

The tolerance tendency and sports engagement levels of kick boxers

Authors' Contribution:

- A Study Design
- B Data Collection
- C Statistical Analysis
- D Manuscript Preparation
- E Funds Collection

Gamze Deryahanoğlu ^{1ABCDE}, Ozan Yilmaz ^{2ACD}, Arda Ozturk ^{3ACD}

¹ Faculty of Sport Sciences, Recreation Department, Hitit University, Corum, Turkey

² Institute of Post-graduate Education, Department of Recreation Management, Recreation Management, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Ankara, Turkey

³ Faculty of Sport Sciences, Recreation Department, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey

Received: 09 March 2021; **Accepted:** 22 June 2023; **Published online:** 21 August 2023

AoBID: 14325

Abstract

Background & Study Aim:

Today, sport has become a phenomenon that contains many emotions, especially the feeling of competition, and its importance is increasing day by day. Especially in combat sports, due to their nature that evokes violence, understanding of tolerance and sports engagement reasons are of great importance. In this sense, the aim of our study is knowledge about the tolerance and sports engagement levels of kick boxers.

Material & Methods:

A total of 252 (age = 23.78 ±4.61) kick boxing (kickboxing) athletes voluntarily participated in the study. Data collection tools used in the study included the 'Tendency to Tolerance Scale' and the 'Sports Engagement Scale'. In the analysis of the data obtained, Mann-Whitney U Test and Kruskal-Wallis test were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, ver. 22.0.

Results:

According to the gender variable of the participants, the internalization sub-dimension of the sports commitment scale ($p<0.05$), the sub-dimensions of the tolerance tendency scale according to their marital status ($p<0.05$), and the tolerance tendency according to the variable of following the sports news every day in the general scale, value and empathy sub-dimension ($p<0.05$) was found to be a significant difference.

Conclusions:

It can be said that age and sports age do not make a significant difference in kick boxers in terms of tolerance tendency and commitment to sports. As a result of our study, it can be deduced that kick boxing can be done by individuals of all ages.

Keywords:

individual • Sports Engagement Scale • Tendency to Tolerance Scale

Copyright:

© 2023, the Authors. Published by Archives of Budo

Conflict of interest:

Authors have declared that no competing interest exists

Ethical approval:

The study was approved by the local Ethics Committee

Provenance & peer review:

Not commissioned; externally peer-reviewed

Source of support:

Departmental sources

Author's address:

Gamze Deryahanoğlu, Hitit University Faculty of Sport Sciences, Recreation Department, Corum, Turkey; e-mail: gamze_dryhngl@hotmail.com

Kickboxing – noun a form of boxing that involves kicking as well as punching [37].

Sports engagement – noun it is described as continuous and constant experiences in a sporting context, and it encompasses ideas such as faith, effort, energy, and enjoyment [38, 39].

Tolerance Tendency – noun it is a notion that relates to an individual acquiring an understanding attitude toward many things that are not consistent with his own feelings, opinions, and ideals [40].

INTRODUCTION

Individuals are social beings who always have to live in a community, establish relationships with others, assume and perform social roles [1]. Individuals who have become a part of the society they live in have a role which both affects the society and is affected by it [2]. Individuals should have certain values in order to be happy in the society they live in, to continue their existence in a healthy way and to be able to display a peaceful attitude towards each other. One of the most important of these values is tolerance [3-5]. Mutual understanding [6] and tolerance are becoming increasingly more noteworthy in order for individuals with different personality traits not to experience conflict in society and to establish healthy communication.

The concept of tolerance is regarded as one of the most essential human and democratic values especially today and has a universal importance [7, 8]. Individuals who make up the society can establish good relationships with each other through tolerance, so they can live in harmony [9].

Stevens and Charles [10] defined the tolerance as a concept that functions as a balance in interpersonal relationships and helps to realize a peaceful social life by preventing conflicts that may exist in the society. Yilmaz [11] explained the basic principle of tolerance not as forcing others to be just like us, but as offering them the opportunity to be themselves.

