WHITE PAPER 02 / ACADEMY OF STRENGTH

The Myth of Muscle Angles

Why Angle Matters—but Progression Matters More

> *“Force demand calls motor units into action; joint position determines how that demand is distributed.”*

Executive Thesis

Fitness marketing often treats tiny changes in bench angle, cable height, stance, or hand position as if each reveals a new muscle. That story is exaggerated. Muscles are not a collection of independent laser beams waiting for the perfect angle.

The opposite slogan—“muscles do not care about angles; they care about load”—is also inaccurate. Joint angle changes external leverage, muscle length, internal moment arms, stability requirements, and the distribution of force across a movement. Training at different lengths and ranges can produce different strength and hypertrophy outcomes.[2,5–9] The useful message is more disciplined: angle is a programming variable, not a substitute for progression.

What All-or-None Actually Means

The all-or-none principle applies to the action potential and the fibers belonging to a recruited motor unit. Once that motor unit reaches threshold, its fibers respond; the nervous system does not send a “half signal” to those fibers. The principle does not mean that an entire muscle is either completely on or completely off.

Whole-muscle force is graded. The nervous system can recruit additional motor units, alter their firing rates, coordinate them differently, and change activation across synergists and antagonists. Meanwhile, joint position changes the mechanical result of that activation. Henneman’s size principle remains central: increasing force demand generally brings progressively higher-threshold motor units into the task.[1]

> **FACT-CHECK**
> “Every fiber fires fully or not at all” is only defensible when it refers to fibers within an activated motor unit. It is not a rule that every region of a whole muscle contributes equally in every exercise or at every joint angle.

Load Is Important, but Load Is Not Acting Alone

A heavy external load creates a high force requirement from the first repetition and is highly useful for improving maximal strength. That does not make the number on the bar the sole determinant of recruitment. With a lighter load, sustained effort and fatigue can increase the demand placed on available motor units. In a controlled study of resistance-trained men, low-load and high-load training taken to volitional failure produced similar muscle hypertrophy, while heavier loading retained advantages for some strength outcomes.[3]

This is why “load” must be interpreted through effort, repetitions, tempo, range, leverage, intent, and technique. A 25-kilogram dumbbell can be easy in one exercise and maximal in another. The muscle responds to the internal demands created by the task, not to the label printed on the plate.

What Joint Angle Changes

Changing an angle can change where a movement is hardest, how long a muscle is under load, which muscles have the best leverage, and how much stable range of motion can be used. These are real mechanical differences. They do not create perfect isolation, but they can create a bias.

Long-muscle-length training provides a clear example. In a controlled hamstring study, seated leg curls produced greater whole-hamstring hypertrophy than prone leg curls, despite both exercises training knee flexion; the seated position placed biarticular hamstrings at longer lengths.[5] In squat research, deep and shallow ranges produced different strength and muscle adaptations.[6] Other studies show that partial-range training at long muscle lengths can outperform short-length partials for some adaptations.[7]

Regional hypertrophy also exists. Strength and power training have produced nonuniform changes within the quadriceps,[8] and isometric training can produce joint-angle-specific strength gains.[9] These findings do not prove that every five-degree adjustment deserves its own exercise. They demonstrate that muscle length, joint position, and range are biologically meaningful.

Why the “Feel” of an Exercise Can Mislead

Sensation may reflect local fatigue, stretch, novelty, metabolites, technique, or attention. It can help an experienced lifter notice whether an exercise is being performed as intended, but it cannot reveal the complete pattern of motor-unit recruitment or predict long-term growth.

Surface electromyography is useful for carefully framed questions about electrical activity near the recording site. It is not a direct measure of muscle force, mechanical tension, or future hypertrophy. Electrode placement, anatomy, normalization, cross-talk, movement, and signal processing all affect the amplitude. Interpreting a larger acute EMG signal as proof that one exercise will build more muscle is therefore a category error.[4]

Bench-angle studies illustrate the distinction. Acute EMG patterns can change across horizontal and inclined pressing,[10] but that finding alone does not establish a superior long-term hypertrophy program. An acute signal can suggest a hypothesis; longitudinal training must test the adaptation.

A Better Exercise-Selection Standard

The Academy’s answer to angle chasing is not to deny mechanics. It is to demand a reason for variation. Keep an exercise when it is safe for the trainee, trains the intended movement or tissue through a productive range, can be loaded and repeated consistently, and improves an outcome that matters.

Change the angle when the change solves a problem: it improves tolerance, exposes a useful muscle length, matches a target range, addresses an identified limitation, or creates a progression that the current exercise cannot. Do not change it merely because the previous version stopped feeling novel.

This approach supports a compound-first system. The squat, press, pull, bench, and deadlift families can cover a large share of general strength training efficiently. A variation or single-joint exercise earns a place when it produces a specific benefit that justifies its time and recovery cost. That is a programming filter, not a claim that anatomy disappears outside the five lifts.

Conclusion

The industry's mistake is not recognizing that angles matter. Its mistake is selling angle novelty as anatomical precision and treating sensation as proof. Load remains essential, especially when maximal strength is the target. Yet load, effort, range of motion, muscle length, and joint mechanics operate together.

> *"Stop chasing novelty. Chase progressively greater force through repeatable, productive ranges."*

References

1. Henneman E, Somjen G, Carpenter DO. Functional significance of cell size in spinal motoneurons. J Neurophysiol. 1965;28:560–580. doi:10.1152/jn.1965.28.3.560
2. Currier BS, et al. Resistance Training Prescription for Muscle Function, Hypertrophy, and Physical Performance in Healthy Adults: An Overview of Reviews. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2026;58(4):851–872. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000003897
3. Morton RW, Oikawa SY, Wavell CG, et al. Neither load nor systemic hormones determine resistance training-mediated hypertrophy or strength gains in resistance-trained young men. J Appl Physiol. 2016;121(1):129–138. doi:10.1152/japplphysiol.00154.2016
4. Vigotsky AD, Halperin I, Lehman GJ, Trajano GS, Vieira TM. Interpreting signal amplitudes in surface electromyography studies in sport and rehabilitation sciences. Front Physiol. 2018;8:985. doi:10.3389/fphys.2017.00985
5. Maeo S, et al. Greater hamstrings muscle hypertrophy but similar damage protection after training at long versus short muscle lengths. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2021;53(4):825–837. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000002523
6. Bloomquist K, Langberg H, Karlsen S, Madsgaard S, Boesen M, Raastad T. Effect of range of motion in heavy load squatting on muscle and tendon adaptations. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2013;113(8):2133–2142. doi:10.1007/s00421-013-2642-7
7. Pedrosa GF, Maeo S, Lemos TMAM, et al. Partial range of motion training elicits favorable improvements in muscular adaptations when carried out at long muscle lengths. Eur J Sport Sci. 2022;22(8):1250–1260. doi:10.1080/17461391.2021.1927199
8. Earp JE, Newton RU, Cormie P, Blazevich AJ. Inhomogeneous quadriceps femoris hypertrophy in response to strength and power training. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2015;47(11):2389–2397. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000669
9. Noorkõiv M, Nosaka K, Blazevich AJ. Neuromuscular adaptations associated with knee joint angle-specific force change. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 2014;46(8):1525–1537. doi:10.1249/MSS.0000000000000269
10. Lauver JD, Cayot TE, Scheuermann BW. Influence of bench angle on upper extremity muscular activation during bench press exercise. Eur J Sport Sci. 2016;16(3):309–316. doi:10.1080/17461391.2015.1022605