY, 1997). The energy that should be directed to the synthesis, critical analysis and application of new concepts is drained in the maintenance of a facade of normality. This metabolic energy expenditure is silent but devastating (DAMASIO, 1994). Upon reaching the end of the academic cycle, the student not only performs less than his real potential, but carries the burden of cognitive fatigue that prevents engagement in other spheres of life (BADDELEY, 2007). The cost of this educational exclusion is the loss of an intellectual diversity that, in a more adaptive ecosystem, would be the engine of innovations and solutions of problems that escape conventional thinking.

In the long term, school exclusion based on standardized metrics consolidates an entry barrier for the labour market and adult life (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). The school, by not validating different forms of intelligence, conditions the individual to believe that his only chance of success is mimicry. The student learns that it is not his talent or his unique perspective that matter, but his ability to be replaceable and predictable. When the educational system ignores the fact that atypical processing can offer side thinking solutions that the average brain does not even glimpse, it impoverishes not only the future of the individual, but the productive

and intellectual fabric of society itself (SNYDERMAN, 2019). Success in this model becomes a matter of resistance and not of real competence.

The paradigm shift therefore requires the transition from a control model to a support model (ROSE; MEYER, 2002). This implies decentralizing the evaluation, shifting it from a unique moment of extreme tension to a continuous process of demonstration of knowledge. When the environment allows the student to choose the means of expression, either by speech, by creating a project, by practical demonstration or by writing, it removes the noise from the format, allowing the intelligence to shine through the clarity of the concept. What neurodivergence points out, ultimately, is that standardization is not synonymous with equality, but rather the imposition of a barrier that favors only a small portion of human variation (DEHAENE, 2012). True inclusion is the architecture of spaces where the question is not whether the student fits the test, but whether the proof is capable of being a mirror for the vastness of the cognitive capacity of the learner.

By eliminating the tyranny of rapid response and forced linearity, the school allows the neurodivergent brain to regain its metabolic pace of consolidation (BADDELEY, 2007). This pace, often misinterpreted as slow, is actually a form of deep processing, where the data are integrated with greater precision and durability (KOLB; WHISHAW, 2015). When the educational system aligns itself with this reality, it turns the classroom of a trial court into a discovery lab. The student's academic trajectory ceases to be a succession of wounds in self-esteem and becomes the construction of a solid intellectual identity, based on the awareness of its own powers, and not on the accounting of its failures within a model that, since its origin, has not been designed to understand it (DAMASIO, 1994).

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 6: neuroplasticity and the potential for change throughout life

The cerebral architecture is not a static plane engraved in stone during embryonic development, but rather a living structure that shapes each interaction with the environment. As noted by the pioneer of neurohistology Santiago Ramón y Cajal (1994), the adult nervous system can be seen, to some extent, as a garden whose trees can sprout new branches and deep branches when cultivated with adequate stimuli. The experience acts as a constant sculptor of neural pathways, strengthening paths that are often traveled and neglecting those who fall into disuse. This phenomenon, known as structural neuroplasticity, reveals that the brain alters its own physical topography in response to the challenges it faces, reconfiguring the density of gray matter and the efficiency of synaptic connections. As Doidge (2020) points out, the brain has the remarkable property of modifying its own structure and functioning to each thought and action. When a neurodivergent student engages in a task that demands intentional cognitive effort, he is not only trying to learn specific content, but forcing his neural tissue to draw new processing routes.

This ability to adapt goes beyond mere reorganization. When a conventional neural pathway presents an obstacle, the nervous system demonstrates remarkable functional flexibility to seek alternatives. This is the case of circuits that, when finding difficulty in the rapid processing of information, mobilize neighboring areas or distributed networks to compose the same cognitive response. This compensation is not a system error, but an evidence of biological robustness and adaptive functional plasticity (Kolb & Gibb, 2014). The brain evaluates the need for the task and allocates resources in unconventional ways, building a unique architecture that privileges functionality over compliance with the average standard. Instead of a design flaw, one perceives a survival engineering that prioritizes solving the problem.

Daily experience acts as a constant stimulus for this refinement. Each new competence required, each skill practiced with intent, sends electrical signals that consolidate the myelination of axons, making the conduction of nervous impulses faster and safer. As Kandel (2009) shows in his studies on learning biology, the change in the effectiveness of synapses and the gene expression induced by experience transform short-term memories into permanent structural changes. The spaced repetition, when applied with understanding of these dynamics, functions as a biological fixation technique. By spacing attempts to recover information, the brain is obliged to reconstruct the neural path of access, preventing learning from becoming an

automatic and superficial habit. This process requires a conscious effort that strengthens the network in such a way that the information integrates structurally to the cognitive repertoire.

The importance of understanding this dynamism lies in the breaking of the deterministic view of development. The initial diagnosis or difficulty does not define the absolute limit of what one can achieve, because the learning trajectory is a process of continuous and mediated construction (Vygotsky, 1998). Strategies that favor plasticity need to consider that time is a fundamental variable in the architecture of change. When the environment provides the necessary support for this exploration to occur without the pressure of a timed execution, the brain gains metabolic freedom to establish more stable and complex connections. The result is an individual who not only overcomes the immediate barrier, but develops a cognitive resilience that will serve as a basis for future learning.

The evidence of this plasticity allows changing the perspective on educational interventions. Instead of focusing exclusively on correcting performance that deviates from what is expected, the focus should be on creating an environment that stimulates neural reorganization through deliberate practice (Ericsson, 2008). The neurodivergent brain, because it has an atypical topography, often finds solutions that a standardized system does not even map. By allowing these alternative paths to be traveled with autonomy, the range of cognitive possibilities is expanded. The real challenge is not the rigidity of the brain, but the rigidity of the system that tries to impose a single map on a territory that, by nature, requires personalized navigation. Neural plasticity transforms hope into a measurable biological process, where each directed effort results in concrete changes, ensuring that learning, as a physical and continuous event, remains accessible throughout life.

Although cerebral architecture maintains a remarkable adaptability over decades, the efficiency of this remodeling is not uniform throughout human trajectory. Neuroscience identifies sensitive periods, temporal windows of biological opportunity in which the nervous system exhibits expanded receptivity to certain types of environmental stimuli (Bruer, 1999). During these intervals, the brain has optimized plasticity, functioning almost as a high malleability tissue, capable of integrating new skills with reduced metabolic expenditure. For the neurodivergent individual, understanding when these windows open is a determining factor for the effectiveness of any educational mediation, because the mismatch between biological maturity and pedagogical expectation can transform a potential learning environment into a scenario of accumulated frustration.

The idea of windows of opportunity does not mean that the door closes after the closure of a specific cycle. The myth of adult rigidity, which suggests the end of plasticity after

adolescence, ignores that the brain operates at different frequencies of change according to demand and novelty (Greenough et al., 1987). What happens is a decline in the ease rate with which new synapses are established in primary processing areas, such as the control of sensory systems. However, the development of superior skills, such as critical thinking and self-reflective regulation, keeps windows open for much longer periods, depending almost exclusively on the quality and persistence of exposure to new challenges.

In a practical context, the temporal mismatch becomes evident when the school system tries to force the literacy or refinement of fine motor coordination in children whose biological readiness windows have not yet reached their peak or require a distinct approach. When a mediator insists on the mechanical repetition of tasks that the apprentice's brain does not yet have synaptic maturation to process, he wastes the moment of greater plasticity for other emerging skills. The result is the exhaustion of the system before learning occurs. Successful educational mediation, therefore, is one that observes the individual rhythm to identify at which stage the student's brain is more able to absorb a specific challenge (Vygotsky, 1998).

The optimization of these periods requires a change of posture in relation to the execution time. If a neurodivergent brain has a longer latency time to process a social track or organize a logical concept, the pressure by speed acts as a physical barrier that closes the window of opportunity before the consolidation of the circuit. Slowness, often seen as a deficit, acts as a strategy to preserve cognitive integrity, allowing neural reorganization to occur without interference from sensory or emotional noises. When pedagogy respects this time, it allows the brain to complete the necessary myelination in alternative ways, making access to information more robust and lasting.

At more advanced ages, the exploitation of these sensitive periods occurs through the reconfiguration of habits and meaning-based learning. The adult brain still retains a plasticity that, although less voracious than in childhood, is extremely focused and efficient (Doidge, 2020). By applying deliberate practice in a window where the intrinsic motivation of the learner is high, it is possible to make qualitative leaps that formal education often ignores. The key to this transformation is to identify the moments when the brain is ready for reorganization, monitoring cognitive energy and directing the effort exactly to the point of greater susceptibility to change.

The recognition of these temporal flows transforms the intervention of an act of imposition into a work of biological synchronization. The role of the educational mediator evolves into that of a curator of opportunities, someone capable of discerning when the brain is in a state of openness conducive to learning and when it requires the rest necessary for the

consolidation of the new circuits. This sensitivity to time and biological readiness removes educational practice from standardized models, allowing development to take place at a pace consistent with the real biology of each mind.

When the nervous system finds a blocked pathway, the brain nature resorts to alternative routes. This load redistribution capacity is what allows an important cognitive function not to be lost, even when the primary biological structure presents difficulties. In the brain, this compensatory reorganization occurs through the recruitment of secondary networks that assume supporting functions (Kolb & Gibb, 2014). This boundary engineering is essential to understand how neurodivergent individuals navigate a world that has not been designed for the particular architecture of their minds. Neural compensation justifies why mental fatigue can be so pronounced after periods of great activity, since the brain maintains a complex traffic system through alternative pathways that require constant metabolic maintenance.

The ability of the brain to reorganize functions is extremely malleable under the correct stimulus conditions, having deliberate practice as the main engine of this process (Ericsson, 2008). When a person engages in exercises that force the use of these compensatory pathways, he consolidates the new route and refines the efficiency of communication between the recruited circuits. Spaced repetition, in turn, prevents empty automatism and forces the brain to reconstruct the neural path of access with greater precision at each attempt, sculpting cognitive resilience through distributed and highly integrated networks (Kandel, 2009).

For this compensation to be effective, the environment needs to offer the time needed for these connections to be strengthened. When the educational system imposes an output rhythm that does not respect the functional reorganization time, external pressure acts as an inhibitory noise. By allowing the student to transit through his own cognitive map, the mediator facilitates the discovery of shortcuts and strategies that optimize performance. The compensation then goes from a need for survival to a strategic advantage, where the individual learns to use their unique processing profile as a problem solving engine.

This perspective radically changes the way we view error. The error does not represent a lack of capacity, but a brain signaling indicating that the current map is not yet efficient for the new task, or that the recruited alternative pathway needs further reinforcement. Each successful attempt to bypass a barrier through a reorganized neural network is a step towards mastery. Functional plasticity thus becomes a tool of autonomy, transforming difficulty into a constant exercise of expansion of one's own mind and allowing the individual to become the architect of his own cognitive architecture (Doidge, 2020).

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 7: neuroeducation practices grounded in scientific evidence

The information architecture in an educational environment often ignores the fragility of the processing bottleneck. When presenting large blocks of content, the educator assumes that the brain has an unlimited bandwidth for simultaneous data reception. In practice, cognitive overload acts as a physical barrier, preventing learning from reaching long-term memory centers (Sweller, 1988). When the input volume exceeds the ability to manipulate the working memory, an operational collapse occurs: attention is dispersed, anxiety triggers and the nervous system enters energy saving mode, closing the doors to the new record.

Segmenting knowledge does not mean simplifying content or making it superficial. This is a cognitive engineering strategy. The objective is to dismember the flow of information in smaller and self-sustaining units, called processing microstages. Each unit must contain a theoretical or practical load that the brain can manipulate fully without resorting to exhaustive compensation mechanisms (Mayer, 2014). By isolating a concept in a restricted time window, the student is allowed to complete the cycle of understanding, validation and storage before being bombarded by the next stimulus.

