

## CHAPTER 4

### RESULTS

#### 4.1 Characteristics of the participants

The participants in this study were seven elite weightlifters (5 males and 2 females) who were selected to attend a national training camp. Participants performed regular weightlifting training program consisting of one hour of cardiovascular and strength training and three hours of skill training per day, 6 days per week. The sample mean  $\pm$  SD of age, height, weight and year of experience were  $23.57 \pm 4.08$  years,  $173 \pm 7.25$  cm,  $85.25 \pm 24.88$  kg and  $9.29 \pm 2.14$  years, respectively.

#### 4.2 Pain intensity

Raw data and mean  $\pm$  SD of pain intensity are demonstrated in Table 4.1. Intensity of pain decreased to 0 at posttest 1 in six of seven participants. One participant showed an increased in pain intensity from baseline to posttest 1 and posttest 2. Mean  $\pm$  SD of pain intensity at baseline, posttest 1 and posttest 2 were  $4.93 \pm 2.39$ ,  $1.00 \pm 2.65$ ,  $1.25 \pm 3.06$ , respectively. Friedman's ANOVA suggested a significant change over back school program and 1 month follow up ( $\chi^2(2) = 6.91$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ). Wilcoxon test with Bonferroni correction was applied and so all effects are reported at a .0167 level of significance. This study showed a tendency of significant difference between baseline and posttest 1.

**Table 4-1 Pain intensity: raw scores, mean  $\pm$  SD and summary of statistical tests**

Subject	Baseline (R1)	Posttest 1 (R2)	Posttest 2 (R3)	X <sup>2</sup> for Friedman two way ANOVA by ranks	Multiple comparison for Friedman two-way ANOVA by ranks
A	2	0	0	6.91 <sup>a</sup>	R1-R2 =1.14 <sup>b</sup>
B	2	0	0		R2-R3 =0.14 <sup>b</sup>
C	8	0	0		R1-R3 =1.00 <sup>b</sup>
D	5	0	0		
E	8	0	0		
F	4	0	0		
G	5	7	8		
mean	4.93	1.00	1.07		
SD	2.39	2.65	2.84		

<sup>a</sup> Statistical significant ( $p < .05$ )

<sup>b</sup> No statistical significant (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test,  $p > .0167$ )

### 4.3 Back care knowledge

Raw data and mean  $\pm$  SD of back care knowledge at baseline, immediate, posttest 1 and posttest 2 were presented in Table 4.2. Mean  $\pm$  SD of back care knowledge measured at baseline, immediate, posttest 1 and posttest 2 were  $15.57 \pm 1.40$ ,  $18.29 \pm 1.12$ ,  $17.00 \pm 1.53$  and  $17.43 \pm 0.98$ , respectively. Friedman's two way ANOVA between four conditions showed a significant change ( $\chi^2 (3) = 11.36$ ,  $p < .05$ ). Wilcoxon test was used to indicate difference between conditions. The study found that the participants' back care knowledge did not change significantly after attending the back school program ( $\chi^2 (3) = 11.36$ ,  $p > .0125$ ). However, tendency of significant difference was detected between baseline and immediate test.

**Table 4-2 Back knowledge: raw scores and summary of statistical test**

Subject	Baseline (R1)	Immediate (R2)	Posttest 1 (R3)	Posttest 2 (R4)	X <sup>2</sup> for Friedman two way ANOVA by ranks	Multiple comparison for Friedman two-way ANOVA by ranks
A	14	19	19	18	11.36 <sup>a</sup>	R1-R2 =2.14 <sup>b</sup>
B	16	19	19	19		R2-R3 =1.07 <sup>b</sup>
C	18	18	15	16		R3-R4 =2.28 <sup>b</sup>
D	16	19	17	17		R1-R3 =1.07 <sup>b</sup>
E	15	19	16	18		R1-R4 =1.35 <sup>b</sup>
F	14	16	16	17		R2-R4 =1.79 <sup>b</sup>
G	16	18	17	17		
Mean	15.57	18.29	17.00	17.43		
SD	1.40	1.12	1.53	0.98		

<sup>a</sup> Statistical significant ( $p < .05$ )

<sup>b</sup> No statistical significant (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test,  $p > .0125$ )

#### 4.4 Lumbopelvic stability test

Results of lumbopelvic stability test are presented in Table 4.3. The study found no significant difference in lumbopelvic stability outcome from back school program ( $\chi^2 (3) = 4.867, p > .05$ ).

