Neuro-Sensorimotor Approaches for the Rehabilitation of Dysarthria: A Theoretical and Analytical Study

Selma Iken
University of Oum El Bouaghi, Algeria. – Laboratory of Social Problems in Algerian Society
Email: iken .selma @ univ-oeb.dz

Received: 25/02/2026 ; Accepted: 05/08/2026 ; Published: 05/09/2026

Abstract
Dysarthria is a neurological motor speech disorder resulting from injury or dysfunction of the central and/or peripheral nervous system and characterized by impairments in the strength, speed, range, steadiness, tone, or accuracy of the movements required for speech. These impairments may affect the respiratory, phonatory, resonatory, articulatory, and prosodic dimensions of speech and may consequently reduce speech intelligibility and communicative effectiveness. Contemporary rehabilitation increasingly draws on neurological, sensory, and motor perspectives, together with principles of neuroplasticity, sensory feedback, and motor learning. The present theoretical and analytical study aims to examine the theoretical foundations of these approaches, clarify the mechanisms through which they may contribute to dysarthria rehabilitation, and highlight the value of integrating neurological, sensory, and motor perspectives within clinical intervention. A descriptive-analytical approach was adopted through a review of relevant theoretical literature, research findings, and rehabilitation programs. The analysis suggests that an integrated sensorimotor framework can provide a more coherent account of the relationship between neurological impairment, sensory processing, speech motor control, and functional communication. The neurological approach provides the underlying explanatory framework; the sensory approach contributes to the processing and use of auditory, somatosensory, and proprioceptive information; and the motor approach translates these mechanisms into structured, repetitive, functionally oriented practice. Accordingly, rehabilitation should be individualized according to dysarthria type, lesion characteristics, affected speech subsystems, and the person's communicative needs.
Keywords: dysarthria; motor speech disorder; neuroplasticity; sensory feedback; motor learning; speech motor control; rehabilitation; speech-language pathology.

1. Introduction and Statement of the Problem

Dysarthria is a neurological motor speech disorder associated with damage or dysfunction within the central or peripheral nervous system. It affects the neuromuscular control and coordination of the structures involved in speech, including the respiratory system, larynx, velopharyngeal mechanism, tongue, lips, jaw, and other orofacial structures. Depending on the site and nature of the neurological lesion, dysarthria may be manifested through abnormalities of respiration, phonation, resonance, articulation, and prosody, with a consequent impact on speech intelligibility and communicative participation (Darley et al., 1975; McNeil, 2009).

The etiological spectrum is broad. Dysarthria may occur in association with degenerative neurological conditions such as Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or Huntington's disease; vascular events such as stroke; traumatic brain injury; neoplastic conditions; congenital and developmental neurological disorders such as cerebral palsy; and other disorders affecting the motor systems responsible for speech.

From a neuroanatomical perspective, dysarthria can result from lesions affecting cortical motor regions and their descending pathways, corticobulbar pathways, cranial motor nuclei or nerves, basal ganglia, cerebellum and cerebellar circuits, or combinations of these systems. The clinical manifestation therefore depends not only on the location of the lesion but also on the underlying motor syndrome and the extent to which speech-related neural networks remain functionally available.

Common speech manifestations include imprecise or distorted consonants and vowels, reduced vocal intensity, abnormal voice quality, altered resonance, abnormal rate, disrupted prosody, and diminished speech intelligibility. Associated orofacial and bulbar impairments may include reduced voluntary movement, drooling, chewing or swallowing difficulties, and coughing or other airway-protection problems. Such associated impairments should be distinguished conceptually from the definition of dysarthria itself, which primarily concerns the motor control of speech.

In recent decades, rehabilitation of neurological communication disorders has increasingly incorporated principles derived from motor control, motor learning, sensory feedback, and neuroplasticity. These perspectives suggest that functional improvement can be supported through appropriately selected practice, repetition, intensity, task specificity, feedback, and meaningful communicative goals. However, intervention should not be reduced to a generic set of sensory or motor exercises. Rather, the clinician must identify the specific speech subsystem(s) affected and select evidence-based interventions that correspond to the patient's neurological and functional profile.

The central problem addressed in this study is therefore the need to clarify how neurological mechanisms, sensory information processing, and speech motor learning can be conceptualized together in the rehabilitation of dysarthria. The guiding research question is: What are the theoretical foundations underlying neurological and sensorimotor approaches, and how do these approaches contribute to explaining the mechanisms involved in dysarthria rehabilitation?

2. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its attempt to connect neurolinguistic and speech-language pathology perspectives in the analysis of dysarthria rehabilitation. It seeks to clarify the neurological, sensory, and motor foundations of intervention and to provide a theoretical framework that can help researchers and clinicians understand why particular rehabilitation procedures may be useful for specific dysarthric profiles.

3. Objectives of the Study

The study aims to:

• clarify the concept of dysarthria, its major clinical types, etiologies, and manifestations;

• examine the theoretical foundations of neurological, sensory, and motor approaches to dysarthria rehabilitation;

• describe major neurological and sensorimotor rehabilitation principles and compare their theoretical contributions;
• explain how sensory feedback and motor learning may support speech motor control and functional communication;
• highlight the value and limitations of integrating these perspectives in dysarthria rehabilitation;
• identify directions for future research and clinical development.

4. Theoretical Framework

4.1. Concept of Dysarthria

Dysarthria is generally defined as a neurological motor speech disorder caused by impairment of the neuromuscular control of the speech mechanism. The disorder can affect the execution of learned speech movements at multiple levels, including respiration, phonation, resonance, articulation, and prosody. Because the underlying neurological conditions vary considerably, dysarthria is best understood as a heterogeneous family of motor speech disorders rather than as a single uniform clinical entity (Duffy, 2013; McNeil, 2009).

Descriptions of dysarthria have historically emphasized the relationship between neurological impairment and perceptual speech characteristics. Early clinical traditions distinguished syndromes such as bulbar and pseudobulbar impairment, while the perceptual classification developed by Darley, Aronson, and Brown identified characteristic dysarthria patterns associated with different neurological systems. Contemporary clinical practice combines perceptual characteristics with neurological diagnosis, instrumental assessment when available, and functional measures of communication.

4.2. Classification of Dysarthria

The classical Darley, Aronson, and Brown framework identifies major dysarthria patterns according to their neurological substrates. The commonly cited classification includes flaccid, spastic, ataxic, hypokinetic, hyperkinetic, unilateral upper motor neuron, and mixed dysarthrias. Some summaries omit unilateral upper motor neuron dysarthria, but it is important to retain it when presenting the complete classical classification.

-. Flaccid Dysarthria

Flaccid dysarthria is associated primarily with lower motor neuron dysfunction, including impairment of cranial nerves, motor nuclei, or other components of the peripheral motor system. Clinical features may include weakness, reduced range of movement, abnormal resonance, imprecise articulation, breathy or weak phonation, and reduced speech endurance. The pattern varies according to the structures involved.

-. Spastic Dysarthria

Spastic dysarthria is typically associated with bilateral upper motor neuron involvement. Speech may be slow, effortful, and strained-strangled, with imprecise consonants, distorted vowels, reduced pitch variation, abnormal loudness patterns, and hypernasality. Associated upper motor neuron signs may include increased muscle tone and impaired voluntary control. Dysphagia and drooling may coexist because the same neurological disease can affect broader corticobulbar functions.

-. Ataxic Dysarthria

Ataxic dysarthria is associated with dysfunction of the cerebellum or cerebellar pathways. Characteristic features may include irregular articulatory breakdowns, impaired timing and coordination, distorted prosody, abnormal stress patterns, and difficulty regulating the force and duration of movements. Speech may sound segmented or scanning in some patients, although contemporary descriptions favor precise characterization of the observed motor abnormalities.

-. Hypokinetic Dysarthria

Hypokinetic dysarthria is frequently associated with Parkinson's disease and basal ganglia dysfunction. Typical manifestations include reduced vocal loudness, reduced pitch variation, rapid or accelerated speech, reduced articulatory amplitude, monotony, and declining intelligibility. Facial hypomimia and other extrapyramidal motor signs may be present.

-. Hyperkinetic Dysarthria

Hyperkinetic dysarthria is associated with involuntary movements that may interfere with respiration, phonation, resonance, articulation, and prosody. Depending on the underlying movement disorder, abnormal movements may include chorea, athetosis, dystonia, or other involuntary motor activity. The speech pattern can therefore vary substantially across and within individuals.

. Unilateral Upper Motor Neuron Dysarthria

Unilateral upper motor neuron dysarthria may occur following a unilateral lesion affecting corticobulbar pathways. Speech changes are often relatively mild compared with other dysarthrias but may include imprecise articulation, reduced facial movement on one side, and other asymmetries depending on the lesion.

-. Mixed Dysarthria

Mixed dysarthria occurs when neurological disease affects more than one motor system. It is common in conditions such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis and multiple sclerosis, although the exact combination depends on disease progression and lesion distribution. Mixed patterns require careful assessment because different subsystems may show different mechanisms of impairment.