A concrete example of this practice lies in the design of instructions. Instead of an extensive explanation accompanied by a complex task, the strategy is to anchor information on a stable basis. The teacher presents the central concept, requests a quick understanding check and, only after this stabilization neural signal, introduces an additional variable. This controlled progression pace keeps the brain in an ideal challenging zone, in which the required effort is compatible with the processing capacity available. When the volume of data is excessive, the brain needs to discard information to maintain stability, and it often discards just the fundamental content that should be assimilated.

Segmentation also applies to the structure of time. Learning does not occur in a continuous block of four hours of absolute focus. The brain operates in cycles of metabolic activity and rest (Kleitman, 1982). Structured intervals between information segments function as pauses for working memory to release the space occupied by previous stimuli, preparing the system for the next input. To ignore these biological cycles is a common pedagogical error, as it forces the student to process new information while the neural network is still committed to cleaning and organizing the previous content.

The reduction in cognitive load is ultimately an act of respect for the physiology of those who learn. By removing unnecessary noise from the teaching material, such as over text in slides or ambiguous instructions, the focus can be directed exclusively to what is essential.

Every resource that does not contribute directly to the construction of understanding is a voracious competitor for neural energy (Sweller, Ayres, & Kalyuga, 2011). In minds that present challenges in the filtering of stimuli, this noise may be the determining factor between academic success and educational exclusion.

By adopting this approach, the educator ceases to be a transmitter of data volumes and starts to act as an informational flow manager. The responsibility ceases to rest entirely on the student's ability to organize the chaos and begins to reside in the quality of the organization offered by the structure of the class. When the environment and content are organized based on the savings of cognitive load, the student is spared the useless wear and tear. This releases precious neural resources for the execution of complex tasks, creative thinking and the deep consolidation of knowledge, allowing learning to become a sustainable experience rather than an exhaustive proof of mental resistance.

Once understood the need to preserve cognitive bandwidth through segmentation, the next logical step involves the way we encode knowledge so that it is assimilated with maximum efficiency. The brain is not a text processor that interprets only abstract symbols in sequence. It is a multisensory network capable of decoding the world through a constant dialogue between vision, hearing, movement and spatial perception (Paivio, 1986). When instruction is limited to the verbal or purely textual channel, it ignores a vast extent of the available neural machinery, forcing the student to translate complex concepts into a single language, which increases the metabolic cost of mental effort.

The use of multiple sensory channels functions as an intelligent redundancy system. If information is presented simultaneously through a structured chart, a verbal explanation and a physical demonstration, the brain establishes multiple anchoring points for that same data. These parallel connections strengthen the memory trait and allow the individual to access the concept through different paths. For a neurodivergent brain, whose pathways of processing can present specific challenges in areas such as auditory decoding or the focus maintained, this multisensory support ceases to be a pedagogical accessory and becomes a resource of equity.

Visual representations in particular require a treatment that goes beyond decorative illustrations. The brain processes images in parallel, integrating the shape, color and spatial layout almost instantaneously, which requires less resources from the working memory than the analysis of extensive text blocks (Mayer, 2014). A diagram that explains the hierarchy of an idea or the logical flow of an event sequence allows the observer to perceive the structure of the content of a glance. This panoramic view prepares the cognitive terrain, providing a mental

map that facilitates the subsequent insertion of verbal details, which come to be seen not as an amorphous mass of information, but as pieces that fit into an already understood drawing.

The practical application of this strategy lies in the systematic translation of abstractions into visual forms. Teachers who adopt this posture often use graphic organizers, such as mental maps that expand as the theme advances or timelines that anchor historical or scientific concepts in a spatial dimension. The crucial point is to ensure that these representations are not only decorative. They should serve as tools for structuring thought. A good visual scheme should allow the student to understand the relationship between the cause and the effect, between the part and the whole, without needing to spend mental energy trying to build the hierarchy of the concept only based on the spoken explanation.

In addition to the impact on memory, the use of multiple sensory pathways acts directly on neural engagement. When learning involves the body, as in the use of gestures, manipulation of physical objects or variations in tone and rhythm in the presentation, the central nervous system responds to a greater diversity of stimuli, which helps to maintain surveillance and sustained attention (Diamond, 2012). The brain is optimized for movement and interaction with the physical environment. When sitting in an environment where the content remains static and one-dimensional, the nervous system often reduces its alertness, interpreting monotony as a sign for rest. The introduction of different sensory channels reactive these networks, keeping the system in a constant state of readiness for the seizure of new patterns.

When planning the use of these resources, efficacy depends on the fine tuning between stimulus and purpose. The most common error is excess visual information, which can lead to unnecessary noise and overload the sensory processing system. The effectiveness of the strategy lies in the economy of representation, in the accuracy of the graph, in the clarity of the gesture and in the intentionality behind the choice of the sensory channel used for each objective. The ultimate goal is not to fill all senses, but to select the path that best translates the concept, ensuring that the brain finds the path of least resistance to deep understanding, transforming the load of information into lasting knowledge.

Predictability acts as an invisible anchor to the nervous system. When the educational environment operates under a chaotic logic, where each class presents a new structure, changing coexistence rules or a sequence of unpredictable activities, the brain consumes a large part of its resources only to monitor the scenario and detect possible threats. This constant hypervigilance state, often present in neurodivergent individuals, generates an extremely high metabolic expenditure, drastically reducing the available capacity for executive functions, such as planning, working memory and inhibitory control (Diamond, 2013). By implementing a

predictable structure, the educator not only organizes time, but also signals to the student's nervous system that the terrain is safe and known.

The routine, when accurately designed, functions as an energy-saving protocol. Imagine a class that always follows the same rite of entry, a moment of material verification, the development of the block of content and a finalization with synthesis. This repetitive pattern allows students to automate social and logistic behavior, releasing the prefrontal cortex from environmental management tasks. When the student does not need to spend energy trying to guess what will happen next or if he will have time to complete a task, he reserves this neural potential for the assimilation of technical knowledge. The safety of knowing what will come next reduces the peaks of anxiety that, in profiles with ADHD or autism, act as true learning blockers.

This structure, however, must be presented explicitly. The brain needs a map. The use of visual supports that indicate the order of activities, the goals of that session and the timeframes functions as a defined horizon that the system can track. This visibility of progress transforms the learning journey into a measurable process. When predictability is integrated into the design of the instruction, the student understands the beginning, the medium and the end, which allows an internal management of the energy itself. The effort ceases to be a reactive response to an unstable environment and becomes a deliberate allocation of focus on the object of study.

The practical application of this routine strategy goes beyond punctuality. It involves creating cognitive anchors. For example, always using a specific visual or auditory signal to mark the transition between the exposure of a concept and the execution of a practice protects the student against the shock of rhythm change. Without this clear signaling, the transition between modes of thought, such as analytical and executive, can be a source of frustration and resistance. The brain that knows the cadence of the environment manages to prepare itself in advance, preparing its neural networks for the next challenge even before it is requested. This anticipation is a form of emotional regulation that benefits everyone, but it is indispensable for those who deal with challenges in the modulation of sensory and cognitive stimuli.

Reducing anxiety through the structure is therefore a performance optimization strategy. Anxiety is a neural state incompatible with deep learning, as it prioritizes survival and rapid reaction to the detriment of reflection and consolidation of memories (LeDoux, 1996). When establishing routines, the educator removes the stressor from the unknown. The classroom environment becomes a support system, not an obstacle. The teacher's creative freedom, in this context, flourishes within the discipline of the pattern, not outside of it. It is in the security of

predictability that the student finds the necessary support to risk, miss and learn without the constant fear of a cognitive collapse caused by unforeseen variables.

The effectiveness of this strategy is observed in the fluidity with which the tasks are started and completed. With the burden of uncertainty eliminated, the student enters focus states with greater speed and support. The teacher stops spending time calming systems or reorganizing expectations and starts to focus on the essence of the content. This alignment between the architecture of the environment and the needs of the nervous system transforms the classroom structure into a teaching tool as powerful as the teaching material itself, proving that the way learning happens is as decisive for the final result as the quality of the information being transmitted.

The architecture of a successful class depends on the speed at which the brain processes the error and converts that failure into precise adjustment. When feedback is delayed or vague, the neural circuit in charge of refining the pattern loses the opportunity for consolidation. Plasticity does not act on a future intention, but on the correction of the gesture, reasoning, or response carried out just now (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In an environment where the student waits days for a correction, the original context of the task has already dissipated from the working memory, making the comment of the teacher something abstract and devoid of corrective value for the neural structure.

Immediate feedback acts as a chemical and electrical marker that signals to the brain which synaptic connections have been successful and which require immediate recalibration. If the student solves a mathematical problem and receives accurate confirmation of his correctness or mistake in the next instant, the dopaminergic system is triggered, reinforcing the neural path that led to the correct answer (Schultz, 2002). For neurodivergent students, who often face difficulties in self-regulation and internal performance monitoring, this externalization of correction is vital. The teacher becomes, at this moment, the extension of the control system that anchors the student in the reality of the task.

Specificity is the second pillar of this strategy. To say that an answer is wrong is insufficient, because this does not indicate which stage of the process has failed. High-quality feedback should point to the exact point of divergence: where the reasoning has gone astray or where the information has been misinterpreted (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). When the educator describes the error in a technical and objective way, he removes the emotional charge from the evaluation and places it in the field of solution design. This prevents the student from interpreting failure as a personal incapacity, turning error into just another given for learning

engineering. The feedback structure should therefore describe the gap, offer the necessary clue for correction and encourage the student to rebuild the mental path on his own.

This recurrent adjustment process accelerates the consolidation of complex patterns. Upon receiving a precise indication of how to adjust its execution, the student has the chance to perform the correction effort with the concept still active in his working memory. It is a window of short biological opportunity, which closes as the focus moves to other stimuli. The spaced repetition, treated as a plasticity tool in other contexts, here gains a refinement layer: each response attempt, followed by almost simultaneous feedback, is an iteration that strengthens the successful neural pathway. With each cycle of error and correction, the path becomes more efficient, requiring less cognitive effort and making the domain of competence something natural and integrated to brain functioning.

The way this communication is delivered also needs to respect the student's processing profile. Some individuals respond better to visual signals that indicate the correct path, while others better process a brief verbal instruction that helps them review the previous step. The key is brevity and focus on future action. The feedback should be a route orientation, not a note about the past. When the teacher positions himself as a constant mediator of the execution flow, performance anxiety decreases significantly, because the student knows that he is not delivered to the void of uncertainty, but supported by a verification system that ensures the correctness before the wrong pattern is consolidated as a neural habit.

The practice of offering this immediate return requires the educator a change of posture in the classroom, from a central exhibitor to an active observer who circulates and intervenes surgically. It is not a matter of interrupting the flow to correct every detail, but of identifying the critical points of cognitive collapse and intervening where the adjustment will have the greatest impact. This approach not only preserves the energy of the student, preventing him from persisting in the error for too long, but also teaches his own mind to monitor his processes. Over time, this external feedback structure is internalized, developing in the student a greater self-assessment capacity, an executive resource essential for independent learning at any stage of life.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 8: the impact of the environment and sensory experience on cognition

The quality of light on a work surface radically alters the metabolic cost of visual processing. In environments planned under a low-cost industrial perspective, the omnipresence of fluorescent lamps poses a silent challenge to the nervous system. Although conscious perception ignores the constant oscillation of these devices, the brain, especially the one with greater sensitivity to sensory stimuli, records each flicker pulse. This invisible frequency forces the visual system to constantly readjust ocular accommodation and focus, generating cumulative fatigue that corrodes the ability to concentrate long before the school or work day is over. The neural effort spent to filter this luminous noise is an inefficient deviation of resources that should be allocated to decoding complex concepts and memory retention, remembering that the use of multiple sensory channels and adequate infrastructure prevent the depletion of cognitive bandwidth (Sweller, 1988; Mayer, 2014).