In society, the individual should tolerate at least some, if not all, of the things that he hates, disapproves, rejects or dislikes [12, 13]. Tolerance is defined as a whole formed by the combination of putting up with, acceptance and appreciation resulting from politeness [14], and through the values such as human rights, justice, equality and dignity, an increase in the tendency to tolerance can be ensured in the society [15]. Individuals who are in favour of social inequality support intolerance to legitimize and strengthen prejudiced attitudes [16]. Intolerance can take many forms such as malevolence, inconsiderateness, and violence behaviours [17]. Tolerance, on the other hand, requires welcoming differences with appreciation and understanding [2] and is a lofty ideal [18].

In general, the concept of sport has a crucial place in the whole life of a person since it develops

notions such as tolerance, justice, peace, virtue, pleasure and happiness. It can be defined as training and building the human body for competition, and achieving the best performance [19, 20].

Sports, especially today, has been embraced by the society in different ways, and individuals' perspective of and participation in sports have been influential on the society [21, 22]. Desire for success triggered by sports, competition under equal conditions, and respect for opponents help athletes understand the values and act in accordance with those values. It is also important for the society that athletes acquire these values [23, 24]. This situation is only possible with a social structure shaped by tolerance [25, 26].

It can be considered that all behaviours that are not suitable for the competitive environment created by sports are caused by intolerance. According to Mavi and Tuncel [27], in a sports environment where there is no tolerance, the emergence of violence arising from competition will be inevitable. On the other hand, within the atmosphere of tolerance among athletes, negativities will be prevented. Sports engagement and the importance attached to sports in society are actually a reflection of the social structure. Despite the fact that there are few people who have detailed information about kickboxing compared to other branches, kickboxing has become a branch of interest [28].

The aim of our study is knowledge about the tolerance and sports engagement levels of kick boxers.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

In this section, the method of the study is presented. The design used in the study, the population and sample, data collection tools and procedures, the analysis of the data and the statistical techniques are elaborated.

Research design

This study was designed according to survey model, one of the quantitative research methods. Survey models are the research approaches that aim to describe a past or present situation as it is. The case, individual or object that is the subject of the research is tried to be defined in its own conditions and in the way as it is [29].

Participants

The population of the study was comprised of the licensed athletes affiliated with the Kick Boxing Federation in 2019. Not any sampling method was employed in the study since it was aimed to reach the whole population. In this regard, the participants of the study included a total of 252 kick boxers consisting of 140 male and 112 female athletes, who fully filled in the data collection tools and accepted to participate in the study voluntarily. The average age of the participating group was 23.78 ± 4.61 years. The average year of sports experience was 7.42 ± 2.94 years.

Data collection tools

The questionnaire form, which used as a data collection tool in the study, included demographic information that will reveal the personal information of students in a descriptive way in the first part, the Tendency to Tolerance Scale in the second part, and the Sports Engagement Scale in the third part.

Personal Information Form

A personal information form, consisting of five items prepared by the researchers, was used to reveal the personal information of the athletes descriptively.

Tendency to Tolerance Scale

The Tendency to Tolerance Scale developed by Çalışkan and Sağlam [26] and consisted of 18 items and 3 sub-dimensions (value, acceptance, and empathy) was used in the study. It is a five-point likert type scale ('1' strongly disagree, '2' disagree, '3' neither agree nor disagree, '4' agree, '5' strongly agree). Internal consistency coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were found as value = 0.86, acceptance = 0.70 and empathy = 0.63. The higher the score obtained from each sub-dimension in the scale indicates that the student's level of the sub-dimension is high.

Sports Engagement Scale

The Sports Engagement Scale developed by Guillén and Martínez-Alvarado [30] and adapted to Turkish after performing the validity and reliability study by Sırgancı et al. [31] was used. The scale consists of 15 items and three sub-dimensions as 'vigour', 'dedication', and 'absorption'. It is a five-point Likert-type scale ('1' almost

never, '2' rarely, '3' occasionally, '4' frequently, '5' almost always). The Cronbach Alpha reliability of the scale was calculated as 0.79, 0.80, 0.82 and 0.91 for the sub-dimensions of 'vigour', 'dedication', and 'absorption' and the whole scale, respectively. Composite reliability value was 0.89 in the vigour and dedication sub-dimensions, 0.87 in the absorption sub-dimension, and 0.95 in the whole scale. The score that can be obtained from the scale varies between 5 and 75.

