







Quality of life assessment for practitioners of an extreme conditioning program

Antônio Ribeiro Neto , Kamila Araújo Pires , Danilo Santos Rocha , Lucimara Ferreira Magalhães , Isabel Aparecida Porcatti de Walsh , Derval Bertoncello 

ABSTRACT:

Objective: This study aims to evaluate the associations between quality of life and sociodemographic characteristics, motivation, and frequency and time of practice in practitioners of an extreme conditioning program. **Methods:** Observational descriptive-exploratory type research, with a convenience sample consisting of CrossFit® practitioners. The practitioners answered a demographic data questionnaire, and the WHOQOL-bref instrument was used to assess the quality of life. **Results:** Of the 260 practitioners evaluated, 59.61% were female. The highest means of QoL scores were for the physical domain (**79.8 ± 11.76**), **social domain (74.1 ± 15.59)**, **psychological domain (73.2 ± 13.67)**, and environment domain (70.7 ± 12.14). Practice time showed positive correlations with all QoL domains. **Conclusions:** The practitioners showed good results for quality of life, with the highest scores for the physical domain, followed by the social domain, the psychological domain, and finally, the environment domain. Longer practice time was correlated with higher averages for all QoL domains.

Keywords: Quality of life, Physical activity, Exercise, Surveys, Questionnaires.

INTRODUCTION

Quality of life (QoL) is defined as the well-being derived from the assessment that the individual makes of different domains of life, being characterized as subjective, multidimensional, and changing over time^{1,2}. Its assessment incorporates the perceptions of physical, psychological, and social well-being, considering the capacity to participate in activities of daily living and practical life, including physical activities, together with social and psychosocial functions¹⁻⁴. The relationship between regular physical activity and the promotion of improvement in QoL has been widely studied in healthy and unhealthy adults, regardless of sex and age^{5,6}.

The World Health Organization recommends that adults engage in 150 minutes of moderate-intensity physical activity per week, or at least 75 minutes per week of intense activity, with clear scientific evidence that, compared to inactive people, physically active people have better physical conditioning, lower risk profiles for several disabling conditions, and lower rates of non-transmissible chronic diseases⁴.

In recent years, there has been an increase in the number and type of activities in which high-intensity activity predominates. These include extreme conditioning programs (ECPs), such as CrossFit®, which are new forms of physical training characterized by performing constantly varied functional exercises at high intensity, with little or no rest^{7,8}. The aim is to promote health by means of a program employing intense exercises that involve cardiovascular/respiratory resistance, energy, strength, flexibility, power, speed, coordination, agility, balance, and accuracy⁹.

The diversity of the training and the sense of community inherent to the practice of this modality creates bonds among practitioners and promotes mental well-being. Meanwhile, research related to ECPs focuses on the analysis of body composition, psychophysiological parameters, musculoskeletal injuries, aspects of life and health, and psychological behavior⁹.

Since studies have focused on the results of functional training in gyms, there remains a gap concerning the analysis of the effect of practicing this modality on QoL. ECPs represent an important strategy for improving QoL,

physical condition, and autonomy, especially in the elderly.

Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate the associations between QoL and sociodemographic characteristics, motivation, and frequency and time of practice in practitioners of an ECP.

METHODS

This was an observational study of the descriptive-exploratory type, approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the institution. Participants who agreed to participate in the study signed a free and informed consent form and were reassured that they were free to withdraw from their participation at any time during the study. The researcher responsible for recruitment and administering the questionnaires was different from the researcher who analyzed the data, ensuring total secrecy.

The sample group was obtained by convenience and consisted of practitioners of an ECP (CrossFit®), of both sexes. To participate in the study, the volunteers were required to be at least 18 years old, practice the modality for at least a month, with a minimum training frequency of twice a week, and perform their practice in an affiliated CrossFit box. Failure to meet these criteria was considered a non-inclusion criterion, and non-response and/or lack of data in either of the questionnaires applied was also considered an exclusion criterion.