4.3. Etiology of Dysarthria

The causes of dysarthria can be organized broadly into vascular, traumatic, neoplastic, degenerative, inflammatory, infectious, congenital, and developmental neurological conditions. Stroke and traumatic brain injury may produce focal or diffuse lesions; neurodegenerative disorders may progressively disrupt several motor systems; and developmental neurological conditions may affect the acquisition or execution of speech motor patterns from childhood onward.

5. Neurological Approach

The neurological approach provides the scientific framework for understanding the relationship between observable speech behavior and the nervous system. It emphasizes the identification of the neural structures and pathways involved in speech motor control, the characterization of neurological impairment, and the implications of such impairment for diagnosis and rehabilitation. Within this framework, speech is treated as a highly organized sensorimotor behavior emerging from distributed interactions among cortical, subcortical, cerebellar, brainstem, and peripheral systems.

5.1. Neuroplasticity as a Theoretical Basis

Neuroplasticity refers broadly to the capacity of the nervous system to modify its functional organization and connectivity in response to experience, learning, injury, and environmental demands. Following neurological injury, functional reorganization may involve changes in synaptic efficacy, recruitment of adjacent or homologous networks, modification of cortical representations, and other adaptive processes. Rehabilitation seeks to shape experience-dependent plasticity through appropriately dosed and functionally meaningful practice.

Evidence from neuroscience demonstrates that sensory deprivation and experience can alter cortical organization, and that rehabilitation can influence neural reorganization after injury. However, neuroplasticity is not inherently beneficial: plastic changes may be adaptive or maladaptive. Moreover, statements suggesting that failure to rehabilitate automatically causes degeneration of surviving neurons are too absolute. The relationship between rehabilitation timing, neural reorganization, and functional recovery is complex and depends on lesion characteristics, task demands, dosage, and individual patient factors.

5.2. Principles Supporting Neuroplastic Change

Rehabilitation strategies that seek to harness neuroplasticity commonly emphasize repetition, intensity or sufficient dosage, task specificity, continuity, salience, progressive challenge, feedback, and active patient engagement. Early intervention may be beneficial for many neurological conditions, but the optimal timing and intensity are not identical across disorders or recovery phases. Consequently, treatment planning should be individualized rather than based on a fixed universal time window.

In dysarthria rehabilitation, these principles favor repeated and functionally relevant speech practice, appropriately targeted feedback, gradual increases in task complexity, and regular monitoring of changes in speech intelligibility and communication participation.

6. Sensory Approach

The sensory approach emphasizes the role of sensory information in the control and learning of movement. During speech, the nervous system continuously receives information from auditory and somatosensory systems, including tactile and proprioceptive information arising from the articulators and laryngeal and respiratory systems. These signals contribute to the monitoring and adjustment of speech movements.

Sensory feedback should be distinguished from anticipatory or predictive control. Feedback refers to sensory information available during or after movement, whereas feedforward control relies on learned predictions that allow movements to be initiated efficiently without waiting for sensory information to arrive. Modern speech motor control theories integrate both forms of control.

Although Ayres' sensory integration theory made major contributions to the understanding of sensory processing, it was developed primarily in the context of broader sensory integration and occupational therapy and should not be presented as a direct, stand-alone evidence base for dysarthria treatment. For dysarthria, a more directly relevant theoretical foundation comes from models of speech motor control that explicitly represent auditory and somatosensory feedback.

6.1. Auditory and Somatosensory Feedback

Auditory feedback provides information about vocal intensity, pitch, voice quality, resonance, articulation, and overall speech output. Somatosensory feedback provides information related to contact, pressure, position, movement, and internal sensations involving the lips, tongue, jaw, palate, larynx, and respiratory system. The nervous system integrates these sources to detect errors and adjust subsequent speech actions.

6.2. The DIVA Model of Speech Motor Control

The Directions Into Velocities of Articulators (DIVA) model is a computational account of speech motor control that distinguishes feedforward control from auditory and somatosensory feedback control. In the model, learned speech targets and motor commands are generated while sensory feedback is used to detect errors and update control. This framework provides a useful theoretical explanation for why altered sensory feedback, impaired prediction, or disrupted sensorimotor integration can affect speech production and motor learning.

7. Motor Approach

The motor approach is grounded in principles of motor control and motor learning. It focuses on the acquisition, refinement, stabilization, and generalization of movement patterns through structured practice. In dysarthria rehabilitation, the relevant motor behaviors include respiratory support, phonatory control, articulatory precision, rate regulation, prosodic control, and coordination across speech subsystems.