The replacement of high frequency lights with natural lighting sources represents a structural change in the ecology of space. Solar light, with its dynamic spectrum and absence of artificial scintillation, interacts with the circadian cycle in order to stabilize the production of melatonin and cortisol, fundamental hormones for the regulation of alert state and rest. Environments that prioritize natural light allow the visual system to relax, because the transition of luminosity throughout the day is organic and predictable. When it is not possible to use direct light, the solution passes through the installation of diffuse light panels with high-frequency drivers, which eliminate the imperceptible flicker, ensuring that the brain receives a stable visual input. This stability removes the need for the nervous system to devote energy to filtering a harmful environmental stimulus, releasing the mind to the task of learning.

In addition to the nature of light, the distribution of this illumination in physical space prevents aggressive contrasts that disorient the perception of depth. High gloss surfaces in reading sites create specular reflexes that act as sensory overload triggers. When choosing matte finishes on tables and walls, the intensity of the reflected light that reaches the periphery of the vision is reduced. This adjustment removes a constant source of distraction that, in neurodivergent individuals, can cause immediate attentional deregulation. The goal is not only to illuminate an object, but to create a visual field that supports the permanence of attention.

The architecture of this lighting must be integrated into the spatial organization so that the individual has control over his own level of light exposure. In an optimized environment, the student or professional has the autonomy to move to a zone with more attenuated light if they perceive the first signs of visual overload, such as tension in the eye region or sudden

disconnection with the activity in progress. This flexibility allows real-time sensory regulation, preventing visual exhaustion from turning into a state of crisis or cognitive block.

Visual predictability also extends to the color temperature of the lamps used in task areas. Overly cold lights, with bluish tones, tend to keep the nervous system in an artificial waking state that can be uncomfortable and produce long-term fatigue. Neutral tones, close to daylight during the morning and slightly warmer in the late afternoon, accompany the natural need for brain oscillation, avoiding light stress. This silent adaptation of the environment removes from the individual the weight of having to constantly adapt to a hostile space. The effectiveness of learning depends not only on the brain's ability to process content, but on the preservation of its physical integrity against the weathers of an environment that ignores the biology of attention. By eliminating the flicker and controlling the incidence of light, the space ceases to be a silent opponent and starts to act as a facilitator of cognition, keeping the mind in a state of availability promptly focused on the acquisition of knowledge.

The management of noise levels in the learning environment transcends the simple concern with absolute silence, with the intentional modulation of the auditory flow to preserve the integrity of the working memory. In shared spaces, the nature of sound is often the main factor of cognitive interruption for neurodivergent minds. Constant background noises, such as the tinnitus of climatization systems, distant conversations or the rhythmic click of keyboards, are not only perceived as acoustic phenomena, but as stimuli that compete fiercely for neural attention. The brain, in trying to filter these elements to keep the focus on the central task, consumes a significant portion of its executive processing resources, resulting in early mental fatigue and inability to sustain the deep engagement required by high complexity activities.

To mitigate this wear, it is necessary to differentiate acoustic treatment according to the cognitive demand of the task. The creation of sound insulation zones is not to create a vacuum, but to establish controlled fields of perception. In areas designated for high-load executive tasks, the use of sound-absorbing materials such as cork panels, textile coatings or furniture with sound absorption properties reduces the reverberation time of sound waves in the environment. This physical intervention decreases the disorientation caused by echo and by the overlapping of frequencies, allowing the individual to process information linearly, without the constant need to reorient their attention to each new unexpected auditory stimulus that cuts the space.

The implementation of light physical barriers acts as a regulator of sensory perception, offering the brain what can be called perimetric protection against external inattention. Modular partitions or vertical decoration elements, when strategically positioned, do not need to

completely isolate the individual from the rest of the room, but establish a visual and sound bulkhead that defines the boundary between the focus zone and the traffic of surrounding stimuli. This configuration reduces the need for continuous monitoring of the environment, because the field of vision and auditory reach are constrained in a comfortable way. The brain, feeling protected, dispenses the hypervigilance response and manages to allocate energy previously spent on filtering noises that are irrelevant to the consolidation of complex information, dialoguing with the concept that environmental predictability reduces the tension load that drains executive functions (Diamond, 2013).

It is also important to offer individual regulation options so that acoustic management is not a rigid imposition of space. Access to devices such as active noise canceling headphones or high-fidelity ear protectors should be integrated into the routine of the environment as a standard tool, and not as an exception or signal of disturbance. When the individual has the autonomy to adjust his/her own sensory input in real time, he/she establishes a control relationship over the environment. This autonomy transforms the learning experience, allowing the mind to transit between moments of total immersion in silence and periods of greater sensory openness, as required by the nature of the task.

The predictability of the sound landscape is the element that stabilizes the nervous system. Environments where noise sources are minimized through architectural design and people's flow management allow cognition to flourish in a state of constant readiness. When a student or professional knows that their work space maintains reliable sound stability, anticipatory anxiety associated with the possibility of noisy interruptions decreases dramatically. This constancy creates an atmosphere where the mind does not feel compelled to be in a state of permanent alertness, releasing neural processing for learning and creativity. The ultimate objective is the construction of an ecosystem where silence is not the absence of life, but the presence of a favorable condition for thought. By aligning the auditory environment to neurobiological needs, space ceases to act as a constant source of interference and starts to function as an essential support for high-level cognitive functioning, respecting the vulnerability and power of diverse minds.

The architecture of a space that respects neurodiversity is ultimately based on the elimination of the constant effort required by the brain to decipher complex or unpredictable spatial maps. When an environment lacks an intuitive visual organization, the mind spends a disproportionate portion of its executive resources just to locate paths, understand the function of each sector, or anticipate the social interactions allowed in a given area. Anxiety generated by this disorientation is not an abstract reaction, but a direct symptom of the excessive cognitive

burden imposed by an environment that does not clearly communicate its purpose. Visual clarity, therefore, acts as a form of signaling that preserves the integrity of the attention circuits, allowing mental energy to be channeled to the processing of relevant information rather than being drained by the continuous attempt to navigate in chaos.

An effective spatial design uses permanent and persistent visual cues to define areas of activity, which allows the individual to understand the logic of the environment almost automatically. Different areas can be demarcated by the intentional use of textures, soft contrasts of colors or even by the very layout of tables, preventing the student or worker from constantly asking where to perform each task. In a school context, for example, the transition between the moment of individual focus and collaborative group work should be physically readable. If the environment changes subtlely through directional lighting or furniture positioning, the brain receives an environmental trigger that facilitates the adjustment of the internal state to the new demand. This predictable structure eliminates the need for constant monitoring of space, providing a sense of safety that is indispensable for deep learning to occur, maintaining consistency with the guidelines of predictable and stable routines for the protection of the prefrontal cortex (Diamond, 2013).

The organization of the visual field within the working space itself follows the same logic of energy saving. Support surfaces that have a defined purpose, without the accumulation of unnecessary visual stimuli, drastically reduce the propensity to external distraction. When the environment presents elements that compete for the attention of the individual, such as overly informative posters, objects disorganized on shelves or direct visibility of areas of intense circulation, the neurodivergent neural system enters a constant peripheral processing state. The attempt to ignore these elements requires a robust inhibitory control that, although it exists, has a resistance limit. By clearing the field of vision of irrelevant stimuli, space allows attention to focus on the task, resulting in a more agile and less exhaustive execution.

Navigation in the school or professional environment gains fluidity when routes are designed to be intuitive and continuous. The architecture of corridors that become dead ends, or classrooms where the seating configuration is rearranged on a daily basis, imposes a constant need for readaptation on the nervous system. For minds that depend on stability to organize thought, this unpredictability acts as a physical barrier to learning. When the layout is established and maintained, the brain creates a mental representation of space, an internal map that comes to be accessed subconsciously. Once this map is consolidated, navigation ceases to be a decision-making task and becomes an automatism, releasing the prefrontal cortex to focus on solving complex problems or acquiring new concepts.

In addition, the implementation of a clear and consistent signaling throughout the environment serves as a cognitive anchor. Numbers, colors or symbols demarcating the functions of each sector allow anyone, regardless of their neurological profile, to quickly identify their destiny without needing to process excessive verbal or social information. This informational transparency is essential to reduce the fatigue of decision that many individuals feel when entering new or unfamiliar places. By offering an environment where the spatial structure speaks for itself, the need for social interaction to clarify norms or locations decreases, protecting the individual from possible episodes of overload. The predictability of space is not, therefore, a creative restriction, but the creation of a solid foundation on which cognition can operate without the constant interruptions of a chaotic environment. The success of learning and productivity begins with the ability of the individual to recognize, effortlessly, the place where he is and what is expected of him at that moment, transforming the physical site into a silent ally of the mental process.

Sensory regulation does not end in the management of visual and auditory inputs, because the body is ultimately the first information processing device. For the neurodivergent nervous system, the static position imposed by the traditional configuration of classrooms or offices is a biological consensus. The brain, being compelled to maintain a rigid posture for long periods, wastes a considerable portion of its metabolic activity only to sustain the muscle tone needed to combat gravity. This postural effort, often invisible to the external observer, acts as a constant background noise that competes for attention to tasks of superior order, such as logical reasoning or text decoding.

The introduction of motion options in the learning environment transforms this dynamic of postural stress into an opportunity for autonomic regulation. Active furniture, which allows you to switch between sitting and standing positions, or the use of chairs that offer micromovements, enables the individual to adjust his alert level through changes in proprioception. When the motor system is engaged in subtle movements, such as the light foot balance or the frequent adjustment of posture, the motor cortex receives constant feedback that helps modulate attention. For many neurodivergent minds, this movement is not a distraction, but a sensory homeostasis mechanism that keeps the nervous system within an ideal activation window for information processing, aligning itself with the principles of support for executive functions and multisensory engagement (Diamond, 2012).

The incorporation of motor regulation zones into collective work spaces alters the perception of error and agitation. When a student or professional feels the need to stand up or change their position to reorganize their thoughts, the environment should not interpret it as a

sign of disengagement, but as an autonomous strategy to search for neural balance. The inclusion of pufes, variable-height seats or areas that allow standing motion offers the brain the necessary support to process information without exhaustion caused by forced immobility. This spatial design, which integrates the need for movement to everyday architecture, eliminates the stigma associated with restlessness, validating the use of motricity as a means of access to cognition.

The posture, in the same way, directly reflects the ability to maintain focus. Some seat structures designed specifically to provide vestibular support, such as chairs that allow a slight inclination or the adoption of sensory supports, help stabilize the body's perception in space. When the support base is perceived as safe, the deep musculature enters a relative resting state, decreasing the signaling load that constantly travels to the brain requesting corrections. This state of greater physical comfort is what allows the mind to abandon body self-surveillance and direct the whole of its executive resources to the content under study or to the task in progress.

The autonomy in the control of these sensory stimuli of motor nature is the most sensitive point of environmental integration. By offering the individual the prerogative of modifying their space of action, the logic of forced adaptation that characterizes conventional education is reversed. The brain ceases to be a passive agent that needs to bend to the constraints of the physical environment and interacts with it dialectically, adjusting the level of comfort and motor dynamics as the cognitive load increases. If a task requires a higher level of processing, the individual can choose a more contained posture, while moments of intuitive reflection or processing can be accompanied by a more fluid and free movement.

The effectiveness of this sensory design strategy lies in agency perception. When the environment recognizes the biology of the individual and offers tools for his postural regulation, the anxiety associated with performance decreases. The individual ceases to spend energy trying to suppress his natural sensory impulses and starts to use them in his favor, transforming agitation into rhythm and movement in support of concentration. It is the transition of resistance effort against space to work fluidity within an ecosystem that understands the intrinsic need for movement as a vital component of cognitive processing. By providing varied options of postural support and freedom of movement, space starts to act as a mediator capable of sustaining high-level neural functioning, respecting the uniqueness of the routes that each mind travels towards knowledge, which benefits from a planned environmental structure based on neuroscientific evidence (Sweller, Ayres, & Kalyuga, 2011).

