International Journal of Physiotherapy Research and Clinical Practice

REVIEW ARTICLE

Motor Control Theories in Physiotherapy: Implications for Current Clinical Practice

Alagappan Thiyagarajan[1,*], Rajan Balakrishnan[1], S Jeyakumar[2], Krishna [3]

[1] *Lecturer, Faculty of Nursing, Health Sciences and Education, School of Physiotherapy, Mahsa University, Selangor, Malaysia*
[2] *Professor Cum Research Supervisor, Garden City University, Bangalore, Karnataka, India*
[3] *Physiotherapist, First Step Physiotherapy Clinic Private Ltd, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India*

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 11-01-2025
Accepted 16-04-2025
Published 22-04-2025

* *Corresponding author.*
Alagappan Thiyagarajan
alagappanphd@gmail.com

https://doi.org/10.54839/ijprcp.v4i1.25.36

ABSTRACT

Motor control theories have long served as the foundation for understanding movement and guiding rehabilitation in physiotherapy. These frameworks offer insights into how the body and brain coordinate actions, adapt to environments, and learn or re-learn motor tasks. This narrative review explores the main motor control theories—reflex, hierarchical, motor programming, systems, dynamic systems, and ecological—and discusses their relevance and integration in current physiotherapy practice. Each theory offers unique contributions to understanding human movement, and modern physiotherapy benefits from combining these perspectives. An integrative, patient-centered approach allows for more effective, adaptable, and functionally meaningful interventions across diverse populations. While no single model is comprehensive, their collective application forms a robust foundation for clinical reasoning, rehabilitation planning, and outcome evaluation. Future work should focus on bridging theoretical models with practical tools, improving accessibility and impact in real-world therapy settings.

Keywords: Motor control; Physiotherapy; Movement rehabilitation; Clinical reasoning

1 INTRODUCTION

Movement is fundamental to human life, enabling individuals to perform daily activities, interact with their environment, and maintain independence. In physiotherapy, the restoration and optimization of movement form the foundation of clinical practice across all populations and conditions. Whether managing neurological disorders, musculoskeletal injuries, or developmental delays, physiotherapists aim to assess, interpret, and influence how movement is controlled. The concept of motor control—how the nervous system organizes the body's musculoskeletal components to perform coordinated actions—therefore lies at the heart of physiotherapeutic reasoning and intervention. In recent decades, the understanding of motor control has evolved significantly, driven by advancements in neuroscience, biomechanics, and motor learning research. This progress has influenced how physiotherapists conceptualize movement impairments and structure treatment plans. Rather than focusing solely on muscle strength or joint mobility, current clinical approaches increasingly recognize the importance of movement quality, task specificity, context, and patient engagement. Motor control is now viewed not as a fixed ability but as a dynamic process shaped by the interaction of multiple systems, including sensory, cognitive, and biomechanical components.[1]

Given the growing emphasis on evidence-based and functionally relevant rehabilitation, a clear understanding of the theoretical foundations of motor control is essential. The various perspectives developed over time have shaped how movement problems are interpreted and addressed in clinical settings. As physiotherapy practice becomes more personalized and context-driven, integrating appropriate motor control concepts allows therapists to deliver interventions that are not only scientifically grounded but also meaningful to patients' real-life goals. This narrative review aims to explore the evolution of motor control theories and critically examine their relevance to contemporary physiotherapy practice. Through this examination, the review seeks to support clinical decision-making and highlight the practical applications of motor control principles in assessment, treatment planning, and therapeutic outcomes.[2,3]

2 METHODOLOGY

Reflex Theory

The reflex theory, proposed by Sir Charles Sherrington in the early 20th century, is one of the earliest explanations of motor behavior. It posits that movement is produced by a chain of reflexes triggered by sensory input, with simple reflex arcs combining to create complex movement patterns. Clinically, this theory influenced early neurorehabilitation approaches, including methods like the Brunnstrom approach, which emphasized eliciting and using reflexes to restore movement post-stroke. It provided a foundational understanding of the nervous system's feedback loops and informed techniques focused on stimulating sensory pathways. However, the reflex theory is now considered outdated due to several limitations. It cannot adequately explain voluntary movements, fast or anticipatory actions, or movements that occur without sensory feedback. As a result, while historically significant, the reflex theory has largely been replaced by more comprehensive models in current practice. [4,5]