Two research instruments were used. A demographic data questionnaire consisted of questions concerning personal characteristics (gender, age, height, marital status, and education) and the practice of the modality [weekly frequency, time (months), and reasons for the practice]. To assess QoL, the WHOQOL-bref instrument was used, consisting of 26 questions, with two being general and the other 24 subdivided into Physical, Psychological, Social Relations, and Environment domains. The answers to the questions within each domain were given on a Likert-type scale, with higher scores being indicative of a better quality of life¹⁰. During the application, it was stressed that the entire questionnaire should be answered considering the last two weeks.

Initial data analysis employed descriptive statistics (mean \pm standard deviation, and absolute and relative frequency, for quantitative and qualitative variables, respectively). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to evaluate data normality. For inferential analysis, the Mann-Whitney and Spearman correlation tests were applied. The significance level adopted was $p < 0.05$. The software used for the analyses was IBM SPSS v. 22.

RESULTS

Of the 260 practitioners assessed, 69.61% ($n = 155$) were female. Ages ranged from 18 to 60 years, with a mean age of 30.15 ± 6.64 years. The average body weight of the practitioners was 72.31 ± 13.86 kg, the average height was 1.69 ± 0.09 m, and the average body mass index was 25.18 ± 3.63 . The duration of practice of the modality ranged from 1 to 132 months, with an average of 21.85 ± 19.34 months. The average weekly practice frequency was 4.51 ± 1.14 , with 36.15% of the sample practicing the modality five times per week, 21.53% three times, 17.69% four times, and 3.1% twice a week.

Regarding the marital status of the practitioners, 60.76% were single, 36.53% were married/lived with partners, and 2.71% were separated/divorced. In this sample, 38.84% had completed higher education, 25% had completed postgraduate education, 21.53% had higher education in progress, 6.53% postgraduate studies in progress, 5.73% had completed high school, and 2.7% had incomplete high school education.

Among the various reasons for practicing the modality indicated by the practitioners, the most frequent were "conditioning", "weight loss", and "hypertrophy", with "QoL" being the fifth most cited reason. The results regarding the characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1.

For QoL, the highest average score was for the physical domain (79.8 ± 11.76), while the lowest average score was for the environment domain (70.7 ± 12.14).

For the inferential analysis, the reasons for the practice were grouped into physical factors (conditioning, weight loss, hypertrophy,

aesthetics, competition, strengthening, muscle definition, performance, and flexibility/mobility) and non-physical factors (health, quality of life, socialization, well-being, and leisure). Marital status was grouped into union (married/living with partners) and no union (single, separated/

divorced). Schooling was grouped into higher education (incomplete/complete/in progress) and basic education (incomplete/complete/in progress). The results are shown in Table 2.

DISCUSSION

This work aimed to evaluate the associations between QoL and sociodemographic characteristics, motivation, and frequency and time of practice in practitioners of an ECP.

Among the various reasons given for ECP practice, the most frequent were “physical conditioning”, “weight loss”, and “hypertrophy”. Although “weight loss” and “hypertrophy” were among the factors most cited as reasons for practicing, about 65% of the practitioners reported that they accepted a lot, including their appearance.

Studies point to “aesthetics” as one of the main factors for practicing physical activity^{11,12} In this study, the expression “quality of life” appeared in fifth place as a reason for practice, perhaps because of the way that this issue was presented¹³, or because QoL is not yet a term strongly associated with gym activities¹⁴. Nonetheless, QoL is a multidimensional and subjective construct, which makes its definition complex and is related to personal well-being, encompassing aspects such as health status, leisure, personal satisfaction, habits, and lifestyle^{13,15}. Regular physical activity has been shown to provide several benefits for QoL in different age groups^{16–18}

Overall, the results indicated good QoL levels among the practitioners in all domains, with the physical domain having the highest average. The benefits of CrossFit® include physical conditioning, which is fundamental for all other bodily needs, together with others such as stress reduction, increased lean body mass, high self-confidence, and muscle tone⁹, as well as improvements in cardiorespiratory conditions and body composition, since the technique demands several physical valences in a single training session⁹.