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 9: neural circuits of emotion and motivation in learning

Memory is not a passive deposit where we store facts such as who organizes files in a bookcase, but a living process, sculpted by the emotional charge that accompanies each experience. When information passes through our senses, the brain performs a silent screening, deciding what deserves to be consolidated and what should be discarded by oblivion. At the center of this decision, the tonsil functions as an affective thermometer. Whenever a content awakens some level of impact, be it enthusiasm for an unexpected discovery or alert of genuine difficulty, the amygdala signals to the hippocampus that that information has a special weight. This emotional marker is what ensures the solidity of memory.

The hippocampus acts as the great orchestrator of this consolidation, converting ephemeral experiences into long-term records. However, its efficiency is intrinsically linked to the modulation it receives from the prefrontal cortex, the area responsible for executive functions and attention control. This is where the process ceases to be purely biological and becomes an engagement game. When emotion is aligned to the purpose, the prefrontal cortex can maintain focus, allowing the bridge between the hippocampus and memory networks to remain open and stable. On the other hand, when learning occurs in an environment of unmeasured anxiety or total indifference, this bridge is often obstructed. The amygdala, by triggering signs of constant alertness or chronic lack of interest, kidnaps the resources that would be destined for consolidation, resulting in knowledge that is never fixed, however much the cognitive effort seems to have been invested.

For the neurodivergent mind, this mechanism operates with peculiarities that we ignore by standardizing teaching. Often the emotional response does not follow the expected logic. A stimulus that for a neurotypical brain is neutral can be loaded with meaning for those who have a distinct sensory or cognitive profile. The failure in the consolidation of learning, in many cases, does not lie in the inability to process the content, but in the absence of an emotional charge that connects the individual to the object of study. If the nervous system does not perceive relevance, the amygdala remains at rest and the hippocampus does not receive the command to record the experience with depth. The brain saves energy and information, although understood at the moment, dissolves hours later, as if it had never been presented.

Understanding that emotion is the seal of memory guarantee radically changes our approach. Instead of insisting on mechanical repetition methods or requiring a continuous focus on topics devoid of personal connection, we need to look for the way in of real motivation. When learning is anchored in something that arouses a positive neurochemical response, the

brain starts operating in a cognitive effort economy regime, where memory forms almost naturally. Consolidation ceases to be a weight for the mind and becomes a byproduct of active curiosity.

The effectiveness of this architecture depends on our ability to cultivate environments that not only transmit data, but that provoke an emotional resonance capable of activating these circuits, ensuring that the brain finds efficient processing pathways without exhausting cognitive bandwidth (Sweller, 1988; Mayer, 2014). If the content is presented as a rigid and depersonalized block, it ignores the physiology of the human mind itself. On the other hand, when we allow learning to be linked to particular interests and emotional states that the brain recognizes as valuable, we transform the consolidation of the memory of a forced exercise into a genuine exploration. The biology of learning rewards enthusiasm with permanence and penalizes apathy with forgetfulness. This is the key that many ignore when trying to force learning through external discipline, without realizing that the true engine is hidden in the depths of the structures that process the meaning of what we feel and, consequently, what we are able to retain.

Dopamine often inhabits the collective imagination as a simple messenger of pleasure, a kind of biochemical reward that arises after the achievement of a goal. This simplistic view, however, conceals its primordial function as an engine of anticipation and search. In the human brain, dopamine does not only mark the end of the journey, it is the fuel that sustains exploration and curiosity during the journey. For the neurodivergent nervous system, the functioning of this reward circuit presents nuances that challenge conventional teaching structures, based almost entirely on extrinsic stimuli such as grades, deadlines or external social approval.

When a teacher or work environment tries to drive a neurodivergent individual through traditional incentive systems, it often encounters resistance that is not due to lack of will, but to a neurochemical discrepancy. The neurodivergent brain tends to demonstrate a attenuated response to reinforcements that it perceives as arbitrary or disconnected from an internal meaning structure. Where others find sufficient motivation in a promise of future and distant reward, the mind that operates under a neurodivergent paradigm requires a deeper alignment between the immediate effort and the cognitive satisfaction that the task itself can provide.

This distinction reveals that extrinsic motivation has a limited range for those whose dopaminergic circuits function with differentiated sensitivity thresholds. When the brain does not realize the intrinsic value of an activity, the metabolic cost to maintain attention becomes prohibitive. The effort to sustain the execution of something without clear purpose drains the energy needed for higher-order cognitive processes. On the other hand, when the individual

encounters an object of study or an activity that connects to his latent interests, spontaneous dopaminergic firing occurs. This phenomenon is what allows learning to happen with an intensity and speed that overcome any effort of discipline imposed from the outside.

The search for this intrinsic motivation becomes, therefore, the most effective strategy to ensure that information is not only processed, but consolidated. Instead of trying to force the system to respond to generic incentives, the neuroeducational approach should focus on identifying what, for each individual, triggers the spark of genuine exploitation. It is not a matter of facilitating content, but of finding the key to access that arouses the natural interest of the mind. The brain that engages out of curiosity operates at another level of resource saving. He does not need to fight his own inertia, because the desire to understand the object of study acts as a constant tensile force, keeping the attention and consolidation circuits organically activated.

This transition from extrinsic to intrinsic motivation requires us to abandon the idea that education should be a one-way street, where learning is served in equal parts to all students. For the individual who experiences neurodivergence, dopamine regulation is intrinsically linked to the perceived relevance of the task. When learning is authentic and significant, it ceases to require excessive consumption of executive control to maintain concentration, as the endogenous reward system assumes the task of maintaining focus. The challenge, then, is to create contexts that allow this brain to navigate by its own interests without the external structure functioning as a sensory or cognitive block.

The recognition of this underlying biology alters the posture of those who teach or lead. Instead of questioning the individual's dedication, we should observe how the environment modulates his dopaminergic response. If the brain turns off in the face of a standardized instruction, perhaps the problem is not the ability to learn, but the absence of a neural connection that makes the information relevant enough to be processed. Success in learning, for many, is hidden in the ability to transform what is mandatory into something that binds to the neural pathways that are already predisposed to explore and discover. By aligning the learning goals to internal triggers of motivation, we allow neuroplasticity to work in our favor, consolidating knowledge that becomes an integral part of the individual's identity, rather than volatile memories that are lost immediately after the evaluation.

In this search for meaning scenario, so-called specific or hyperfocused interests emerge not as a distraction, but as high cognitive performance channels. When the neurodivergent brain is fixed on a theme, a reorganization of neural activity occurs that favors deep processing to the detriment of peripheral surveillance. Hyperfocus is the biological state in which the barrier between the self and the object of study dilutes, allowing memory consolidation to occur with

a precision that generic instruction would never achieve. What many interpret as a passing obsession is, in fact, an incessant search engine for complexity, where the brain tests the limits of knowledge in search of patterns and logical connections.

The practical function of these intense focus on learning is the construction of robust mental schemes. When exploring a subject through a lens of deep interest, the individual not only decodes superficial information, but establishes a network of associations that anchors each new data into a structure of pre-existing meaning. Dopamine released during these incursions not only serves as a marker of pleasure, but acts as a synaptic facilitator that makes cerebral plasticity much more receptive. In a school or professional environment, this characteristic can be capitalized by allowing technical learning to be structured through the prism of such interests, transforming the acquisition of necessary skills in part of a broader personal exploration.

The central challenge, however, lies in sustaining this gear in the face of the social demands of generalism. The human mind, when forced to disperse its energy on topics that do not activate its reward circuit, enters a state of conservative economy, where the retention of information is minimal. When the educational system ignores this biology, it is not just failing to teach, it is wasting the individual's ability to focus. Interest-based pedagogy should not be seen as a concession to the student's will, but as a strategic adjustment necessary to align curriculum requirements with the physiology of the brain that needs to be learned.

The transition between intense focus and practical application occurs when the individual perceives the usefulness of his specific knowledge to solve problems that he considers real. Hyperfocus, when well channeled, is a mastery tool. The ability to dive deep into a niche allows the development of a refined critical thought, capable of dissecting complex systems with a dexterity that is rarely observed in superficial approaches. By validating this process of learning by immersion, we change the paradigm of education, from a transmission of facts to a cultivation of research skills.

The management of these high-intensity states requires the surrounding environment to provide the necessary fuel so that curiosity does not become a source of exhaustion. This means offering not only space, but the time needed for exploration to reach its natural completion cycle. The sudden interruption of a hyperfocus state to fulfill arbitrary calendars causes a break in synaptic consolidation that deeply impairs learning. Focus biology demands respect for the pace of discovery, where engagement precedes memorization and passion for the object of study ensures that cognitive effort is worth the energy investment, ensuring that the nervous system maintains the necessary stability without going into exhaustion (Diamond, 2012).

Finally, the integration of these interests into the individual's repertoire of skills allows learning to become autonomous. Once the brain learns to use hyperfocus as a content-domain strategy, this competence can be transferred to other domains of life, creating a cycle of constant self-learning. The key to unlocking this potential is not the restriction or standardization of interests, but the creation of a support architecture that understands the biological value of this dedication. By recognizing that the focus is the motor of memory, we fail to see the specific interest as a symptom of deviation to see it as the strongest foundation on which we can build a lasting and meaningful knowledge.

Emotional regulation acts as the gatekeeper of all high-level cognitive activity. While the amygdala and hippocampus manage relevance and memory, it is the individual's ability to monitor and adjust their internal states that determines whether this architecture will be productive or blocked. For the neurodivergent mind, the challenge of attention is not a failure of character, but the direct consequence of an overload in emotional regulation. When the environment demands focus on information that the brain processes as irrelevant or stressful, the expense of metabolic energy only to sustain an appearance of attention exhausts the executive battery needed for the task of learning itself.

Effective self-regulation techniques begin with the perception of the internal state before cognitive collapse occurs. A practical method that has demonstrated solid results is the technique of conscious interruption based on sensory intervals. Instead of forcing the prefrontal cortex to keep the focus for uninterrupted periods, the individual trains the identification of the first physical signs of deregulation, such as mandible tension, short breathing or increased motor restlessness. By noticing these indicators, learning is paused strategically. This interval should not be filled with new information, but with the restoration of sensory balance. Walking through a controlled environment, changing lighting or allowing a short-term sensory immersion helps the nervous system to reset, releasing the amygdala from its alert state and returning to the prefrontal cortex the clarity necessary to resume complex processing, maintaining consistency with the need for predictability that protects executive functions against exhaustion (Diamond, 2013).

Another crucial point is the restructuring of the workload so that it aligns itself with the cycles of mental energy. Often, the attempt to process highly complex information at sensory fatigue times generates a helplessness effect, where the brain, unable to organize the data, shuts down its absorption capacity as a form of self-protection. The strategy of dividing complex problems into microstages that offer small consecutive victories is a direct application of reward neuroscience. Each stage completed triggers a dopaminergic response that, in turn, facilitates

emotional regulation and maintains the bridge between the hippocampus and the open and operative prefrontal cortex. The sensation of progress, however minor, acts as a biological antidote to anxiety that paralyzes complex thinking.

Environments that prioritize predictability drastically reduce the emotional charge that the brain needs to administer. Knowing exactly what is expected, what the task time limit and what the stages of a complex activity allow the neurodivergent brain to save resources. The use of visual scripts or checklists, which function as an external memory, relieves the prefrontal cortex of the task of monitoring the progress of execution, allowing it to concentrate fully on the content of learning. The removal of ambiguity reduces the uncertainty that the tonsil often interprets as a threat. When the brain realizes that the environment is safe and the rules are clear, it can abandon the posture of defensive surveillance and open up to the processing of dense information, benefiting directly from a stable environmental structure that mitigates the tension overload (Diamond, 2013).