**Table 4-3 Lumbopelvic stability test: raw scores and summary of statistical tests**

Subject	Baseline (R1)	Posttest 1 (R3)	Posttest 2 (R4)	X <sup>2</sup> for Friedman two way ANOVA by Ranks
A	1	1	1	.40
B	4	5	5	
C	4	3	3	
D	3	4	3	
E	1	1	1	
F	4	3	4	
G	3	3	2	

#### 4.5 Quality of life

Quality of life was measured by The Thai SF-36V2. The level of quality of life was presented in eight domains; physical function, role physical, role emotion, bodily pain, vitality, social function, mental health, general health perceptions. Analyses of differences in mean scores between baseline 1, posttest 1 and posttest 2 using Friedman's ANOVA were demonstrated in Table 4.4. The data revealed that eight domains of SF-36 scores were not significantly different in all situations ( $p > .05$ ).

**Table 4-4 Mean  $\pm$  SD, (95%) scores of the 8 domains of SF-36 of Weightlifters**

SF-36	Baseline	Posttest 1	Posttest 2	<i>p</i> -value*
	N=7	N=7	N=7	
Physical functioning	75.00 $\pm$ 20.62	69.29 $\pm$ 15.39	82.86 $\pm$ 14.10	0.11
Role physical	75.00 $\pm$ 17.74	63.43 $\pm$ 20.51	72.29 $\pm$ 21.12	0.56
Bodily pain	53.57 $\pm$ 15.42	62.29 $\pm$ 22.55	67.00 $\pm$ 27.15	0.44
General health	63.57 $\pm$ 12.49	63.57 $\pm$ 25.77	63.57 $\pm$ 14.64	0.99
Mental health	57.86 $\pm$ 16.04	58.57 $\pm$ 22.31	67.14 $\pm$ 17.29	0.532
Role emotion	75.00 $\pm$ 18.06	70.14 $\pm$ 26.34	77.29 $\pm$ 20.78	0.787
Vitality	61.00 $\pm$ 15.68	59.14 $\pm$ 16.17	60.14 $\pm$ 17.64	1.000
Social function	66.29 $\pm$ 20.11	82.43 $\pm$ 12.18	80.57 $\pm$ 21.34	0.457
PCS	66.79 $\pm$ 13.82	64.64 $\pm$ 13.00	71.43 $\pm$ 15.96	0.77
MCS	65.04 $\pm$ 14.71	67.57 $\pm$ 15.55	71.29 $\pm$ 17.98	0.86









PCS= physical component summary

MCS= mental component summary

#### 4.6 Quality of lifting

Pain intensity during each phase of snatch and clean and jerk lifting are presented in Tables 4.5 and 4.6, respectively. The results showed that 5 of 7 elite weightlifters had an improvement in pain during snatch lift and 6 of 7 weightlifters had an improvement in pain during clean and jerk lift. Conversely, one weightlifter had a progressively worse result in both snatch and clean and jerk lift when assessed at post test1 and 2.











Table 4-5 Quality of lifting: raw score of snatch lifting

Subject	Evaluate	Snatch								Result
										
A	Base		2							+
	Post 1		0							
	Post 2		0							
B	Base		2							+
	Post 1		0							
	Post 2		0							
C	Base									*
	Post 1									
	Post 2									
D	Base	8	8							+
	Post 1	0	0							
	Post 2	0	0							
E	Base	8			7			8		+
	Post 1	0			0			0		
	Post 2	0			0			0		
F	Base	0	7	0	0					-
	Post 1	7	7	7	7					
	Post 2	8	8	8	8					
G	Base	4				2				+
	Post 1	0				0				
	Post 2	0				0				

Result= + improve, - worse

\* No pain in this lifting position

Table 4-6 Quality of lifting: raw score of clean &amp; jerk lifting

Subject	Evaluate	Clean & Jerk										Result
												
A	Base										3	+
	Post 1										0	
	Post 2										0	
B	Base										2 2	+
	Post 1										0 0	
	Post 2										0 0	
C	Base										6 7 6	+
	Post 1										0 0 0	
	Post 2										0 0 0	
D	Base										8 8	+
	Post 1										0 0	
	Post 2										0 0	
E	Base										7	+
	Post 1										0	
	Post 2										0	
F	Base										0 7 0 7	-
	Post 1										0 7 7 7	
	Post 2										8 8 0 8	
G	Base										4	+
	Post 1										0	
	Post 2										0	

Result= + improve, - worse