Hierarchical Theory

The hierarchical theory evolved as an extension of the reflex model and gained prominence during the mid-20th century. It suggests that the CNS is organized in a hierarchical structure, where higher brain centers (like the cortex) control and inhibit lower centers (like the spinal cord and brainstem). Movement, according to this theory, emerges as higher levels mature or regain function, progressing from reflexive to voluntary control. This theory provided the basis for treatment approaches such as Neurodevelopmental Treatment (NDT) and the Bobath concept, especially in pediatric and stroke rehabilitation, by focusing on the inhibition of primitive reflexes and facilitation of "normal" movement patterns. Although influential, the hierarchical model has significant limitations. It oversimplifies the nervous system's organization and underestimates the role of peripheral inputs and reflexes in skilled movement. Additionally, the assumption that movement only flows top-down does not account for the reciprocal or distributed nature of neural control observed in modern neuroscience. [6,7]

Motor Programming Theory

The motor programming theory emerged to address the limitations of purely reflex-based models by introducing the concept that the CNS can generate movement through stored motor commands or "motor programs," even in the absence of sensory feedback. These programs can be generalized for tasks such as writing or walking and allow for consistent, efficient execution of learned motor tasks. Evidence for this theory includes findings from spinal cord research, such as central pattern generators (CPGs), which can produce rhythmic patterns like walking without cortical input. In clinical practice, this theory supports interventions that focus on re-establishing or modifying motor programs through repetition and task-specific practice, commonly used in gait retraining and functional task learning. However, the theory has been criticized for its limited consideration of environmental context, biomechanical constraints, and movement adaptability. It also raises questions about how many programs the CNS must store, leading to further development of systems-based theories. [8]

Systems Theory

Introduced by Russian physiologist Nikolai Bernstein, systems theory proposes that movement emerges from the interaction of multiple systems, including neural, musculoskeletal, cognitive, and environmental components. It views the body as a system with numerous degrees of freedom that must be coordinated to achieve purposeful movement. Systems theory marked a major shift from top-down models to a more dynamic, interactive approach, making it highly applicable to physiotherapy. It encourages clinicians to consider multiple influencing factors—such as posture, coordination, strength, and perception—when assessing movement impairments. For instance, gait disturbances are seen not just as a muscle problem but as a result of complex interactions between sensory input, motor output, and balance control. A key strength of this theory is its holistic nature, promoting individualized treatment strategies. However, its broad and complex framework can make it difficult to apply in a structured, standardized way without clinical experience or additional guiding models. [9,10]

Dynamic Systems Theory

Expanding on Bernstein's work, dynamic systems theory applies principles of physics and nonlinear dynamics to motor control. It introduces the idea that movement patterns are not strictly dictated by the CNS but instead self-organize based on the interaction of internal and external constraints. Key concepts include control parameters (variables like speed or fatigue), attractor states (preferred, stable movement patterns), and phase transitions (shifts in movement behavior as a result of changing parameters). Clinically, dynamic systems theory underpins many pediatric, neurological, and sports physiotherapy approaches by encouraging variability in practice and promoting self-directed motor learning. Rather than prescribing exact movements, therapists create environments where patients can explore and discover the most efficient or stable patterns themselves. This theory emphasizes adaptability and functional movement over "ideal" patterns. While powerful, its abstract and mathematically rooted framework may be challenging to apply without simplification or translation into practical therapeutic strategies. [11]

Ecological Theory

Ecological theory, developed by psychologist James Gibson, emphasizes the role of the environment and perception in shaping movement. It suggests that individuals perceive ”affordances”—opportunities for action—based on their capabilities and environmental context. Movement, therefore, is not solely a product of internal planning but emerges through continuous interaction with surroundings. This theory has strong implications for physiotherapy, particularly in promoting functional, goal-directed activities in real-life settings. For example, practicing stair navigation in a patient's home environment aligns with ecological principles and enhances transfer to daily life. Therapists using this model focus on perception-action coupling and often design tasks that are context-rich and meaningful to the patient. The theory's strengths lie in its patient-centeredness and practical applicability. However, it tends to downplay the internal processes of motor control and is often used in combination with other models to provide a more complete view of motor behavior.