The practical application of these self-regulation strategies requires learning to be seen as a dance between effort and rest. Encouraging autonomy for the student or the neurodivergent professional to determine their own rhythm, considering the limits of their emotional regulation capacity, transforms the act of learning from an exhaustive battle into an exercise of personal mastery. The central objective is to create a development zone where the cognitive requirement is balanced with emotional support. By aligning the task to natural energy cycles, we reduce the friction between the individual's biology and the demands of the outside world. The result of this approach is a deeper and, above all, lasting learning, because it ceases to be a forced response to external pressures and becomes the organic construction of a repertoire of skills that the brain finally recognizes as valuable.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 10: practical perspectives: stories of neurodivergent students

Lucas, a fourteen-year-old adolescent diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), sat in the ranks of the back of the classroom as if he were preparing an imminent escape. For him, the traditional school environment functioned as a rigid containment structure against his own internal energy. While teachers demanded a prolonged immobility that he interpreted as a titanic and fruitless effort, his mind actively sought stimuli that could justify the expense of his focus. The scene of its transformation began not with a more rigorous discipline, but with the deliberate permission for the movement to occupy the place of silence.

By allowing Lucas to use a stationary exercise bike in the corner of the room, or to alternate his posture between the chair and the swing support during the explanation of complex physics problems, the educational system stopped fighting the biology of that brain. The constant movement activated the vestibular and proprioceptive system, providing the nervous system with the stimulation necessary for dopamine levels to stabilize in the prefrontal cortex. Without the constant need to spend cognitive resources trying to suppress motor restlessness — a process that exhausts the so-called "bandwidth" of working memory (Sweller, 1988) —, Lucas managed to channel the remaining energy to the topics that aroused his curiosity, especially the fluid dynamics.

The specific interest of the student, who was previously seen by educators as a distraction that removed him from the common pedagogical path, became the engine of his dedication. When physics problems ceased to be abstract equations on the blackboard and became practical challenges about the aerodynamics of models that he himself projected in his hours of hyperfocus, learning changed in nature. The adolescent no longer needed to force attention in an exhaustive way, as Diamond (2013) points out, the engagement anchored in intrinsic motivation sustains the focus in a much more efficient and organic way than the inhibitory control forced by external pressures. The reward came not from arbitrary notes or from the approval of teachers, but from the resolution of the problem itself which he had proposed to understand.

This change of approach also changed the way Lucas perceived his own intellectual ability. For years, he had internalized the message that the difficulty of sitting was synonymous with lack of commitment or inability to learn. When the environment began to integrate its motor need as an integral part of the pedagogical strategy, its self-esteem began to rebuild on more solid pillars. He failed to see himself as a misfit student to recognize himself as an

individual who simply processed information in a distinct way, requiring a specific environmental configuration for his potential to be released.

Luke's case illustrates an essential truth about applied neuroeducation. The attempt to standardize the school experience ignores that the cognitive readiness of a brain with ADHD is linked to circuits that seek novelty and immediate relevance. When Lucas' teacher adapted the didactics to include modular challenges that answered questions that the student actually asked, the need for external regulation decreased dramatically. The student learned to manage his own rhythm, understanding that for every period of intense concentration needed to solve a complex calculation, his body needed a range of motion that functioned as a synaptic recharge and a pause in the overload of operational memory (Mayer, 2014).

This newly conquered autonomy did not eliminate the challenge that the disorder imposes, but transformed the internal conflict into a strategy of self-knowledge. Luke began to identify which topics required an environment of low sensory stimulation and which allowed the use of music or movement to raise his alertness. The school structure ceased to be a straitjacket to become a platform he used intelligently, moving from one activity to another as required by the demand for attention. By integrating his peculiar physiology into the process of acquiring knowledge, he proved that learning is a biological act that flourishes only when the environment respects and adjusts to the functioning of the nervous system that inhabits him.

Beatriz's trajectory, a seventeen-year-old girl, offered a necessary counterpoint to Lucas' case, revealing how the invisible barriers of dyslexia can be transposed when the sensory system is adequately circumvented by assistive technologies and multisensory methods. While Lucas' ADHD demanded regulation by movement and hyperfocus, Beatriz's dyslexia imposed a silent conflict, camouflaged by good academic performance in areas of exacts that led her to compensate for her reading difficulties with an exhaustive, almost exhausting dedication. For years, the simple task of decoding dense texts of history or literature transformed the learning experience into an exercise of frustration, in which cognitive fatigue supplanted the pleasure of discovery.

The turning point occurred when her school abandoned the requirement that Beatriz overcome her condition only through volitional effort, starting to treat dyslexia as a difference in phonological processing that required specific tools for sensory translation. The introduction of assisted reading software, which converted texts written in audio synchronized with the visual highlight of the words, allowed her brain to bypass the bottleneck in the decoding of letters and could allocate its neural resources directly to semantic understanding and critical analysis. The multisensory method, aligned with the principles of multimodal instructional

design (Mayer, 2014), created cognitive bridges between textual information and long-term memory, drastically reducing the overload that isolated visual processing caused.

This adaptation was not limited to the use of electronic devices, but reconfigured the student's own relationship with time. By being allowed to access the content in a multimodal way, Beatriz was finally able to experience the cognitive flow that her colleagues typically developed effortlessly. Technology did not function as a crutch, but as a catalyst that allowed it to access the same level of academic complexity as its peers, without energy cost being constant emotional exhaustion. The effectiveness of this intervention proved that when neuroeducation recognizes the specificity of a student's processing, it transforms what was perceived as a disabling deficit into a variability that can be managed with strategic resources.

The impact of this transition on Beatriz's self-esteem was immediate and palpable. She stopped identifying herself as a student who was slow or unable to retain literary information, and began to recognize herself as a thinker who integrated information by alternative means. The school environment ceased to be a court that judged the speed of her reading to become a laboratory where she explored the best way to organize her knowledge. Realizing that her difficulties were not due to a lack of intelligence, but to a disconnect between the way information was presented and the way her brain was processing her, she developed a capacity for emotional self-regulation that was fundamental to the protection of her executive functions (Diamond, 2013).

Her story reinforces that dyslexia, when met by methods that respect the student's neurological architecture, ceases to be the center of an identity crisis. Multimodal coding techniques facilitate memory consolidation, as they require the brain to process information through multiple sensory channels, strengthening synaptic connections by the redundancy of stimuli. When the school finally accepted that access to information should not necessarily depend on decoded reading, it made room for Beatriz to demonstrate her true intellectual competence. Her trajectory is the testimony of the effectiveness of strategies that prioritize real cognition over the rigid pedagogical protocol, demonstrating that technology assists, coupled with pedagogical respect, gives the student the leading role in his own journey of discovery.

These cases, both of those who found in the movement the support for the focus and of those who used the technology to overcome textual processing barriers, converge to an undeniable conclusion. Neuroeducation is not a set of magical solutions, but a posture attentive to the biology of each individual within the classroom. By adjusting the environment to the specific demands of the nervous system, the educator is not facilitating the way, he is ensuring that learning happens, respecting the unique architecture of each mind. The transformation

observed in these students reveals that intelligence is omnipresent, waiting only for the environment to provide the appropriate access keys so that it can fully manifest itself.

The turn in the school trajectory of any neurodivergent student, whether through sensory adequacy or assistive technology, always carries a profound side effect that reverberates far beyond grades or academic performance. The reconstruction of self-esteem is not born from an empty external praise or artificial overcoming of a limitation, but from the discovery that the environment can finally be an ally of physiology itself. When a student realizes that the educational system has stopped acting as a relentless censor of their differences and has integrated their needs into daily life, chronic anxiety begins to be replaced by genuine curiosity.

What happens in the emotional plane is a reorganization of the internal narrative. The child or adolescent who for years was defined by the lens of failure, believing that their difficulty in organizing or verbal processing was a defect of character, begins to see their peculiarities as variants of a functional cognitive style. The feeling of inadequacy, often manifested as social withdrawal or, on the contrary, as explosions of frustration, dissipates as the student finds that success is possible without the need for constant masking. The peace that arises when the effort no longer needs to be spent just to seem normal is by itself a potent learning catalyst, as it reduces the levels of cortisol that historically block synaptic plasticity.

This transformation is visible in body posture and voluntary engagement within the classroom. Students who once hid in the periphery of the teacher's vision, hoping that the time of class would pass without being called for an impossible task, become active participants and sometimes protagonists of their own investigations. Self-esteem, in this context, becomes a direct reflection of demonstrated competence and efficiency in cognitive load management (Sweller, 1988). By mastering a reading tool that once seemed an insurmountable obstacle, or by finding in the movement the cadence necessary for abstract thinking, the student consolidates the belief that he is able to learn. This is the basis of a healthy and resilient academic identity.

The external recognition of specific needs validates the subjective experience of the individual. When an educator demonstrates, through a simple change of layout or an accessibility tool, which understands the unique way in which that brain operates, a bond of trust is established that disables the stress response of the nervous system mediated by the tonsil. Learning flourishes in environments where emotional security precedes instruction. That student who once felt that he was swimming against the current starts to feel the impulse of the flow in his favor, understanding that it is not necessary to be like others to achieve the same levels of intellectual excellence.

The consolidation of autonomy is the most significant outcome of this process. The student, having his/her support strategies integrated, learns to monitor his/her own functioning and accurately identify the conditions in which his/her brain yields better. This meta-consciousness is one of the most valuable executive functions that neuroeducation can cultivate (Diamond, 2013). By understanding their own tools of regulation and processing, the individual takes control of his journey, no longer being a passive passenger of a rigid system to become the manager of his own cognitive development.

Therefore, the emotional transformation that accompanies the recognition of the neurodivergent potential is the final evidence that the pedagogical adjustment is, first of all, an act of deep respect for the integrity of each mind. The change in the view of a student who realizes, for the first time, that his ideas have value and that his barriers are circumventable, is the clearest testimony of the success of a truly inclusive educational practice. The goal of neuroeducation is not to repair the student, but to remove the obstacles that prevent his/her particular brilliance from manifesting itself, allowing each one to build his/her own path with the conviction that his/her neurobiology is a legitimate basis for the conquest of knowledge.

The emotional transformation that flourishes when the school environment recognizes and respects the neurobiological specificities of a student is not an isolated phenomenon, but the result of a restructuring of the reward system and inhibitory control of the brain itself. When a neurodivergent student realizes that the place he occupies in the classroom does not require the suppression of its basal functioning to obtain results, the circulating cortisol level decreases and the willingness to cognitive risk increases. This phenomenon demonstrates that learning depends largely on the sense of psychological security that the environment transmits to the nervous system. When the educational structure ceases to be a control mechanism and becomes a support tool, the student ceases to spend useless energy in an attempt to camouflage his neurodivergence.

The change of perspective on oneself is the fundamental basis for this new academic stance. Students who previously classified their attention or decoding difficulties as personal failures or evidence of an intrinsic disability begin to observe their own brain with a technical curiosity. They identify the triggers for their state of focus and environmental conditions that favor their regulation, which represents the transition from the role of passive object of pedagogy to that of managing their own cognition. This meta-consciousness changes the perception of error: instead of looking at the difficulty as a condemnation, the student interprets it as a technical data, a sign that the current strategy requires adjustment.

This change in the internal narrative reverberates in social interactions within the school. The pressure for non-existent compliance generates exhaustive social wear, since the effort to appear typical consumes the same executive resources that should be allocated to the processing of complex information (Sweller, 1988; Diamond, 2013). As the environment welcomes the necessary adaptations, the chronic anxiety that permeated the days of these young people gives way to a confidence built on the demonstrated competence. The student realizes that the effectiveness does not come from standardization, but from the alignment between his way of processing the world and the tools he uses. This removes the barrier of fear of failure, which often blocks the consolidation of long-term memories and inhibits creativity.