The practice of the modality provides benefits that are both physical and psychological. It was shown to increase flexibility and quality of life in general in women, with no difference according

Table 1

Sample characteristics.

	n	%
Reasons for the practice		
Conditioning	132	34.02
Weight loss	74	19.07
Hypertrophy	44	11.34
Health	38	9.8
Quality of life	22	5.67
Socialization	20	5.15
Aesthetics	12	3.09
Well-being	12	3.09
Competition	9	2.31
Muscle definition	9	2.31
Performance	7	1.80
Flexibility/mobility	4	1.03
Leisure	3	0.77
Strengthening	2	0.55
Sex		
Male	105	40.39
Female	155	59.61
Marital status		
Single	159	61.15
Married/living with partner	94	36.15
Separated/divorced	7	2.7
Education		
Complete higher education	102	39.23
Full graduate	65	25
Higher education in progress	41	15.76
Incomplete higher education	14	5.38
Graduation in progress	17	6.53
Complete high school	15	5.76
Incomplete high school	5	1.92
Incomplete basic education	1	0.42
	Mean	SD
Practice time (months)	21.32	18.11
Weekly frequency	4.51	1.14
BMI	25.18	3.63
Age	30.15	6.64
Quality of life		
Physical Domain	79.8	11.76
Social Domain	74.1	15.59
Psychological Domain	73.2	13.67
Environment Domain	70.7	12.14

Table 2

Associations between motivation to practice, sociodemographic characteristics, and quality of life.

	PD		PDS		ED		SRD		
	Mean (SD)	p	Mean (SD)	p	Mean (SD)	p	Mean (SD)	p	
Reasons for practice		0.953		0.645		0.849		0.864	
Physical	79.84 (12.14)		72.96 (13.9)		74.59 (14.55)		70.64 (12.60)		
Non-physical	79.79 (11.19)		73.87 (13.15)		73.61 (17.05)		70.94 (11.35)		
Sex		0.784		0.362		0.927		0.072	
Male	79.42 (12.08)		73.97 (14.29)		74.37 (16.49)		72.33 (11.22)		
Female	80.04 (11.57)		72.69 (13.28)		73.92 (15.01)		69.59 (12.64)		
Marital status		0.544		0.551		0.976		0.548	
No union	80.71 (11.78)		72.66 (14.01)		74.35 (14.98)		70.41 (11.39)		
Union	79.11 (11.76)		74.20 (13.03)		73.92 (15.01)		71.21 (13.42)		
Education		0.433		0.477		0.873		0.628	
Basic	82.15 (11.29)		75.93 (9.96)		75.92 (10.65)		73.09 (11.05)		
Higher	79.62 (11.80)		73.0 (13.89)		73.97 (15.91)		70.52 (12.22)		
		p	r	p	r	p	r	p	
Practice time (months)		0.025*	0.139	0.009*	0.162	0.027*	0.137	0.037*	0.130
Weekly frequency		0.566	0.036	0.073	0.112	0.171	0.085	0.509	0.041
BMI		0.437	0.049	0.973	0.002	0.892	0.008	0.208	0.078
Age		0.070	-0.112	0.800	0.016	0.560	-0.036	0.980	0.002

PD = Physical Domain, PDS = Psychological Domain, SRD = Social Relations Domain, ED = Environment Domains. *Spearman correlation ($p < 0.05$)

to the time of practice of the modality¹⁹. In addition to the physical benefits, CrossFit® also improves the capacity of professionals working in the modality (coaches, physical education professionals) since such ability is related to the physical and psychological domains²⁰.

In the case of the psychological domain, the average score also indicated good QoL, and it could be inferred that this result confirmed that the physical benefits of exercise were reflected in psychological aspects, such as a sense of well-being, with improved self-esteem and self-confidence¹⁴. CrossFit® can be performed collectively, ceasing to be an exhausting activity and instead becoming a pleasant activity, with mutual encouragement among participants, making the modality more attractive.

The environment domain of QoL was the worst evaluated, which could be explained by the fact that it is influenced by other aspects, such as social and economic factors, which go beyond the effects of the physical activity itself. In the WHO-QOL-Bref, this domain considers physical safety

and protection, home environment, financial resources, availability and quality of health and social care, opportunity to acquire new information and skills, recreation/leisure participation and opportunities, and physical environment (pollution, noise, traffic, climate, and transport), among others²¹.

