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1. INTRODUCTION

The belief that sports behavior is a cult 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, & Hahn, 1998) was developed to assess moral (r = .28-.80) and social (r = .70-.77) reasoning. The former is based on the principles of honesty, responsibility, and justice. By applying the defined principles, any abused or confused situations 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.

2. METHODOLOGY

Participants

+ 238 PE students (10th through 12th grades)
+ Mean age = 16.93 ± 1.34
+ 36.6% males and 63.4% females

Instruments

+ 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 solution
  - 5-point Likert scales (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree)
+ Social reasoning scale (mean of 10 items; r=.42).

3. RESULTS

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

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Factor analysis supports original Moral Reasoning scale with most its items, but three, leading on one factor. All items were grouped in one factor with acceptable internal consistency (r=.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 comprising all items is very low (r=.42).

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 underlines mental reasoning, thus task-involvement scale classification.

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 (TS) 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 similar as to what extent they should compromise individual well-being for the sake of the group. Moral Reasoning scale seems promising, and further refinements should be made to improve its factor structure.
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