Motor learning principles commonly considered in neurological rehabilitation include practice specificity, repetition, task difficulty, distribution of practice, feedback, retention, transfer, and the gradual withdrawal of external cues when appropriate. Maas et al. (2008) emphasized the importance of distinguishing temporary performance changes from genuine learning. A patient may perform better while receiving intensive feedback during a treatment session without necessarily demonstrating durable retention or transfer to everyday communication.

The principle of motor specificity is particularly important. Interventions should be sufficiently similar to the target speech behavior to support transfer. This does not mean that every exercise must reproduce natural speech exactly, but it does mean that clinicians should critically evaluate whether an exercise has a plausible and evidence-supported pathway to functional speech improvement.

7.1. Feedback in Motor Learning

Feedback may be intrinsic, arising from the individual’s own sensory systems, or augmented, provided by the clinician or a technological system. Augmented feedback can include visual displays, acoustic information, tactile cues, rate-control devices, or other forms of biofeedback. The amount and timing of feedback should be calibrated because excessive or permanent external feedback may support immediate performance but may not always optimize independent retention and generalization.

8. Integrated Neuro-Sensorimotor Framework

Speech production is a complex sensorimotor behavior rather than a sequence governed by a single linear pathway. Linguistic formulation, motor planning, motor programming, execution, sensory monitoring, error detection, and learning interact dynamically across distributed neural networks. Cortical regions, basal ganglia, cerebellum, brainstem pathways, cranial motor systems, and peripheral sensory receptors all contribute to the process.

The respiratory system provides the aerodynamic energy required for speech, while the larynx converts airflow into a modulated acoustic source. The articulatory system shapes this source through coordinated movements of the tongue, lips, jaw, and velopharyngeal structures. Sensory receptors provide information about movement and contact, while auditory feedback informs the speaker about the acoustic consequences of the produced utterance.

Motor execution and sensory monitoring therefore operate as a closed-loop and partially predictive system. Feedforward commands allow rapid initiation of familiar movements, while sensory feedback allows deviations to be detected and corrected. With practice, repeated success may strengthen and refine internal models, reduce the need for conscious control, and support more efficient speech motor performance.

8.1. Neurological Basis of Speech Sensorimotor Control

Speech motor control involves distributed networks rather than a single “speech center.” Premotor and primary motor cortices contribute to movement generation; supplementary motor regions participate in sequencing and internally guided action; parietal regions contribute to sensory integration and body-state representation; auditory and temporal regions process speech-related acoustic information; basal ganglia contribute to movement selection and scaling; and the cerebellum contributes to timing, coordination, and prediction. Descending corticobulbar pathways connect cortical motor systems with brainstem motor nuclei controlling the muscles of speech.

8.2. Proprioception and Internal Sensory Monitoring

Proprioceptive and tactile information contributes to awareness of articulator position, movement, contact, and force. Mechanoreceptors in oral tissues provide information about contact and pressure, while proprioceptive information from muscles and joints contributes to the estimation of movement and position. In the respiratory and laryngeal systems, sensory information about mechanical conditions and airflow-related states also contributes to regulation. These signals are integrated with auditory feedback and motor commands to support stable speech production.

9. Analytical and Interpretive Discussion

The literature reviewed suggests that neurological, sensory, and motor perspectives should not be treated as mutually exclusive treatment schools. They represent complementary levels of explanation. The neurological approach identifies the systems affected by disease; the sensory approach explains how internal and external information is used for monitoring and adaptation; and the motor-learning approach explains how repeated functional practice can change performance and support durable learning.

From a clinical perspective, the relationship between impairment and intervention should not be simplified into a fixed correspondence in which one symptom automatically determines one approach. Respiratory impairment, for example, may require respiratory-focused treatment within a broader speech motor program; phonatory deficits may benefit from intensive voice-oriented treatment; articulatory imprecision may require task-specific articulatory practice; and rate or prosodic abnormalities may require pacing or rhythmic interventions. The selection of techniques should follow comprehensive assessment of the individual’s neurological status, speech subsystems, intelligibility, participation, and goals.

Similarly, the statement that rehabilitation should always strengthen the speech muscles requires qualification. Weakness may be a major contributor in some dysarthrias, whereas others are characterized more by spasticity, rigidity, incoordination, involuntary movement, or impaired movement scaling. Therefore, nonspecific strengthening or oral-motor exercise should not be treated as a universal solution. Intervention should be chosen according to the underlying impairment and supported by evidence demonstrating relevance to functional speech outcomes.

Technologies such as transcranial magnetic stimulation, transcranial direct-current stimulation, electrical stimulation, and computerized biofeedback are promising areas of research, but their role in routine dysarthria rehabilitation remains dependent on the specific technique, patient population, treatment protocol, and quality of the evidence. They should therefore be described as emerging or adjunctive approaches rather than universally established standards of care.