It has been reported that environmental factors such as basic sanitation, public safety, health and social care, pollution, traffic, transportation, and climate negatively impact the QoL of the Brazilian population²¹. Significant correlations between longer practice time and better QoL, in all domains, confirmed the influence of the modality for these variables. Studies reported in the literature have evaluated the effects of CrossFit® training time on body weight, anaerobic resistance, and fatigue index in basketball players²², vertical jump capabilities of male fighters²³, vertical jump characteristics of female athletes²⁴, and improvements in heart rate, blood pressure, and body composition of male practitioners²⁵.

No reports concerning effects on QoL were found in the literature consulted. However, it

seems reasonable to suppose that QoL will be directly influenced by improvements in physical conditions such as muscle strength, aerobic resistance, flexibility, and postural balance.

There is an increasing search for physical activity modalities, including ECPs⁹, that offer sporting and functional characteristics and can be practiced every day, providing a range of health benefits⁹.

CrossFit[®], as a strength and conditioning training program, has demonstrated a great capacity for optimization in cardiorespiratory and muscular endurance, strength, flexibility, power, speed, coordination, agility, balance, and precision²². Brazil has the world's second-highest number of boxes dedicated to the sport, after only the United States²⁶. The modality provides an exercise model that aims at improving both health and QoL through the broad development of different physical capacities, favoring the motivation and adherence of its practitioners^{26,27}.

The present study is the first to evaluate the QoL of practitioners of this modality, using a validated self-administered questionnaire¹⁰ with clear and coherent questions that facilitated understanding and responding. The initial data obtained here can be used to assist the development of further investigations designed to measure this variable.

New studies are needed to identify and quantify the relationships existing between the modality and other factors in order to improve knowledge within the scientific and clinical communities, in addition to facilitating the planning of the gyms themselves. Despite the novelty of this study, it has some limitations. The sample was obtained based on convenience, so it could not be considered comprehensive and diverse, with a possible selection bias. In addition, the observational/cross-sectional design of the study prevented the determination of a cause-effect relationship between training results and QoL.

CONCLUSIONS

The practitioners showed good results for QoL, with the highest scores in the physical domain, followed by the social domain, the psychological domain, and finally, the environment

domain. Longer practice time was correlated with higher averages in all QoL domains.

REFERENCES

1. Urzúa Morales A, Julio Toro C, Páez Ramírez D, Sanhueza González J, Caqueo Urizar A. Are there any differences in the assessment of quality of life when children score the importance of what is asked to them? *Archivos Argentinos de Pediatría* 2013;0-0.
2. Urzúa MA. Health related quality of life: Conceptual elements. *Revista Médica de Chile*. 2010;138(3):358-65.
3. Riley AW, Spiel G, Coghil D, Döpfner M, Falissard B, Lorenzo MJ, et al. Factors related to health-related quality of life (HRQoL) among children with ADHD in Europe at entry into treatment. *Eur. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry* 2006;15 Suppl 1:I38-45.
4. Global recommendations on physical activity for health. Geneva: WHO; 2010.
5. Silva RS, Silva I da, Silva RA da, Souza L, Tomasi E. Atividade física e qualidade de vida. *Ciênc. Saúde Coletiva* 2010;15:115-20.
6. Pucci GCMF, Rech CR, Fermino RC, Reis RS. Association between physical activity and quality of life in adults. *Revista de Saúde Pública* 2012;46(1):166-79.
7. Gillen JB, Percival ME, Ludzki A, Tarnopolsky MA, Gibala MJ. Interval training in the fed or fasted state improves body composition and muscle oxidative capacity in overweight women. *Obesity (Silver Spring)* 2013;21(11):2249-55.
8. Tibana RA, de Almeida LM, Frade de Sousa NM, Nascimento D da C, Neto IV de S, de Almeida JA, et al. Two consecutive days of CrossFit training affects pro and anti-inflammatory cytokines and osteoprotegerin without impairments in muscle power. *Frontiers in Physiology* 2016;7:260.
9. Claudino JG, Gabbett TJ, Bourgeois F, Souza H de S, Miranda RC, Mezêncio B, et al. CrossFit overview: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine - Open* 2018;4(1):11.
10. Fleck MP, Louzada S, Xavier M, Chachamovich E, Vieira G, Santos L, et al. Aplicação da versão em português do instrumento abreviado de avaliação da qualidade de vida "WHOQOL-bref". *Revista de Saúde Pública* 2000;34(2):178-83.
11. Monteiro CA, Conde WL, Matsudo SM, Matsudo VR, Bon-senior IM, Lotufo PA. A descriptive epidemiology of leisure-time physical activity in Brazil, 1996-1997. *Revista Panamericana de Salud Publica* 2003;14:246-54.
12. Samulski DM, Noce F. A importância da atividade física para a saúde e qualidade de vida: um estudo entre professores, alunos e funcionários da UFMG. *Revista Brasileira de Atividade Física & Saúde* 2000;5(1):5-21.
13. Minayo MC de S, Hartz ZM de A, Buss PM. Qualidade de vida e saúde: um debate necessário. *Revista Ciência & Saúde Coletiva* 2000;5(1):7-18.