The concrete impact of this paradigm shift is reflected in the persistence of more dense academic challenges. When the autistic child, for example, is respected in their need for structure and logical order, it not only solves complex problems more easily, but also develops the resilience needed to deal with the unforeseen. The understanding that your brain architecture gives you unique advantages in certain patterns of reasoning alters your hierarchy of values. It ceases to measure its success by comparing with others and begins to measure its progress in relation to its own domain goals, which solidifies its own academic identity.

This emotional self-regulation acts as the foundation for self-directed and sustainable learning. Over time, the student internalizes that efficacy does not require the abandonment of their identity, but the strategic integration of their biological peculiarities into the daily routine of studies. Autonomy, thus achieved, is the most accurate indicator that neuroeducation has fulfilled its function. It transcends the improvement of grades, culminating in the emancipation of a student who now understands how his nervous system operates and, more importantly, how he can request and use the necessary adjustments to keep his potential fully functioning.

By observing the brightness of the discovery in the eyes of a student who understood a complex concept through a path that he himself helped to adapt, we note the closure of the exclusion cycle. The history of each student who has overcome pedagogical rigidity through methods that respect neurological diversity serves as definitive proof: intelligence is not a homogeneous trait that manifests itself only in one way, but an adaptive force that, when released from the bonds of a system designed for a single model, flourishes with amazing diversity and depth. The academic success that arises from this process is not only a pedagogical achievement, but the restoration of human integrity in the face of the challenge of learning.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 11: neurobiological challenges on the path to diagnosis and equity

Phenotypic variability acts as a mantle of invisibility that maskes the complexity of many neurodivergent brains. When we talk about early diagnosis, we often encounter profiles whose neurobiological manifestations are external and disruptive, forcing the school system to notice the existence of a distinct functioning. However, there is a large portion of individuals whose cerebral architecture, although it follows a divergent course of the average pattern, develops compensatory mechanisms so sophisticated that the result is the mimicking of neurotypicality under conditions of sustained effort.

The brain has a latent plasticity that allows the individual, often unconsciously, to circumvent its functional limitations. Imagine a student who faces processing challenges in the organization of logical sequences or in the filter of intense sensory stimuli. If this brain has complementary cognitive resources, such as a robust working memory or a sharp analytical capacity, it can design complex camouflage strategies. This student does not overcome the original difficulty; he overcomes it with a colossal energy expenditure that occurs behind the scenes of thought, exhausting the bandwidth of his operational memory (Sweller, 1988). The ability to observe the social norm and mimic it, through a constant analysis of the environment, allows it to transit through the school without triggering the warnings that would lead to a diagnosis.

This phenomenon of compensation, however, charges a high biological price. While early diagnosis allows the implementation of supports that relieve the load on the nervous system, the profile that camouflages its neurodivergent features remains unaided. For the external observer, good academic performance or behavioral adaptation are interpreted as signs of normality. The brain, under this continuous pressure, operates in a state of hypervigilance, where emotional regulation and attentional control managed by the prefrontal cortex are consumed by the exhaustive task of maintaining appearances (Diamond, 2013). This is not a conscious choice, but an adaptive imperative of a system that desperately seeks to adjust to the requirements of an environment designed for a different cognitive functioning.

The discrepancy between the internal effort and the observed behavioral output creates a diagnostic abyss. Individuals who present disruptive behaviors or visible learning difficulties receive clinical attention, because their functioning comes into direct shock with the expectations of the environment. The one who invests all his potential in silent adaptation is often ignored or, in more serious cases, considered exemplary. This invisibility is a two-edged knife, because the apparent success conceals deep cognitive exhaustion, leading to scenarios

where the failure of compensation strategies occurs only in adulthood, when performance demands exceed the ability to maintain these façade mechanisms.

The focus on biological variability obliges us to recognize that the current diagnostic criteria are, to a large extent, shaped by what is more easily detectable and sometimes more problematic for school management. If the brain can disguise its divergence, it ceases to exist on the inclusion map. This camouflage mechanism, driven by neural circuits that prioritize social survival and acceptance to the detriment of energy conservation, reveals the fragility of our clinical gaze. We need to understand that the absence of obvious symptoms is not equivalent to the presence of a typical brain, but rather to the effectiveness of an concealment strategy that, in the long term, can compromise the well-being and potential of the individual. Therefore, inclusion depends less on the visibility of the behavior and more on the technical ability to identify, under the mask of normality, the functional needs of brains that operate differently.

The clinical lens with which we examine brain function is, in essence, a cultural artifact that often ignores crucial biological nuances. When the diagnostic manuals were written, the observation was mostly based on the manifestation of behaviors in boys, crystallizing a pattern of symptoms that became the universal measure for the identification of neurodivergence. This gender bias creates a dangerous distortion. Neurodivergent girls, for example, often exhibit a profile of interests and a form of social interaction that does not align with the rigidity of traditional criteria. Instead of a search for absolute isolation, we observe in them an almost performative capacity of social mimicry, where the child learns to observe the typical pairs and to replicate their gestures, their speeches and their play dynamics to avoid scrutiny.

This mimetization is interpreted by the school and by many clinicians as proof of absence of divergence. The girl who passes the recess observing the dynamics of a group and, after months of tacit study, manages to enter into the conversation without fuss, is not exercising an innate ability of fluid socialization. It's running a complex algorithm for processing social information that consumes an immense amount of mental energy. As the final result of its behavior is seen as adequate, the educational system concludes that it does not need support. Therefore, the requirement for an early diagnosis ends up being barred by our own inability to see the exhaustive effort that occurs behind a facade of normality.

In addition to gender, cultural barriers impose an additional layer of opacity. What we define as disruptive behavior or lack of focus is inevitably mediated by the sociocultural context in which the child is inserted. In environments where compliance and blind obedience are supreme values, the child who questions, who moves or who demonstrates a curiosity hyperfocused on non-trivial themes may be the subject of a pedagogical correction based on

repression, rather than on clinical understanding. On the other hand, in contexts where autonomy is most valued, certain manifestations of neurodivergence can only be seen as eccentric personality traits. This interpretive subjectivity makes access to support resources depend less on the neurological reality of the individual and much more on the tolerance or ability to detect parents and teachers.

The failure to recognize this phenotypic diversity within diagnoses generates a cycle of silent neglect. The individual who does not fit into the cliché of the restless boy or child completely isolated remains in a limbo. It continues to be required under typical parameters, accumulating frustrations that often manifest only years later as chronic anxiety, persistent exhaustion or depression. The diagnosis ends up being late, not because the signs were not present, but because the observer was blind to anything that did not confirm his previous prejudices about what it means to be neurodivergent. The clinical culture, when seeking the pattern that is familiar to it, ends by discarding those whose divergence is manifested through intelligent but deeply onerous adaptive strategies for the nervous system.

Identifying neurodivergence requires, first of all, a detachment of hegemonic narratives about child behavior. We need to replace the question based on social adequacy with the question about the biological cost of learning. The student who reads perfectly, but describes reading as an exhaustive battle of decoding that leaves him powerless for the rest of the day, is a clear example of how performance conceals divergence. Equity in inclusion will only be possible when we stop waiting for the student to provide proof of his/her need through failure, social exclusion or disorder, and start seeing divergence as a spectrum of biological variations that, regardless of the ability of mimeticism, require an educational environment prepared to sustain the difference. Without this reconfiguration of the look, the diagnosis will remain a privilege of those who cannot hide its functioning, perpetuating the invisibility of so many others who, although operating differently, carry the invisible weight of a constant adaptation to what was not designed for them.

Receiving a formal diagnosis should represent the key that opens the doors to a structured support network, but the practical reality reveals a desolating gap between clinical labeling and the implementation of effective changes in the educational environment. There is a persistent belief that once the neurodivergent profile has been identified, the educational system will automatically adapt its gears to accommodate this student. In practice, what happens is a bureaucratization of the difference. The medical document becomes a archive object that, although necessary for legal purposes, rarely translates into changes in teaching strategies within the classroom. The system usually absorbs the diagnosis only as a conformity

stamp, without the corresponding change in the architecture of the tasks or in the forms of evaluation.

The obstacle lies in the failure to translate clinical data into daily management strategies. Education professionals, often burdened by numerous classes and the rigidity of curricula, receive a report describing the brain functioning of the student, but do not receive a functional navigation map to deal with the idiosyncrasies of this functioning. The diagnosis alone does not carry the ability to instruct the teacher on how to convert a purely textual teaching method into a multisensory approach (Mayer, 2014) or how to modulate the cognitive load to avoid sensory dessert that disrupts the student's nervous system. Without a training that connects the knowledge of neurobiology to practical actions, the diagnosis remains as an isolated data, while the student continues to navigate in an ecosystem that requires the suppression of its basal functioning to obtain results.

This gap between clinical knowledge and pedagogical practice is amplified by the expectation that the child adapts to the method, and not the other way around. When a student receives ineffective support, the educational system tends to attribute the lack of progress to the inherent limitation of the condition, rather than questioning the inadequacy of the implemented strategy. If a child with dyslexia receives only more time to perform a test, without access to assistive reading technologies or methods of phonological decomposition, the extra time is a palliative measure that ignores the biological root of its difficulty. The diagnosis, in this scenario, is used as a way to justify the failure of the student under the pretext that the environment did what was possible, transferring to the individual the responsibility for a system that refuses to evolve.

Moreover, the implementation of effective strategies often runs into a school culture that penalizes the difference in the name of misunderstood equality. When equity is confused with the offer of the same treatment for all, the need for differentiation is seen as an unfair privilege, not as a tool of biological justice. Teachers who wish to implement effective curricular adaptations find institutional resistance, under the argument that this would break the standardization of evaluations or demand disproportionate attention. The direct consequence of this thought is that the strategies, when they exist, are implemented loosely and without continuity, becoming interventions that do not alter the student's learning trajectory and only perpetuate their veiled exclusion.

The effectiveness of school support depends on a change in the perception of what constitutes educational success. Currently, we value the speed of response, obedience to classroom rituals and compliance in deliveries, which automatically excludes brains that need

time for sensory integration, movement to maintain attention or nonlinear paths for problem solving. Even when those responsible bring accurate diagnoses and detailed intervention plans, the institutional environment acts as a filtering system that discards what does not fit in their mass production logic. The inclusion, therefore, ends up being treated as an optional accessory, a theoretical goal that is promptly sacrificed at the altar of standardized school efficiency.

To overcome this inertia, it is essential to abandon the idea that the diagnosis solves the conflict. The diagnosis is only the starting point for a constant dialogue and for the construction of a collaborative environment, where the neurobiological need dictates the rhythm of pedagogy. As long as we continue to treat inclusion as a set of bureaucratic rules to be complied with, rather than a thorough restructuring of the way information is delivered and knowledge is processed, we will continue to fail with students who have brilliant but distinct brains. Equity is not achieved with medical reports in drawers, but with the willingness to reconstruct educational routines from a real and respectful understanding of the neurological variability of each individual (Diamond, 2013).

Even when the educational system finally opens for diagnosis and recognizes the presence of a student with neurodivergent functioning, an invisible but devastating barrier arises: the weight of stigma and the deliberate reduction of expectations. The diagnosis, although it is a technical document, often works as a label that reduces the horizon of possibilities for that student in the eyes of the school community. Teachers and managers, sometimes unconsciously, begin to see divergence not as a difference in cognitive processing, but as an insurmountable limit for high complexity learning. This phenomenon is subtle and operates through a set of silent beliefs that dictate the behavior of those who teach.

The teacher, knowing that a student has a specific neurodivergent profile, can adopt a posture of protective condescendence. The support strategy that should serve as a scaffolding for intellectual growth becomes a containment structure. Instead of offering the challenges necessary for full cognitive development, the system simplifies content, reduces delivery targets and mitigates requirements, under the justification of avoiding overload or frustration. The practical result of this indulgence is the creation of an artificial roof. The student, realizing that there is no expectation of excellence or deep exploration, ends up adapting to this low level of challenge, losing the stimulus to exercise the maximum potential that his brain, although distinct, is perfectly capable of sustaining when properly provoked.

