

A Decade of Observational Inquiry Into Informed Touch,

Systemic Response, and Range of Motion Without Stretching

Dedric Carroll, LMT

Working Manuscript / Practice-Based Observational Research Report

Abstract

Background: This decade-long classroom inquiry asked a focused question: can informed touch increase joint range of motion without any formal stretching intervention? The work also explored whether local manual input could influence broader systemic information associated with stress regulation and biological response. **Methods:** Across repeated massage-therapy student cohorts, participants with measurable restriction were assessed before and after a standardized informed-touch intervention. Range of motion was measured with a goniometer. No stretching intervention was performed. Repeated classes were used to observe whether the same pattern appeared across different participants and cohorts. **Observations:** The repeated finding was that range of motion increased after informed touch alone, without formal stretching. The magnitude and consistency of this response suggested that the change could not be understood only as a local mechanical lengthening effect. **Interpretation:** The observations supported a broader model in which touch functions as biological and sensory input, influencing local tissue behavior, nervous-system regulation, and systemic stress-related signaling. This framework later became foundational to the Empirical Knead Functional Model.

Primary Research Question

The central question was not whether stretching improves flexibility. Stretching was intentionally absent from the intervention. The question was whether informed touch by itself could produce measurable increases in range of motion at a restricted joint. A second, related question was whether this change reflected more than a local musculoskeletal event specifically, whether informed touch could reduce local and systemic stress-related information in a way that allowed the nervous system and body to permit greater motion.

Study Design and Classroom Methods

The inquiry was repeated over approximately 10 years in a classroom setting across multiple massage-therapy student cohorts. Participants with measurable restrictions were identified and baseline range of motion was recorded with a goniometer. A standardized informed-touch intervention was then applied without adding a formal stretching procedure.

Range of motion was reassessed after the intervention. The same general structure was repeated over many classes so that the investigator could determine whether the response was reproducible rather than a one-time demonstration. The work was observational and practice-based, but it was shaped by prior experience with controlled massage research and by a deliberate effort to reduce unnecessary variation in how the intervention was delivered and measured.

Core Observation

The repeated result was overwhelmingly consistent: informed touch alone was followed by increased range of motion, even though no stretching was performed. This finding challenged the assumption that improved motion must come primarily from mechanically lengthening a muscle or forcing a joint through a greater range. Instead, it suggested that the body was changing its response to the available range after receiving a specific form of sensory and mechanical input.

Neurobiological and Systemic Interpretation

The observations were interpreted in the context of the broader Emory massage-research findings that manual touch can be associated with measurable changes in stress-related, neuroendocrine, and immune markers. The classroom findings therefore raised a larger question: if informed touch can alter biological communication and stress response, can a reduction in local or systemic threat-related information change motor output and the amount of motion the body permits? The repeated increase in range of motion without stretching was consistent with that possibility and became a major influence on the investigator's clinical

reasoning.

Relationship to the Empirical Knead Functional Model

This work became part of the foundation of Empirical Knead. A painful or restricted area is not treated only as a local tissue problem. The model asks what sensory, fascial, mechanical, movement, and nervous-system information may be contributing to the presentation. The clinical sequence - Observe, Assess, Treat, Reassess - reflects the same logic used in the classroom inquiry: establish a measurable baseline, apply informed input, observe the biological and functional response, and use the response to guide the next decision.

Limitations

This document is a retrospective review of data and notes and applied in practice-based synthesis rather than a peer-reviewed clinical trial report. The complete participant-level dataset, formal statistical analysis plan, and full archival records are not fully incorporated into the findings and represents a percentage of the data obtained over the experiment duration. The findings should therefore be presented as repeated observational results from the investigator's own classroom research and as hypothesis-generating evidence that informed later clinical practice, not as a population-level efficacy claim.

Conclusion

Across approximately a decade of repeated classroom observation, informed touch was consistently associated with increased range of motion in the absence of formal stretching. This held for approximately 10-15 minutes before pretreatment measurements were obtained. The importance of the finding was not simply that motion changed, but that it changed without using stretching as the mechanism. This supported the investigator's view that manual input can influence the nervous system and broader biological communication in ways that alter functional output. Raises the question, if applied every 15 minutes, would it produce and how many sessions would it take to produce a longer sustained lengthened state? That principle became central to the Empirical Knead Functional Model.

Next

The next design will look at that question in the hypermobile body. Challenging in that there are many variables of adaptation, which may prove difficult to have consistent data, but may reveal a better insight behind the complexities of hypermobility. And perhaps a developing proactive approach to variables within movement adaptations of daily activities of this demographic.