Data collection procedure

It was aimed that the athletes participated in the study voluntarily. The data were collected online with the questionnaire from 8 April to 16 June 2020 using the application 'Google Forms' (Google LLC, Mountain View, USA).

Statistical analysis

The analysis of the obtained data was performed in IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, ver. 22.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, USA). Whether the data showed normal distribution or not was analysed with Shapiro-Wilk test, and it was seen that it did not show normal distribution. The statistical findings including arithmetic mean (M), standard deviation (SD or \pm), significance level, probability (p), the simplest approximation for the quantile function (z). Mann-Whitney U was utilized for paired comparisons, and Kruskal Wallis Test was employed for multiple comparisons. Data analysis was evaluated at 95% confidence interval and $p < 0.05$ significance level.

RESULTS

A statistically significant difference was found in the absorption sub-dimension of the Sports Engagement Scale ($p < 0.05$). This difference was determined to be in favour of the males. There is no statistically significant difference in the other sub-dimensions of Sports Engagement Scale and in the sub-dimensions of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale according to the gender variable (Table 1).

A statistically significant difference was found in the value, acceptance, and empathy sub-dimensions of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and in the total scores of Tendency to Tolerance Scale according to the marital status variable ($p < 0.05$). This difference was found to be in favour of married

Table 1. Mann-Whitney U test results regarding Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to gender variable.

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Gender | N | M | SD | z | p |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------|-----|-------|-------|--------|--------------|
| Tendency to Tolerance Scale | value | male | 140 | 39.92 | 4.76 | -1.038 | 0.29 |
| | | female | 112 | 39.66 | 4.21 | | |
| | acceptance | male | 140 | 19.82 | 3.74 | -1.672 | 0.09 |
| | | female | 112 | 19.17 | 3.45 | | |
| | empathy | male | 140 | 17.22 | 2.54 | -0.811 | 0.41 |
| | | female | 112 | 17.58 | 2.07 | | |
| Tendency to Tolerance Total Score | | male | 140 | 76.97 | 9.28 | -0.968 | 0.33 |
| | | female | 112 | 76.42 | 7.66 | | |
| Sports Engagement Scale | vigour | male | 140 | 13.41 | 5.42 | -1.177 | 0.23 |
| | | female | 112 | 14.27 | 5.09 | | |
| | dedication | male | 140 | 13.92 | 5.30 | -0.248 | 0.80 |
| | | female | 112 | 14.04 | 4.75 | | |
| | absorption | male | 140 | 14.92 | 5.73 | -2.010 | 0.04* |
| | | female | 112 | 13.56 | 4.78 | | |
| Sports Engagement Total Score | | male | 140 | 42.27 | 13.60 | -0.347 | 0.72 |
| | | female | 112 | 41.88 | 11.56 | | |

* p<0.05

Table 2. Mann-Whitney U test results regarding the Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to marital status variable.

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Marital status | N | M | SD | z | p |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------|-------|--------|--------------|
| Tendency to Tolerance Scale | value | single | 192 | 39.45 | 4.68 | -2.323 | 0.02* |
| | | married | 60 | 40.96 | 3.77 | | |
| | acceptance | single | 192 | 19.12 | 3.61 | -3.336 | 0.00* |
| | | married | 60 | 20.85 | 3.35 | | |
| | empathy | single | 192 | 17.20 | 2.42 | -2.143 | 0.03* |
| | | married | 60 | 17.96 | 1.99 | | |
| Tendency to Tolerance Total Score | | single | 192 | 75.78 | 8.68 | -3.231 | 0.00* |
| | | married | 60 | 79.78 | 7.55 | | |
| Sports Engagement Scale | vigour | single | 192 | 13.98 | 5.22 | -0.931 | 0.35 |
| | | married | 60 | 13.18 | 5.50 | | |
| | dedication | single | 192 | 14.06 | 5.04 | -0.453 | 0.65 |
| | | married | 60 | 13.70 | 5.14 | | |
| | absorption | single | 192 | 14.12 | 5.30 | -1.097 | 0.27 |
| | | married | 60 | 14.95 | 5.55 | | |
| Sports Engagement Total Score | | single | 192 | 42.18 | 12.61 | -0.277 | 0.78 |
| | | married | 60 | 41.83 | 13.13 | | |

* p<0.05

couples. On the other hand, no statistically significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of the Sports Engagement Scale (Table 2).