This dynamic is reinforced by an interpretation bias of effort. When the neurodivergent student demonstrates a remarkable competence in a specific area, the system often treats it as an anomaly or as the only brightness point in a profile that, in the rest, is considered deficient.

This compartmentalization prevents the teacher from seeing intelligence as a whole. When the student fails in a conventional task, the error is quickly attributed to the diagnosis, validating the previous belief that he does not have the ability to deal with denser abstractions. This labeling mechanism interrupts the growth cycle, as it closes the door to the opportunity for error and correction that governs the real motor of learning.

The persistence of stigma is also manifested in the way correct strategies are applied, or rather, denied by fear of inequality. It is common to find institutions that, knowing perfectly what assistive technologies or multisensory methods would be effective for a certain student, decide not to implement them for fear that this may generate discomfort or feeling of injustice among other colleagues. The equity, which should mean offering to each one what it needs to reach its summit, is confused with the uniformity of treatment. When the educational environment refuses to apply the correct strategies under the pretext of maintaining equality, it is, in fact, imposing a silent exclusion that condemns the neurodivergent student to operate constantly below his real capacity.

The impact of this environment is corrosive to self-esteem and to the endogenous reward system. When a young man realizes that people around him expect only conformity or average performance in simplified tasks, he goes on to internalize the limitation. Learning biology is sensitive to the social context and feedback we receive about our capabilities. If the brain receives constant signs that there is no room for cognitive risk or for creative deepening, dopamine ceases to act as a driver of curiosity, causing the system to lose motivation to engage in tasks that require greater executive effort. The tragedy of stigma is not only the denial of resources, but the denial of belief in the value and intelligence of that mind.

In order for inclusion to come out of institutional promise and enter into practical reality, it is urgent that the school environment treat diagnosis as a starting point for the personalization of the challenge, and not as a sentence of limitations. This requires that the faculty be able to separate the difference in the way information is processed from the ability to build deep knowledge. The student who reads through voice software, who uses mental maps to organize reasoning or who needs frequent pauses for sensory regulation has exactly the same intellectual ability to achieve high levels of complexity as any colleague. Real change occurs when we stop reducing expectations and begin to demand the quality of thought, providing only the necessary tools for this thought to materialize. As long as the stigma dictates the architecture of what is possible, the school will continue to produce, even among the diagnosed, a profound waste of human potential.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Chapter 12: toward education centered on diversity

The transition to an educational model that ignores the rigidity of diagnostic labels begins with the deep understanding of each student's cognitive biology. The traditional system often treats diagnosis as a signboard that dictates the student's destiny, but modern neuroscience points to a much richer and less static reality. When we unlink the teaching process of the need for a clinical label, we open space to observe the individual neurobiological profile in its raw and authentic form. The focus moves from the compensation of a supposed deficiency to the potentiation of a unique brain architecture.

A student does not learn better because the medical record says that he has dyslexia or ADHD. He learns when the teacher identifies that his nervous system processes phonological information with distinct latency or that his attention circuit requires quick and variable triggers to keep the operating memory gear active. Pedagogic practice needs to be based on direct observation of cognitive variability, such as how an individual organizes reasoning chains, how it reacts to different sensory loads or what rate of data entry allows the formation of lasting synapses. This functional mapping, anchored in the principles of cognitive load, replaces the need to fit brains into standardized categories (Sweller, 1988).

The personalization of learning is no longer a rhetorical ideal to become a management of neurodiversity in the classroom. If an educator understands that the human brain functions as a distribution network, he stops trying to force a single flow of information. Environments that allow real choices, such as the possibility of alternating between tasks of high cognitive demand and moments of sensory regulation, recognize that the neurobiological state of a student is not constant throughout the day. The rigidity of the current academic model, which imposes the same time and methodology for thirty different brains, ignores the fact that the consolidation of memory depends on the harmony between the content, that learner's specific neural topography and instructional multimodality (Mayer, 2014).

For this change to be possible, it is essential that teacher education incorporates principles of applied neuroscience, transforming observation into a pedagogical strategy. The educator who sees the functioning of the brain is not frightened by the divergence; he uses it as fuel for the diversification of teaching. When a student demonstrates difficulty in an activity, the trained teacher does not seek the diagnosis, he investigates the mismatch between the method and the individual cognitive mechanism. It changes the form of delivery, adjusts the physical environment or modifies the type of stimulus, treating the obstacle not as a failure of the student, but as an opportunity to adjust the educational tool.

The recognition of neurodivergent individuals as individuals with singular contributions is the natural result of this paradigm shift. The history of innovation is full of minds who, when educated outside the norm, have developed nonlinear patterns of thought essential for scientific discoveries and artistic expressions. When education moves away from the attempt to normalize and nourish the unique architecture of each brain, it ceases to transfer content only to form individuals capable of processing the world with originality. This approach requires intellectual courage to abandon the bureaucratic security of labels in favor of human complexity, transforming the classroom into an ecosystem of high cognitive performance where diversity is the necessary infrastructure for success (Diamond, 2013).

The future lies not in the creation of a special method for each condition, but in the construction of a system where customization is the basic standard. When the educator and the institution understand the biology of learning, the barriers that today limit the potential of thousands of minds become obsolete. Person-centered education, not statistical mean education, is the only way that each brain, in its singularity, can find its own way of expression and contribution, ensuring that intelligence is never wasted by the bias of a teaching model unable to perceive the hidden wealth in biological variation.

Redrawing school systems requires a radical change in the architecture of the learning environment, transforming school into an organism responsive to biological diversity. The physical rigidity of classrooms, characterized by queues and a static distribution of light and sound, acts as a filter that penalizes brains with hypersensitivity or constant motor stimulus needs. To accommodate cognitive variation as a standard, furniture and spatial arrangement need to allow the student's autonomy in the management of his/her own workflow. This means that space should not be a fixed stage for the teacher, but a modular ecosystem where living in quiet high concentration zones, kinesthetic motion stations and areas of sensory regulation, allowing each student to modulate their own interface with the environment according to their metabolic needs for information processing.

The school routine, traditionally segmented by a uniform schedule, is the main point of conflict with neurodivergent functioning. The fragmentation of time in rigid blocks of fifty minutes ignores the variability of the cycles of attention and the latency necessary for the consolidation of memory. An intelligent system integrates time in a fluid way, offering autonomous execution windows in which the student's progression is dictated by his capacity for deep engagement, not by the bell. When the environment recognizes that cognitive fatigue is variable, it allows the student to naturally switch between tasks that require intense executive

effort and activities that promote synaptic recovery, avoiding the exhaustion that occurs when a brain is forced to maintain the focus at a dissonant external rhythm.

The evaluation of learning must also undergo a thorough reform. In a system that accommodates the variation, the standardized test loses its unique arbitrator position. Success is no longer measured by the rapid reproduction of information to be evaluated by the ability to solve problems, technical creativity and practical application of knowledge. Evaluative instruments are redesigned to capture competence through multiple ways of expression: orality, visual productions, engineering projects or critical analysis, aligning with the principles of multimodal instructional design (Mayer, 2014). By diversifying the format of deliveries, the system removes the weight of motor performance or rigid linguistic coding, allowing intellectual content to be the true object of analysis.

The maintenance of this structure requires a management of pedagogical data that escapes the logic of the clinical label. School monitoring systems should focus on functional metrics, such as latency time for understanding a concept, response to different types of sensory stimuli, and the evolution of autonomy in task management. When these data are collected systematically, the school can adjust the inputs offered without waiting for an external intervention or for a new diagnostic label. It is a preventive approach, based on continuous observation, that transforms the environment into a constant support agent. If a student presents a recurrent pattern of distraction at high luminosity times, the response is not a medication or an additional diagnosis, but the immediate adjustment of the illumination of that specific sector or the offer of an alternative space that meets the sensory demand of that nervous system.

Finally, the organization of school flows should consider emotional variation as an inseparable component of cognition. States of anxiety, overload or disengagement are read not as indiscipline, but as indicators of an incompatibility between the environmental demand and the neurobiological status of the student. By incorporating decompression zones that are not marked by the stigma of isolation, but by the legitimacy of regulation, the system trains inhibitory control and teaches students to recognize their own needs and actively seek balance (Diamond, 2013). The environment becomes an invisible collaborator who, by providing sensory predictability and methodological flexibility, eliminates the frictions that today consume the mental energy of thousands of students. This is the necessary transition: to abandon the utopia of a homogeneous class in favor of an architectural and operational system designed for real diversity.

The formation of educators in applied neuroscience is the foundation without which any inclusion project remains in the field of intention. Currently, the teaching structure is forged in

pedagogical models that assume a nonexistent neurological average, leaving the teacher unarmed in the face of the biological variability that actually composes the classroom. Investing in neuroscientific knowledge does not mean turning the teacher into a clinician or a diagnostic specialist, but rather conferring on him the technical competence to read the student's behavior as a reflection of cognitive and sensory processes. When the educator understands, for example, the allostatic load mechanism and how chronic stress alters the connectivity between the amygdala and the prefrontal cortex, he ceases to interpret the disconnection or agitation of a student as a failure of character or deliberate disinterest.

This transition to a practice based on neurobiology changes the nature of the pedagogical relationship. The teacher starts to act as an engineer of learning environments, able to identify why a specific method of content exposure fails for certain brains. By mastering the principles of neuroplasticity and sensory regulation, this professional starts to offer stimuli in a strategic way. It knows when the delivery of information needs a more robust visual anchor to bypass bottlenecks in operating memory (Sweller, 1988) or when fragmentation of a complex task is essential to avoid overloading systems that process data with high noise sensitivity. This investment in human formation is what allows the transposition of inclusive theory into everyday reality.

The pedagogy that ignores the biological substrate of the mind condemns the teacher to an exhaustive attempt to standardize the unrepeatable. On the contrary, professionalized neuroeducation offers a repertoire of interventions that treat cognitive diversity as a predictable and manageable variable. When educational institutions understand the urgency of this training, they no longer depend on external referrals to solve learning problems and assume control over the effectiveness of their own delivery. The cost of not investing in this formation is very high, because it results in the stagnation of minds whose potentials remain blocked by methods that do not dialogue with their specific architectures.

A teaching staff instructed in neuroscience becomes, consequently, the guardian of the individual potential of students. Instead of measuring success by conforming to a static curriculum, these professionals learn to detect the sparks of talent and alternative reasoning routes that each brain uses to solve a problem. This technical sensitivity allows the teacher to validate forms of expression that the traditional system often ignores or punishes. By understanding that creativity, synthesis capacity and technical originality are often by-products of nonlinear brain functions, the educator starts to encourage, rather than repress, the idiosyncrasies of each student.

The consolidation of this educational practice creates a virtuous cycle where the classroom ceases to be a place of comparative performance to become a laboratory for developing singular skills. Continuing training, when based on real data and on the observation of cognitive processes, allows the school to adjust its gear before the obstacle even becomes an academic failure. The focus shifts from recovery to what has not been learned to anticipate the processing needs of each individual. It is this diagnostic competence intrinsic to the pedagogical environment that removes stigma, because the intervention becomes a natural and routine technical response, and not an exceptional event focused on a student labeled as different.

The definitive transformation of the school requires the educator to take possession of his scientific authority. By understanding how the human brain learns, retains and integrates information, the teacher gains the autonomy necessary to draw teaching trajectories that respect the metabolic and cognitive variations of his students. That's the biggest return investment a society can make. It transcends the bureaucracy of educational norms and touches the central point of school effectiveness: the direct and informed connection between those who teach and those who, processing the world in a unique way, seek only the right keys to unlock their ability to contribute and evolve.