14. Simões CSM, Samulski DM, Simim M, Santiago ML de M. Análise da qualidade de vida de professores e alunos de musculação: um estudo comparativo. *Revista Brasileira de Atividade Física & Saúde* 2011;16(2):107–12.
15. Seidl EMF, Zannon CML da C. Qualidade de vida e saúde: aspectos conceituais e metodológicos. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* 2004;20(2):580–8.
16. Bize R, Johnson JA, Plotnikoff RC. Physical activity level and health-related quality of life in the general adult population: a systematic review. *Preventive Medicine* 2007;45(6):401–15.
17. Shibata A, Oka K, Nakamura Y, Muraoka I. Recommended level of physical activity and health-related quality of life among Japanese adults. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2007;5:64.
18. Wendel-Vos GCW, Schuit AJ, Tijhuis MAR, Kromhout D. Leisure time physical activity and health-related quality of life: cross-sectional and longitudinal associations. *Quality of Life Research* 2004;13(3):667–77.
19. Magalhães L, Neto A, Walsh I, Bertoncetto D. Benefits of extreme fitness programs for women. *REFACS* 2020;8:274–81.
20. Neto A, Magalhães L, Walsh I, Bertoncetto D. Capacity for work and quality of life in Crossfit. *REFACS* 2020;8:242.
21. Gordia AP, Quadros TMB de, Campos W de, Petroski ÉL. Domínio físico da qualidade de vida entre adolescentes: Associação com atividade física e sexo. *Revista de Saúde Pública* 2009;11:50–61.
22. Kartal A, Ergin E. Investigation of the effect of 6-week CrossFit exercises on anaerobic endurance and anaerobic strength in male basketball players. *African Educational Research Journal* 2020;8(1):S62–8.
23. Yüksel O, Gündüz B, Kayhan M. Effect of Crossfit training on jump and strength. *Journal of Education and Training Studies* 2018;7(1):121–4.
24. Zagduren B, Evans GS, Inman C, Stone W, Arnett S, Schafer M, et al. Crossfit vs. circuit-training: Effects of a ten-week training program on aerobic, anaerobic and flexibility indicators. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise* 2015;47(5S):801.
25. Schultz J, Parker A, Curtis D, Daniel J, Huang HH. The physiological and psychological benefits of CrossFit training – a pilot study. *International Journal of Exercise Science: Conference Proceedings* 2016;2(8). Available at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/ijesab/vol2/iss8/14>
26. Dominski FH, Casagrande P de O, Andrade A. O fenômeno CrossFit®: análise sobre o número de boxes no Brasil e no mundo e modelo de treinamento e competição. *RBPFEEX - Revista Brasileira de Prescrição e Fisiologia do Exercício* 2019;13(82):271–81.
27. Amaral RM de S, Oliveira JRR de. Impactos da prática de Crossfit na vida de seus praticantes / Impacts of Crossfit practice in the life of its practitioners. *Revista Saberes Acadêmicos* 2020;4(1):35–41.

Financial statement

Financial support for this work was provided by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior – Brasil (CAPES, Finance Code 001). Master’s scholarships were provided by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). Undergraduate scholarships were provided by Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais (FAPEMIG).

Corresponding Author:
Antônio Ribeiro Neto
antoniorn11@yahoo.com.br

Editor:
Profa. Dra. Ada Clarice Gastaldi

Received: may 18, 2023
Approved: jun 28, 2023