No statistically significant difference was found in the Tendency to Tolerance and the Sports Engagement Scales according to the age variable (Table 3).

No statistically significant difference was found in the Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to year of sports experience variable (Table 4).

A statistically significant difference was found in the value and empathy sub-dimensions of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and in the total Tendency to Tolerance score according to the variable of following sports news daily ($p < 0.05$). This difference was determined to be in favour of those who do not follow sports news daily. No statistically significant difference was found in the acceptance sub-dimension of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and in the sub-dimensions of the Sports Engagement Scale (Table 5).

Table 3. Kruskal Wallis test results regarding Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to age variable.

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Age (years) | N | M | SD | Chi-square | p |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|-----|-------|-------|------------|------|
| Tendency to Tolerance Scale | value | 18-24 | 142 | 39.47 | 4.88 | 1.420 | 0.49 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 40.15 | 4.07 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 40.63 | 3.63 | | |
| | acceptance | 18-24 | 142 | 19.14 | 3.73 | 3.841 | 0.14 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 19.95 | 3.28 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 20.40 | 3.99 | | |
| | empathy | 18-24 | 142 | 17.33 | 2.50 | 0.161 | 0.92 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 17.42 | 2.14 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 17.59 | 2.15 | | |
| Tendency to Tolerance Total Score | | 18-24 | 142 | 75.94 | 9.13 | 1.786 | 0.40 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 77.53 | 7.57 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 78.63 | 8.54 | | |
| Sports Engagement Scale | vigour | 18-24 | 142 | 14.28 | 5.15 | 3.233 | 0.19 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 13.06 | 5.48 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 13.54 | 5.23 | | |
| | dedication | 18-24 | 142 | 14.21 | 4.71 | 0.989 | 0.61 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 13.69 | 5.58 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 13.63 | 5.19 | | |
| | absorption | 18-24 | 142 | 14.44 | 5.36 | 0.313 | 0.85 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 14.30 | 5.60 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 13.59 | 4.54 | | |
| Sports Engagement Total Score | | 18-24 | 142 | 42.94 | 11.81 | 1.719 | 0.42 |
| | | 25-30 | 88 | 41.06 | 14.25 | | |
| | | 31-37 | 22 | 40.77 | 11.93 | | |

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis test results regarding Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to year of sports experience variable.

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Sports experience (years) | N | M | SD | Chi-square | p |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|------|
| Tendency to Tolerance Scale | value | 3-8 | 169 | 39.81 | 4.54 | 2.469 | 0.29 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 39.52 | 4.59 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 41.63 | 3.41 | | |
| | acceptance | 3-8 | 169 | 19.47 | 3.56 | 4.174 | 0.12 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 19.33 | 3.81 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 21.72 | 2.57 | | |
| | empathy | 3-8 | 169 | 17.44 | 2.40 | 1.469 | 0.48 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 17.16 | 2.25 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 17.81 | 2.08 | | |
| Tendency to Tolerance Total Score | 3-8 | 169 | 76.74 | 8.63 | 3.826 | 0.14 | |
| | 9-14 | 72 | 76.02 | 8.70 | | | |
| | 15-20 | 11 | 81.18 | 5.91 | | | |
| Sports Engagement Scale | vigour | 3-8 | 169 | 13.82 | 5.10 | 1.157 | 0.56 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 13.55 | 5.59 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 15.00 | 6.34 | | |
| | dedication | 3-8 | 169 | 13.89 | 4.95 | 0.203 | 0.90 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 14.25 | 5.15 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 13.54 | 6.47 | | |
| | absorption | 3-8 | 169 | 14.08 | 5.46 | 1.778 | 0.41 |
| | | 9-14 | 72 | 14.95 | 4.98 | | |
| | | 15-20 | 11 | 13.72 | 6.34 | | |
| Sports Engagement Total Score | 3-8 | 169 | 41.80 | 12.41 | 0.257 | 0.88 | |
| | 9-14 | 72 | 42.76 | 12.99 | | | |
| | 15-20 | 11 | 42.27 | 16.35 | | | |

Table 5. Mann-Whitney U test results regarding the Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales according to the variable of following the sports news daily.