Integrative Application in Contemporary Practice

In modern physiotherapy, no single theory fully accounts for the complexity of human movement. Instead, clinicians adopt a multimodal approach, blending elements from various theories to guide comprehensive and individualized treatment. For instance, a patient recovering from a stroke may benefit from reflex-based facilitation in the early stages, followed by motor program retraining, systems-based postural control work, and ecological task practice in a home setting. By integrating these theoretical perspectives, physiotherapists can address underlying impairments while promoting meaningful functional outcomes. This flexibility ensures that interventions are not only evidence-based but also relevant to the patient's specific goals, environments, and experiences. [12]

3 DISCUSSION

The application of motor control theories in physiotherapy is essential to guiding clinical reasoning and informing the design of effective interventions. While each theory offers unique contributions to understanding movement behavior, their integration within contemporary practice is what ensures holistic, adaptable, and patient-centered care. The complexity of human movement, influenced by a blend of biological, psychological, and environmental factors, necessitates a flexible theoretical approach rather than rigid adherence to any one model. [2,13]

One of the most significant evolutions in clinical thinking has been the shift from linear, top-down control models such as the reflex and hierarchical theories to more dynamic and interaction-based perspectives like the systems and ecological theories. In the past, reflex and hierarchical models heavily influenced traditional neurorehabilitation strategies, focusing on normalizing movement patterns and inhibiting abnormal reflexes. While these methods were foundational in early therapy approaches, their limitations—particularly in failing to account for voluntary, anticipatory, and adaptable movement—have reduced their centrality in modern care. [8]

In contrast, systems theory and dynamic systems theory offer a more comprehensive view of movement, recognizing it as an emergent property of multiple interacting subsystems, including musculoskeletal, neural, and sensory systems, all modulated by the environment and task demands. This multifactorial perspective has directly influenced modern physiotherapy practices, such as task-specific training, balance retraining, and functional mobility exercises that consider not just impairments, but also activity limitations and contextual barriers. For example, a patient recovering from a stroke may not only require neuromuscular re-education but also environmental modifications and strategy training to return safely to community mobility. [14]

Motor programming theory continues to hold value, particularly in the rehabilitation of automatic or repetitive tasks such as gait or hand function. Therapists frequently use principles of motor learning—such as practice intensity, variability, and feedback—to restore or adapt motor programs. However, clinical emphasis has shifted away from the idea of ”retraining perfect movement patterns” toward helping patients develop functional and adaptable movement solutions that can be generalized across environments and tasks.

The ecological theory has gained considerable traction in recent years, aligning closely with the goals of functional rehabilitation and patient-centered care. This model encourages therapists to emphasize real-world practice, simulate daily environments, and ensure that patients engage in tasks that are both meaningful and transferable. By focusing on perception-action coupling, therapists can help patients regain independence through naturalistic, purposeful movement. For example, practicing stair negotiation or transfers within a patient's own home context enhances both relevance and outcomes. [15–17]

Moreover, the use of motor control principles has expanded beyond neurological rehabilitation. In musculoskeletal physiotherapy, concepts such as dynamic control, movement variability, and postural strategies are applied in the management of conditions like chronic low back pain or shoulder instability. In sports physiotherapy, motor control frameworks guide skill acquisition, injury prevention, and return-to-play strategies by incorporating variable practice, contextual training, and athlete-specific tasks. [18]

