brought to you by TCORE

# The RSBH Value-judgment Inventory: Preliminary Analysis of the Portuguese Version

## Luis Calmeiro<sup>1</sup>, Sharon Stoll<sup>2</sup> and Jennifer Beller<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL, <sup>2</sup>Center for Ethics, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID <sup>3</sup>Washington State University, Pullman, WA

The belief that sports build character has been held across the centuries. However, the scientific scrutiny of these beliefs is only a few decades old.

The RSBH Value-judgment Inventory (RSBH VI; Rudd, Stoll, Beller, & Hahm, 1996) was developed to assess moral ( $\alpha$  = .82-.88) and social ( $\alpha$  = .70-.77) reasoning. The former is based the principles of honesty, responsibility, and justice. By applying the defined principles, any abused or confused situation should be solved within moral standards (see Lumpkin, Stoll & Beller, 2003). The latter is about weighing a social value against a moral value which is more important.

The purpose of this study is to validate the Portuguese version of RSBH Value-judgment Inventory (RSBH VI-P). To investigate for construct validity, it was anticipated that moral reasoning would be negatively associated with ego-involvement, but positively associated with task-involvement.

- 238 PE students (10th through 12th grades)

### \*RSBH Value-judgment Inventory-Portuguese version (RSBH VI-P)

- Translation-back translation method
   Moral Reasoning and Social Reasoning Scales.
   ethical dilemmas, to which subjects indicate the extent of agreement with the presented
  - 5-point Lickert scales (1=strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree)
    Scores can vary between 10 and 50

### ♦ Task and Ego Orientation Sport Questionnaire (TEOSQ; Duda et al., 1994;

Portuguese version [Serpa et al., 1992])

- Task-orientation (mean of 7 items, α= .71)

### Demographic information

Table 1 - Mean, standard deviation and factor loadings (Principal Component Analysis, Varimax rotation) for a) Moral Reasoning and b) Social Reasoning items.

a)	Moral Reasoning				Social Reasoning				
Item									4
16.	2.26 ± 1.07	.80		6.	3.60 ± 1.14	.68			
12.									
19.	$2.69\pm1.68$	.70			$3.50\pm1.19$	.64			
8.							.84		
	$3.05\pm1.28$				$3.84 \pm 0.96$				
13.									
	$3.34 \pm 1.51$				$3.16\pm1.20$				
20.									
18.	3.19 ± 1.16		.61		4.57 ± 0.79				.80
11.									37
Total									

Table 2 - Correlations coefficients between Moral Reasoning Scale and Task- and Egoorientation, gender and sport participation, and results of Univariate Analysis Variance for gender and sport participation.

Moral Reasoning											
			Mean	SD							
Gender	Male	86	25.38	6.08	36.89***		.48***				
Gender	Female	150	31.78	5.63							
Sport Participation	Non-athlete										
Sport I articipation	Athlete	58	26.24	6.70							
Task-orientation											
Ego-orientation							30***				
1 /											



Figure 1 - Moral reasoning scores for males and females according to sport participation.

### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Factor analysis partially supports original Moral Reasoning scale with most its items, but three, loading on one factor. All items were grouped in one factor with acceptable internal consistency ( $\alpha$ = .77). The original structure of Social Reasoning scale was not reproduced, for its items loaded in four different factors. Furthermore, internal consistency of the scale

Moral reasoning was uncorrelated with Task-involvement (cf. Stephens, 2000), but was negatively correlated with Ego-involvement (cf., Kavussanu & Ntoumanis, 2003; Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001; Stephens, 2000). Focusing on comparing to others may undermine moral reasoning. Role of task-involvement needs clarification.

As in Beller et al. (1995), non-athletes (NA) and females have significantly higher moral reasoning scores than athletes and males, respectively. Male NA also score higher than both Individual Sport (IS) and Team Sport (IS) male athletes, while IS male athletes score higher than TS male athletes. Female TS athletes score lower than female NA and IS athletes. Contrary to Beller et al.'s study, female IS athletes score higher than NA.

The Social Reasoning scale needs further development. Social concerns may be more important in current sample, inducing subjects to be unclear as to what extent they should compromise individual well being for the sake of the group. Moral Reasoning scale seems promissory, and further refinements should be made to improve its factor structure.

Kavussanu, M. & Ntoumanis, N. (2003). Participation in Sport and Moral Functioning: Does Ego Orientation Mediate Their Relationship? Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, Vol 25(4), 501-518.

Kavussanu, M. & Roberts, G. (2001). Moral functioning in sport: An achievement goal perspective. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, Vol 23(1), 37-54.

Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S.K. & Beller, J. (2003). Sport Ethics: Applications for fair play. Third edition. New York, NY: MacGraw-Hill.

Beller, J. et al. (1995). The Relationship of Competition and a Christian Liberal Arts Education on Moral Reasoning of College Student Athletes. Paper presented at

the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Portland, OR, March 29.

Stephens, D.E (2000). Predictors of likelihood to aggress in youth soccer: An examination of co-ed and all-girls teams. Journal of Sport Behavior, 23, 311-325.