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Do you follow the sports news daily? | N | M | SD | z | p |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|-------|
| Tendency to Tolerance Scale | value | yes | 104 | 38.89 | 5.11 | -2.355 | 0.02* |
| | | no | 148 | 40.45 | 3.94 | | |
| | acceptance | yes | 104 | 19.45 | 3.64 | -0.349 | 0.72 |
| | | no | 148 | 19.59 | 3.61 | | |
| | empathy | yes | 104 | 16.95 | 2.57 | -2.338 | 0.02* |
| | | no | 148 | 17.68 | 2.13 | | |
| Tendency to Tolerance Total Score | yes | 104 | 75.29 | 9.44 | -2.027 | 0.04* | |
| | no | 148 | 77.74 | 7.80 | | | |

| Scale | Sub-dimensions | Do you follow the sports news daily? | N | M | SD | z | p |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|--------|------|
| Sports Engagement Scale | vigour | yes | 104 | 14.17 | 5.53 | -1.132 | 0.25 |
| | | no | 148 | 13.53 | 5.11 | | |
| | dedication | yes | 104 | 14.09 | 5.45 | -0.429 | 0.66 |
| | | no | 148 | 13.89 | 4.78 | | |
| | absorption | yes | 104 | 14.50 | 5.39 | -0.507 | 0.61 |
| | | no | 148 | 14.18 | 5.36 | | |
| Sports Engagement Total Score | yes | 104 | 42.77 | 13.30 | -1.094 | 0.27 | |
| | no | 148 | 41.62 | 12.30 | | | |

* p<0.05

DISCUSSION

In the study carried out, a significant difference was found in the absorption sub-dimension of the Sports Engagement Scales according to the gender variable, and looking at the scores, this difference was observed to be higher in the male athletes ($p<0.05$). When the literature is examined, Ling et al. [32], in their study with Malaysian Racquet Sports Athletes, found a significant difference in the level of sports engagement and this difference was in favour of men. This situation was similar to our study. In their study conducted with swimmers, Larson et al. [33] revealed that young swimmers' sports engagement is directly proportional to their enjoyment of sports and team tradition. Sport is not only the basis of physical and mental health, but also a means of protecting young people who enter life with high hopes from various harmful foreign ideas and habits [34] Pulido et al. [35] in their study conducted to examine young footballers' sports engagement, indicated that the coach's support style was positively related to the footballers' sports engagement.

Additionally, a significant difference was found in favour of married athletes in the Tendency to Tolerance Total Score and in value, acceptance and empathy sub-dimensions of Tendency to Tolerance according to the marital status variable ($p<0.05$). In the study, according to the variable of Following Sports News daily, a significant difference was found in the Tendency to Tolerance Total Score and the Value and Empathy sub-dimensions of Tendency to Tolerance in favour of the athletes who do not follow sports news

($p<0.05$). When we examine the literature, there are not many studies conducted with athletes regarding their tendency to tolerance. However, in a study examining the perceptions of athletes regarding the notion of tolerance in sports, it was perceived by the athletes as different concepts namely fair play and respect for the opponent [27, 36].

As a result, sports today, besides being a magical game that affects and directs societies, is a propaganda tool used by countries against other countries. Although sport is defined as the achievement based on competition, characteristically it also includes features such as respect, acceptance and struggling in the case of difficult situations. In addition, the athletes' acquiring these values approved by the society is a crucial factor for athletes. Actually, this point shows the importance of sports and sport engagement. This study will shed some light on the society by examining athletes' tendencies to tolerance and sports engagements.