However, despite the advantages of integrating multiple theories, challenges remain. One key difficulty is translating theoretical knowledge into clinical reasoning, especially for novice clinicians. The breadth and complexity of systems-based approaches can be overwhelming without sufficient training or mentorship. Moreover, standardized protocols are less defined within dynamic or ecological frameworks, requiring clinicians to rely heavily on clinical judgment and individualized assessment.[19]

Another challenge is measuring motor control outcomes, which often rely on qualitative observation or function-based assessments rather than quantifiable metrics. While technological tools such as motion analysis systems, wearable sensors, and virtual reality platforms are emerging, access and implementation vary widely across clinical settings.In summary, the practical use of motor control theories in physiotherapy has evolved from simplistic, reflexive models to sophisticated, context-aware approaches. Modern physiotherapy embraces an eclectic, patient-specific strategy that draws from the strengths of multiple theories to enhance functional outcomes. Continued education, research, and innovation are necessary to ensure that these theoretical frameworks remain relevant, accessible, and effective in improving the lives of individuals recovering from movement disorders or injuries.[20–22]

4 CONCLUSION

Motor control theories provide the foundational understanding required to assess and treat movement disorders in physiotherapy. While no single theory fully captures the complexity of human movement, each contributes valuable insights into different dimensions of motor behavior—from reflexes and central programming to systems interactions and environmental influences. Contemporary physiotherapy practice benefits most from an integrative approach that blends multiple theoretical frameworks to accommodate the dynamic, task-specific, and person-centered nature of rehabilitation. As our understanding of motor control continues to evolve, physiotherapists must remain adaptive in applying theory to practice, ensuring that interventions are meaningful, evidence-based, and functionally relevant to the lives of their patients.

Limitations

Despite the rich conceptual insights offered by various motor control theories, several limitations affect their practical application. Firstly, many of these theories are based on theoretical or laboratory research, with limited direct clinical validation. This makes it difficult for practitioners to select or apply them in a standardized way. Secondly, some models, such as dynamic systems theory or ecological theory, while comprehensive, can be abstract and lack clear clinical guidelines, particularly for early-career clinicians. Additionally, most motor control theories were developed with minimal consideration for diverse populations, including children, older adults, or individuals with complex comorbidities, limiting their generalizability. Finally, the subjective nature of assessing motor control—often through observation rather than quantifiable measures—makes outcome tracking and research comparison challenging.[23]

Recommendations for Future Research

Future research should aim to bridge the gap between motor control theory and clinical practice through:

- Empirical validation of theoretical models in real-world physiotherapy settings.
- Development of clinician-friendly tools or guidelines for integrating multiple motor control theories into assessment and intervention planning.
- Exploration of motor control across diverse populations, including pediatric, geriatric, and multi-diagnosis groups.
- Advancement in technology-based assessments, such as motion tracking and wearable sensors, to provide objective measures of motor control performance.
- Continued research into the effectiveness of task-oriented and ecological-based interventions, with a focus on patient-centered outcomes and long-term functional independence.[24,25]

REFERENCES

1. Annett J. The learning of motor skills: sports science and ergonomics perspectives. *Ergonomics*. 1994;37(1):5–16. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00140139408963617.
2. Aloraini SM, Gelley G, Passmore S. Motor control and learning theories in the study of balance: A scoping review. *Journal of Exercise, Movement, and Sport*. 2017;49(1). Available from: https://doi.org/10.16958/jer.49.1.1499scapps.org.
3. Baillieul J, Sun Z. Neuromimetic Control — A Linear Model Paradigm. In: 2021 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC). IEEE. 2021. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1109/CDC45484.2021.9683392.
4. Bernstein NA. The coordination and regulation of movements. Pergamon Press. 1967. Available from: https://books.google.co.in/books/about/The_Co_ordination_and_Regulation_of_Move.html?id=mUhzjwEACAAJ&redir_esc=y.
5. Coker CA. Behavioral theories of motor control. In: Motor learning and control for practitioners. Routledge. 2017;p. 77–108. Available from: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315185613.
6. Colquhoun HL, Levac D, O'Brien KK, et al. Scoping reviews: Time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2014;67(12):1291–1294. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.013.
7. Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, et al. Sarcopenia: Revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. *Age and Ageing*. 2019;48(1):16–31. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/afy169.
8. Dick MB, Hsieh S, Dick-Muehlke C, Davis DS, Cotman CW. The Variability of Practice Hypothesis in Motor Learning: Does It Apply to Alzheimer's Disease? *Brain and Cognition*. 2000;44:470–489. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1006/brcg.2000.1206.
9. Dewald JPA, Pope PS, Given JD, Buchanan TS, Rymer WZ. Abnormal muscle coactivation patterns during isometric torque generation at the elbow and shoulder in hemiparetic subjects. *Brain*. 1995;118(2):495–510. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/brain/118.2.495.
10. Elliott D. Intermittent Versus Continuous Control of Manual Aiming Movements. In: Advances in Psychology;vol. 85. Elsevier. 1992;p. 33–48. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62009-9.