The strongest theoretical position emerging from the analysis is thus an integrated, individualized model in which neurological diagnosis informs the target of intervention, sensory information is used to support error detection and calibration, and motor-learning principles structure practice so that gains are retained and transferred to functional communication.

10. Conclusion

Dysarthria is a heterogeneous neurological motor speech disorder whose manifestations reflect disruption within the complex systems responsible for respiration, phonation, resonance, articulation, prosody, and their coordination. Its rehabilitation cannot be adequately explained by a single theoretical perspective. A neurological framework is necessary for understanding lesion-related mechanisms and expected motor patterns; a sensory framework clarifies the role of auditory, tactile, and proprioceptive information in monitoring speech; and a motor-learning framework explains how appropriately structured practice can promote improved performance, retention, and transfer.

The integration of these perspectives offers a coherent theoretical basis for individualized dysarthria intervention. Nevertheless, integration should be evidence-driven rather than additive: the clinician should select those components that correspond to the person's neurological profile, affected speech subsystems, and communicative goals. Future research should therefore move beyond generalized claims about "neuro-sensorimotor" rehabilitation toward well-designed clinical studies examining specific interventions, patient subgroups, dosage, mechanisms, and functional outcomes.

11. Recommendations

- develop dysarthria rehabilitation programs tailored to specific neurological and dysarthria profiles;
- integrate sensory feedback and motor-learning principles into evidence-based speech treatment when clinically indicated;
- prioritize speech-specific and functionally meaningful practice and carefully justify the use of nonspeech exercises;
- conduct controlled clinical studies comparing different combinations of neurological, sensory, motor-learning, and technology-assisted interventions;
- provide clinicians in speech-language pathology with advanced training in neurology, motor speech disorders, motor learning, sensory feedback, and evidence-based rehabilitation;
- clearly distinguish established clinical interventions from emerging neuromodulation or experimental techniques.

References

Al-Anzi, R. (2015). Training autistic children in the use of mental skills [Master's thesis]. Faculty of Social Sciences.

Bear, M. F., Connors, B. W., & Paradiso, M. A. (2016). Neuroscience: Exploring the brain (4th ed.). Wolters Kluwer.

Billot, A., & Kiran, S. (2024). Disentangling neuroplasticity mechanisms in post-stroke language recovery. Brain and Language, 251, 10581.

Borel-Maisonny, S. (2009). Rééducation orthophonique: Les dysarthries. Fédération Nationale des Orthophonistes, 239.

Borgnet, Z. (2024). Évaluation de la dysarthrie chez l'enfant [Master's thesis]. Université de Lille.

Bradshaw, A., et al. (2021). The role of sensory feedback in developmental stuttering. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Darley, F. L., Aronson, A. E., & Brown, J. R. (1975). Motor speech disorders. W. B. Saunders.

Duffy, J. R. (2013). Motor speech disorders: Substrates, differential diagnosis, and management (3rd ed.). Elsevier.

Jayaraman, D. K., Das, J. M., et al. (2023). Dysarthria. In StatPearls. StatPearls Publishing.

Karim, R., Proulx, M., et al. (2021). Neuroplasticity and crossmodal connectivity in the normal, healthy brain. Psychology & Neuroscience, 14(3).

Kitago, T., & Krakauer, J. W. (2013). Motor learning principles for neurorehabilitation. In Handbook of Clinical Neurology (Vol. 110). Elsevier.

Koch, C., & Fellows, A. (2023). Principles of motor learning and intervention for speech sound disorders. American Speech-Language-Hearing Association.

Lederman, E. (2013). Therapeutic stretching: Towards a functional approach. Churchill Livingstone.

Maas, E., Robin, D. A., Austermann Hula, S. N., Freedman, S. E., Wulf, G., Ballard, K. J., & Schmidt, R. A. (2008). Principles of motor learning in treatment of motor speech disorders. American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 17(3), 277–298.

McNeil, M. R. (2009). Clinical management of sensorimotor speech disorders (2nd ed.). Thieme.

Mulder, T., & Hulstyn, W. (1984). Sensory feedback therapy and theoretical knowledge of motor control and learning. American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, 63(5).

Porell, B., & Houde, J. F. (2019). Modeling the role of sensory feedback in speech motor control and learning. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research.

Steve, M. (2019). Création d'un outil d'évaluation pour le diagnostic de la dysarthrie et de l'anarthrie [Master's thesis]. Université de Liège, Belgium.