CONCLUSIONS

In the study, considering the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and the Sports Engagement Scale according to gender variable a significant difference was found in the absorption sub-dimension scores of the Sports Engagement Scale. Considering the Tendency to Tolerance and Sports Engagement Scales, according to marital status variable there is a significant difference in Tendency to Tolerance Total Score and value, acceptance and empathy

sub-dimensions of the Tendency to Tolerance in favour of married athletes.

In the study, no significant difference was found in both the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and the Sports Engagement Scale according to age variable ($p>0.05$). No significant difference was found in both the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and the

Sports Engagement Scale according to the year of sports experience variable ($p>0.05$).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors express a deep sense of gratitude to all survey participants of the study.

REFERENCES

1. Yetim AA. *Sociology and Sports*. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi; 2019 [in Turkish]
2. Kolaç E. Hacı Bektaş Veli. Value and Tolerance Education in Turkish Lessons With the Philosophy of Yunus, Mevlana and Hacı Bektash. *Türk Kült Hacı Bektaş Veli Arast Derg* 2010; 55: 193-208 [in Turkish]
3. Hotaman D. An Investigation of Pre-Service Teachers' Perceptions of Teacher Personality Characteristics. *Kuramsal Eğitbilim Derg* 2012; 5(2): 186-201 [in Turkish]
4. Miglietta A, Gattino S, Esses VM. What causes prejudice? How may we solve it? Lay beliefs and their relations with classical and modern prejudice and social dominance orientation. *Int J Intercult Relat* 2014; 40: 11-21
5. Piepiora P. Personality profile of individual sports champions. *Brain Behav* 2021; 11(6): e02145
6. Keengwe J. Fostering Cross Cultural Competence in Preservice Teachers Through Multicultural Education Experiences. *Early Child Educ J* 2010; 38(3): 197-204
7. Lintner T. A World of Difference: Teaching Tolerance through Photographs in Elementary School. *Soc Stud* 2005; 96(1): 34-37
8. Witenberg RT. The moral dimension of children's and adolescents' conceptualisation of tolerance to human diversity. *J Moral Educ* 2007; 36(4): 433-451
9. Chongruksa D, Prinyapol P, Wadeng Y et al. Storytelling: program for multicultural understanding and respect among Thai-Buddhist and Thai-Muslim students. *Proc Soc Behav Sci* 2010; 5: 282-288
10. Stevens R, Charles J. Preparing Teachers to Teach Tolerance. *Multicult Perspect* 2005; 7(1): 17-25
11. Yılmaz H. Hz. Tolerance as a principle in the education of the Prophet. *Cumhuriyet Univ İlah Fak Derg* 2004; 8(1): 109-132 [in Turkish]
12. Gibson JL. Enigmas of Intolerance: Fifty Years after Stouffer's Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. *Perspect Polit* 2006; 4(1): 21-34
13. van Doorn M. The nature of tolerance and the social circumstances in which it emerges. *Curr Sociol* 2014; 62(6): 905-927
14. Schwartz B. Tolerance: Should We Approve of It, Put Up with It, or Tolerate It? *Academe* 1996; 82(3): 24-28
15. Goudsblom J. Tolerantie en macht. In: Duyvendak JW, Engbersen G, Teeuwen M, Verhoeven I, editors. *Macht en verantwoordelijkheid: Essays voor Kees Schuyt*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press; 2007: 43-53 [in Dutch]
16. Esses VM, Hodson G. The Role of Lay Perceptions of Ethnic Prejudice in the Maintenance and Perpetuation of Ethnic Bias. *J Soc Issues* 2006; 62(3): 453-468
17. Campbell A. A Creative Arts-Based Approach to Using Children's Rights as a Vehicle for Tolerance Education at the Senior Elementary School Level [PhD dissertation]. Thunder Bay: Faculty of Education, Lakehead University; 2011 [cited 2021 Jan 19]. Available from: URL:https://knowledgecommons.lakeheadu.ca/bitstream/handle/2453/456/CampbellA2012m-1b.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