The release of neurodivergent potential requires society to abandon the view of neurological difference as a deficit to be corrected or an obstacle to be circumvented. When the educational system and, by extension, the professional environment recognize brain variation as an innovation engine, the focus shifts from normative adequacy to the use of a singular processing capacity. Individuals operating outside the frequencies of the statistical average often demonstrate exceptional skills in recognition of complex patterns, lateral thinking, hyperfocus in areas of deep interest, and an analytical capacity capable of deconstructing problems that seem insurmountable to minds trained only in linear thinking.

These unique contributions become visible at the time when the architecture of success ceases to depend on compliance. Consider the trajectory of minds that, when finding spaces where their neurobiology was not read as failure, transmuted keen sensory perceptions in technological innovations or redefined artistic fields through an unconventional aesthetic sensitivity. The autistic individual who perceives invisible details in the data structure of a company, the student with ADHD whose mind leaps between quick and seemingly disconnected interdisciplinary connections to reach a creative solution, or the one with dyslexia that develops a powerful three-dimensional visual thought are clear examples of how cognitive diversity is a reserve of unexplored intellectual value.

Society thrives when the adaptation effort ceases to be an exclusive burden of the individual and becomes a competence of the collective. In a culture that values only the efficiency measured by a rigid pattern of delivery, much talent is wasted in processes of camouflage or exhaustion generated by constant combat against environments hostile to its nature. The cost of this invisibility is extremely high. It deprives the world of solutions that depend precisely on this divergent view. When the school environment offers the necessary support, such as sensory flexibility and respect for its own biological rhythm, it allows this potential to unfold and find its channel of practical expression, transforming latent competence into tangible value for the community.

The transition to a diversity-based collaboration model requires organizations and institutions to cultivate what we might call interface intelligence. This means, in practice, creating communication bridges that respect different cognitive languages. It is not just about offering accessibility tools, but about recognizing that diversity is an asset. Teams that integrate minds with different processing profiles demonstrate superior resilience, because the variety of neurological perspectives anticipates failures that a homogeneous group would ignore. Where a brain seeks predictable structure, another identifies system failure, and the third proposes the necessary change. The interdependence of these processes, when well orchestrated, elevates the performance of the whole system.

The true, grounded hope lies in the change of the lens with which we observe these minds. Instead of asking why a certain student cannot keep up with the conventional flow, the question that defines the future is how we can orchestrate the environment so that this mind contributes to what it has most original. This shift of power and perspective is the basis of equity. By valuing the unique contributions of neurodivergent individuals, we are not just practicing a welcoming policy, we are, in fact, ensuring that the intellectual and technical progress of society is not limited by the bias of repetition.

At the end of this journey, the message is clear. The human brain is remarkably plastic, capable of creating and consolidating connections in ways that challenge the average, provided it finds fertile ground for its manifestation. When we remove unnecessary barriers, when we adjust the gears of education and work to diversity, we open the possibility for individuals hitherto underutilized to take leadership roles in their fields. The society that learns to release the potential of its neurodivergent members is the one that inevitably reaches new levels of complexity and creativity, because innovation is rarely born from the average, but from the edges, where the biological difference finds the space necessary to become practical genius.

Conclusion

The architecture of a truly human educational future lies in the ability to transmute neuroscientific theory into everyday practices that recognize brain variation not as an obstacle, but as the very essence of collective intelligence. When the structure of classrooms and work environments ceases to be a static imposition and starts to function as a responsive ecosystem, the barriers that historically isolated bright minds begin to collapse. The paradigm shift requires not only new methods, but a new awareness of what constitutes the ability to learn. Learning, in its deepest form, is a biological process of constant adaptation, a dance between the neural circuits of the individual and the demands of the environment, optimizing the use of operational memory without exceeding the limits of mental processing (Sweller, 1988). When this medium becomes predictablely flexible, learning ceases to be an unsustainable energy cost and becomes the natural manifestation of human plasticity.

Neurodiversity brings with it a diversity of rhythms, sensitivities and processing modes that, if well understood, allow the construction of more efficient educational solutions for all. The student or professional who, for years, has been marginalized for not fitting into linear models of attention and memory, carries in itself a reserve of singular cognition. This singularity, far from being a deficiency, represents the possibility of finding unusual paths to complex problems, precisely because your brain travels neural pathways that the statistical average ignores. By integrating knowledge about reward mechanisms, emotional modulation and the impact of the sensory environment, the educational system gains surgical precision capable of unlocking potentials previously hidden by the stigma of academic failure.

The sustainability of this transition depends on the active role that educators and managers assume as interface architects. Neuroeducational practice does not seek homogenization, but rather the creation of supports that allow each mind to operate at its functional peak. When pauses for sensory regulation are treated as essential stages of high-level work, promoting the strengthening of the prefrontal cortex and executive functions (Diamond, 2013), and when feedback is structured to promote autonomy rather than dependence on external correction, it builds a solid basis for continued intellectual development. The transition from the classroom as a court to the classroom as a laboratory is the movement that ensures that the effort to learn does not dissipate in frustration, but accumulates as a repertoire of own skills.

The diagnosis of conditions such as autism, ADHD or dyslexia, when used as a tool of self-knowledge and guidance for adequate support, loses the connotation of sentence and gains the strength of a map. It reveals how the specific biology of an individual demands particular

conditions so that his intelligence can shine. The inclusion, therefore, goes far beyond the physical presence in the same environment: it is the deliberate offer of strategies that allow the translation of the raw potential in practical realization through multiple channels of representation and expression (Mayer, 2014). Success is not the adequacy of the norm, but the expression of personal mastery within the parameters that respect the unique neurobiology of each individual.

A society that aspires to progress needs to learn to value the cost-benefit of a culture that tolerates and fosters cognitive difference. The waste of human potential resulting from environments that force diverse minds to camouflage in standardized molds is an incalculable loss of innovation and creativity. On the other hand, the investment in adapting the environment to neurodivergent brains is one of the best possible returns to the productivity and intellectual health of the social body. Where linear thinking finds difficulty, lateral and systemic vision, often present in neurodivergent profiles, offers exits that anticipate failures and propose disruptive innovations.

This path demonstrates that intelligence is not a fixed trait, but an adaptive force that requires fertile ground to flourish. By abandoning the expectation that the brain should bend to pre-existing school models, we transfer responsibility to the structure of the system, which comes to be evaluated by the quality of its interface with biological diversity. The effectiveness of evidence-based strategies is directly linked to the willingness to make real adjustments, either in the lighting of the environment, following the content — avoiding the overload of visual and auditory channels (Mayer, 2014) —, in the load of sensory stimulation or in the timing of pedagogical interactions. These small but vital interventions manage the intrinsic cognitive load and generate a favorable environment for the harmonious functioning of diverse neural systems (Sweller, 1988).

The integrity of the human being, in facing the challenge of learning, depends on a healthy relationship between his biology and the environment. When this balance is achieved, education ceases to be a process of training and becomes an exercise of liberation. The child who discovers his way of organizing thinking, the adolescent who finds the right channel for his intrinsic motivation and the adult who assumes his cognitive style as a competitive advantage — exercising inhibitory control and mental flexibility (Diamond, 2013) — all confirm that neurological diversity is the engine of human complexity. The future belongs to systems that, rather than fear divergence, integrate it as an essential layer of their own intelligence and capacity for innovation.

As the walls of pedagogical rigidity give way to the fluidity of a diversity-centered education, what is observed is not only individual success, but an increase in the level of demand and intellectual quality of the whole set. The ability to learn, when exercised in environments that recognize biology as a protagonist, becomes a patrimony of the individual, a tool of autonomy that will accompany him in all the challenges of adult life. The alignment between external demands and neural functioning itself is the point of convergence between the need to belong and the desire for excellence.

The construction of a responsive educational scenario, therefore, is not a final destination, but a continuous commitment to adaptation. The challenge is not to find the universal method that meets everyone, but to develop the sensitivity necessary to read the signals of each mind and adjust the support tools in real time, respecting the limits of human cognitive architecture (Sweller, 1988). That's the essence of applied pedagogical intelligence. The value of neurological diversity lies in its ability to offer perspectives that would otherwise never be accessed. When this diversity finds the welcome needed, it ceases to be an edge of society to become the center of practical innovation.

The path so far confirms that the understanding of neurobiology applied to learning offers a clear way to overcome the immobilism of traditional structures. It is possible, through tangible adjustments and a profound change of perspective, to transform any teaching or work environment into a space where cognitive diversity can finally express its fullness. Intelligence, when released from the ties of standardization and supported by strategies that respect its biological nature and the plasticity of the brain, flourishes in directions that previously seemed impossible (Diamond, 2013). This is the starting point for any society that wishes not only to include its members, but to benefit in its entirety from the genius that inhabits the difference.

References

BADDELEY, Alan. Working memory: looking back and looking forward. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, v. 4, p. 829–839, 2003.

BEAR, Mark F.; CONNORS, Barry W.; PARADISO, Michael A. Neuroscience: exploring the brain. 4. ed. Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer, 2016.

CAMARGO, Síglia Pimentel Höher; RISPOLI, Mandy. Análise do comportamento aplicada como intervenção para o autismo: definição, características e pressupostos filosóficos. Revista Educação Especial, v. 26, n. 47, p. 639–650, 2013.

DEHAENE, Stanislas. Reading in the brain: the new science of how we read. New York: Viking, 2009.

DIAMOND, Adele. Executive functions. Annual Review of Psychology, v. 64, p. 135–168, 2013.

GOSWAMI, Usha. Neuroscience and education: from research to practice? Nature Reviews Neuroscience, v. 7, p. 406–413, 2006.

KANDEL, Eric R. et al. Principles of neural science. 6. ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2021.

MAYER, Richard E. Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

MORA, Francisco. Neuroeducación: solo se puede aprender aquello que se ama. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2013.

POSNER, Michael I.; ROTHBART, Mary K. Educating the human brain. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2007.

SHAYWITZ, Sally E. Overcoming dyslexia: a new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2003.

SIEGEL, Daniel J. The developing mind: how relationships and the brain interact to shape who we are. 3. ed. New York: Guilford Press, 2020.

STANOVICH, Keith E. Matthew effects in reading: some consequences of individual differences in the acquisition of literacy. Reading Research Quarterly, v. 21, n. 4, p. 360–407, 1986.

SWELLER, John. Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. Cognitive Science, v. 12, n. 2, p. 257–285, 1988.

VYGOTSKY, Lev S. A formação social da mente. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2007.

RCMOS – Revista Científica Multidisciplinar O
Saber. ISSN: 2675-9128. São Paulo - SP.
Ano VII, v.1 2026 | submissão: 11/10/2026 | aceito: 18/10/2026 | publicação: 23/10/2026

Biography

Arthur Coradini Pin is a biologist, educator and researcher dedicated to the interfaces between neurobiology, psychopedagogy and school praxis. Graduated in Biological Sciences from Centro Universitário São Camilo, in Pedagogy by UNIFRAN and in Special Education by FAVENI, besides having technical training in Environment by the Federal Institute of Paraná (IFPR) and ongoing training in Religion Sciences by UNIFAHE, combines a solid multidisciplinary basis to daily experience in Basic Education (Child Education and Elementary Education I and II) in the municipal public network of Castelo (Spirit Santo). He specializes in multiple areas of education, biology and language, with a Master's degree in Technology Applied to Education from MUST University and a PhD in Education Sciences from Christian Business School (CBS).

Its trajectory is marked by commitment to emancipatory education and the coordination of educational and socio-environmental impact initiatives. Active in professional organizations and associations, it maintains a bond and representativeness with the Regional Council of Biology (CRBio-10), the Brazilian Association of Psychopedagogy (ABPp-ES), the Brazilian Society of Neuropsychopedagogy (SBNPp) and the Federal Council of Educators and Pedagogy (CFEP). As a researcher, it investigates how applied neuroscience and neurodiversity management can transform the school into a responsive ecosystem. By defending the replacement of diagnostic labels by a functional observation centered on the biological rhythm and cognitive architecture of each learner, the author consolidates in this book a humanized, innovative and deeply evidence-based vision for the future of inclusive education.