11. Flanagan JR, Vetter P, Johansson RS, Wolpert DM. Prediction Precedes Control in Motor Learning. *Current Biology*. 2003;13(2):146–150. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0960-9822(03)00007-1.
12. Gallagher S. How the body shapes the mind. Oxford University Press. 2005. Available from: https://books.google.co.in/books/about/How_the_Body_Shapes_the_Mind.html?id=zhv5F-GYm98C&source=kp_book_description&redir_esc=y.
13. Gentile AM. A Working Model of Skill Acquisition with Application to Teaching. *Quest*. 1972;17(1):3–23. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00336297.1972.10519717.
14. Kimpo RR, Rinaldi JM, Kim CK, Payne HL, Raymond JL. Gating of neural error signals during motor learning. *eLife*. 2014;3:1–23. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.7554/elife.02076.
15. Kandel ER, Schwartz JH, Jessell TM. Principles of neural science. 4th ed. McGraw-Hill. 2000. Available from: https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Principles_of_Neural_Science_Fourth_Edit.html?id=yzEFK7Xc87YC&redir_esc=y.
16. Latash ML. Neurophysiological Basis of Motor Control. Human Kinetics. 2008. Available from: https://books.google.co.vi/books?id=_fcYstm9LMkC&source=gbs_navlinks_s.
17. Lee TD, Genovese ED. Distribution of Practice in Motor Skill Acquisition: Learning and Performance Effects Reconsidered. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 1988;59(4):277–287. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1988.10609373.
18. Magill RA. Motor Learning and Control. Concepts and Applications. McGraw-Hill. 2007. Available from: https://books.google.co.in/books?id=rCPdAAAACAAJ&source=gbs_book_other_versions_r&redir_esc=y.
19. Molina-Rueda F, de la Cruz SP. Reflections on Physical Therapy: motor learning, how our patients learn? *Issues of Physiotherapy*. 2010;39(3):211–218. Available from: https://doi.org/10.48047/CU.
20. Panjabi MM. The Stabilizing System of the Spine. Part I. Function, Dysfunction, Adaptation, and Enhancement. *Journal of Spinal Disorders*. 1992;5(4):383–389. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00002517-199212000-00001.
21. Perrin PP, Roussel M. Theories of motor control: Implications for rehabilitation. *Neurorehabilitation and Neural Repair*. 1993;7(3):187–193. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1177/154596839300700303.
22. Rothwell J. Control of human voluntary movement. 2nd ed. Chapman & Hall. 1994. Available from: https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-94-011-6960-8.
23. Schmidt RA, Lee TD. Motor control and learning: A behavioral emphasis. 3rd ed. Human Kinetics. 1999. Available from: https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1998-06369-000.
24. Shadmehr R, Mussa-Ivaldi FA. Adaptive representation of dynamics during learning of a motor task. *The Journal of Neuroscience*. 1994;14(5 Pt 2):3208–3224. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.14-05-03208.1994.
25. Thelen E, Spencer JP. Postural Control During Reaching in Young Infants: A Dynamic Systems Approach. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*. 1998;22(4):507–514. Available from: https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s0149-7634(97)00037-7.