18. Bullard S, Carnes J, Hofer M et al. *Starting Small: Teaching Tolerance in Preschool and the Early Grades: Complete Text and Video Package for Teachers*. Montgomery: Southern Poverty Law Center; 1997
19. Pehlivan Z. Sport in schools for improving the concept fair-play. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi Spor Bilim Derg* 2004; 2(2): 49-53 [in Turkish]
20. Swartz L, Bantjes J, Rall D et al. "A More Equitable Society": The Politics of Global Fairness in Paralympic Sport. *PLoS ONE* 2016; 11(12): e0167481
21. Kılıçgil E. *Relations of Social Environment and Sport: Theory and An Application Regarding Elite Athletes*. Ankara: Bağırhan Publishing House; 1998 [in Turkish]
22. Spracklen K. *Leisure, Sports & Society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; 2013
23. Simon RL. *Fair Play: The Ethics of Sport*. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press; 2004
24. Coakley J. Assessing the sociology of sport: On cultural sensibilities and the great sport myth. *Int Rev Sociol Sport* 2015; 50(4-5): 402-406
25. Deveci H, Ay TS. Values in daily life according to diaries of primary school students. *Uluslar Sos Araşt Derg* 2009; 2(6): 167-181 [in Turkish]
26. Çalışkan H, Sağlam Hİ. A Study on the Development of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale and an Analysis of the Tendencies of Primary School Students to Tolerance Through Certain Variables. *Educ Sci-Theor Pract* 2012; 12(2): 1440-1446
27. Mavi S, Tuncel SD. Perception of athletes concerning 'Tolerance in Sport' term. *Spormetre Beden Eğitimi Spor Bilim Derg* 2012; 10(4): 125-129 [in Turkish]
28. Deryahanoğlu G, Sari İ, Soyer F. An Investigation on the Relationship between Decision Making, Assertiveness Level and Professional Adequacy of Kick Box Referees. *Int J Sci Cult Sport* 2016; 4(4): 461-473
29. Karasar N. *Scientific research method*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım; 2007 [in Turkish]
30. Guillén F, Martínez-Alvarado JR. The Sport Engagement Scale: An Adaptation of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (UWES) for the Sports Environment. *Univ Psychol* 2014; 13(3): 15-24
31. Sırgancı G, Araç İlgar E, Cihan BB. A Study on Validity and Reliability of "Sports Engagement Scale". *Gençlik Araşt Derg* 2019; 7(17): 182-191
32. Ling A, Teo EW, Chin NS. Sport Commitment among Malaysian Racquet Sports Athletes. *Malays J Med Sci* 2019; 26(4): 86-93
33. Larson HK, Young BW, Reade IL. Exploring high school swimmers' sources of sport commitment. *Int J Sport Psychol* 2018; 49(2): 91-111
34. Rakhimov MF. *Physical Education And Sport As A Social Phenomenon*. Her Pedagog 2022; 2(2): 28-30
35. Pulido JJ, Sánchez-Oliva D, Sánchez-Miguel PA et al. Sport commitment in young soccer players: A self-determination perspective. *Int J Sports Sci Coa* 2018; 13(2): 243-252
36. Tatlısu B, Bayraktar G. Concept of Tolerance in Sport According to Undergraduate Students at the Department of Physical Education and Sport (Bayburt University Example). *Atatürk Üniv Beden Eğitimi Spor Bilim Derg* 2020; 22(1): 44-54 [in Turkish]

37. Dictionary of Sport and Exercise Science. Over 5,000 Terms Clearly Defined. London: A & B Black; 2006
38. Lonsdale C, Hodge K, Jackson SA. Athlete engagement: II. Developmental and initial validation of the Athlete Engagement Questionnaire. *Int J Sport Psychol* 2007; 38(4): 471-492
39. Lonsdale C, Hodge K, Raedeke TD. Athlete engagement: I. A qualitative investigation of relevance and dimensions. *Int J Sport Psychol* 2007; 38(4): 451-470
40. Kaya A. Introduction to Communication: Basic Concepts and Processes. In: Kaya A, editor. *Interpersonal Relationships and Effective Communication*. 5th ed. Ankara: Pegem Akademi; 2013 [in Turkish]

Cite this article as: Deryahanođlu G, Yilmaz O, Ozturk A. The tolerance tendency and sports engagement levels of kick boxers. *Arch Budo* 2023; 19: 327-335