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Abstract

The aims of this study are to identify the interpersonal value profiles and analyze whether there are differences with respect to behavior and social attitude in a sample made up of 885 Compulsory Secondary Education (ESO) students (14-17 years), of whom 49.8% (n = 441) were males and 50.2% (n = 444) were females. The results show the identification of three different interpersonal value profiles corresponding to different levels of antisocial and criminal behavior. Thus the ARL-BCB (high recognition and leadership – low conformity and benevolence) group had the most antisocial and criminal behavior, low levels of social sensitivity, conformity and helpfulness-collaboration, and high levels of dominance, aggressiveness-stubbornness and apathy-isolation. Points that need to be worked on in preventive intervention of antisocial and criminal behavior of students by improving their social attitudes are highlighted.
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Resumen

Los objetivos de este trabajo son identificar los diferentes perfiles de valores interpersonales y analizar si entre ellos, existen diferencias respecto a la conducta y actitud social. Todo ello, en una muestra formada por 885 alumnos de Educación Secundaria (14 a 17 años), de los cuales, el 49.8% (n = 441) son hombres y el 50.2% (n = 444) mujeres. Los resultados muestran la identificación de tres perfiles de valores interpersonales diferentes, correspondiéndose con diferentes niveles de conductas delictivas y antisociales. Así, el grupo con mayor presencia de ambas conductas, antisociales y delictivas, bajos niveles de sensibilidad social, conformidad y ayuda-collaboración, y altos niveles de dominancia, agresividad-terquedad y apatía-retraimiento es el ARL-BCB (alto reconocimiento y liderazgo – baja conformidad y benevolencia—). Finalmente, se ponen de relieve los aspectos a trabajar en la intervención preventiva de las conductas antisociales y delictivas del alumnado a través de la mejora de las actitudes sociales.
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Introduction

The study of interpersonal values in adolescence is of special interest in the field of Social Sciences (Pertegal, Oliva, & Hernando, 2010), focusing, for example, on analyzing the values that contribute to adolescent social competence (Oliva et al., 2010), on studying the role they acquire in preventing violent behavior (Benson, Scales, Hamilton, & Sesman, 2006), and describing their role in adolescent decision-making (Wallace, Pettite, Scheffler, & Smith, 2006). Interpersonal values are defined as a person’s convinced beliefs with regard to a certain preferential mode of conduct sustained over time (Kornblit, 2003), and are considered the core of a person’s system of attitudes, which persevere and orient behavior toward their goals (Hollander, 1968).

Rockeach (1973) differentiated between final values (with a purpose), and instrumental values (orienting behavior), and Weber (1993) divided the first into personal and social, and the second into moral and competence. Later on, Gordon (1977), in his Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV), discussed six facets: stimulation (perceiving and being treated kindly, considerately, etc.), conformity (following norms), recognition (being recognized by others, admired and thought well of), independence (making one’s own decisions, with own criteria and being free), benevolence (being generosity, helping others), and leadership (exerting authority over other people). Schwartz and Bilsky (1987) suggested that values are universal, and distinguished ten basic types: universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security, power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation and self-direction. On the other hand, Scales and Leffert (1999) suggested that the values that should be taken into account are prosociality, integrity, responsibility, honesty and equality and social justice. More recently, Antolín, Oliva, Pertegal and López-Jiménez (2011), in their scale of values for positive adolescent development, differentiated social commitment, prosociality, hedonism, social recognition, honesty, integrity, justice and equality and responsibility dimensions.

These values are acquired through first experiences in the family context, where the individual shapes his identity and configures a system of primary values (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Lila, 2011). Apart from this, the educational context offers possibilities of interaction with peers for construction of a hierarchy in the value system acquired (Jiménez, Moreno, Murgui, & Musitu, 2008), and it is here where educational programs for adolescent social and moral development become of interest (Pertegal, Oliva, & Hernando, 2010). Attitudes may be defined as a mental and neurophysiological state, the fruit of experience, which influ-
ence the individual and his reaction to objects and situations (Allport, 1935). Attitudes, along with the socio-cognitive skills and strategies a person uses when relating to others, make up what is known as social competence (Trianes, Jiménez, & Muñoz, 1997). Similarly, the social behavior of each individual is the result of the complex interaction of biological, psychological and social factors. There are studies analyzing social behavior and its relationship with variables such as parenting style (Fuentes, García, Gracia, & Alarcón, 2015), age, sex, motivational values and personality (Musitu, Moreno, & Murgui, 2007) and cultural facets (Rodríguez-Hidalgo, Ortega-Ruiz, & Zych, 2014). Behavior, conduct or attitudes influencing social adaptation have also been analyzed, concentrating on such aspects as empathy, interpersonal relations and social anxiety (Degnan, Almas, & Fox, 2010; Delgado, Inglés, & García-Fernández, 2013), differences between men and women (Crapanzano, Frick, Childs, & Terranova, 2011), etc.

Returning to the relationship between attitudes and values noted by Hollander (1968), an example of the connection between interpersonal values and attitudes may be observed in an analysis of the victims of aggression, who acquire a negative view and unfavorable values, such as insecurity and feeling threatened by their surroundings (Sutton & Smith, 1999), becoming timid and anxious (Polo, León, Gómez, Palacios, & Fajardo, 2013), introverted (Oñate & Piñuel, 2005), and socially isolated (Moreno, Vacas & Roa, 2006). Such antisocial behavior (introversion, anxiety, etc.), are negatively related to psychosocial adjustment (Kohlberg, Ricks, & Snarey, 1984). On the contrary, prosocial behavior is what generates positive interpersonal relationships (Gilman & Anderman, 2006). There are gender differences in antisocial behavior (Gámez et al., 2010; Pérez-Fuentes, Gámez, Molero, Mercader, & García-Rubi, 2011), which increase throughout adolescence (Inglés et al., 2009), diminishing in later stages of development as the individual matures and his ability to resist influence by others increases (Monahan, Steinberg, & Cauffman, 2009).

Taking up the idea proposed by Kornblit (2003) about the role of interpersonal values in behavior again, their absence and absence of prosocial behavior, as well as low emotional intelligence are observed to be related to violence in the individual (Inglés et al., 2014; Morales & Trianes, 2012). A variety of different authors and research has shown interest in studying interpersonal values because of their role in preventing violent behavior (Benson et al., 2006), behavior which is in turn related to certain beliefs and attitudes (Romera, Del Rey, & Ortega, 2011). Thus the values of adolescents with antisocial behavior are directed at anti-
social goals and social recognition (López-Romero & Romero, 2010), this last point coinciding with aggressive behavior, which also seeks leadership in their group of peers (Farmer et al., 2010). Garaigordobil et al. (2013) found that groups with less risk of showing antisocial behavior had higher levels of kindness. Low scores in the kindness dimension have also recently been demonstrated to be very closely associated with involvement in episodes of violence (Fossati, Borroni, & Maffei, 2012), and a weak education in values. In general, the results of various studies show that antisocial behavior is associated with less empathy (Garaigordobil, 2005), impulsiveness (Luengo, Sobral, Romero, & Gómez, 2002), being more neurotic and irresponsible (Garaigordobil et al., 2013), highly extroverted and anxious (López & López, 2003), and substance use (Estévez & Emler, 2011; Xue, Zimmerman, & Cunningham, 2009), low social competence (Sorlie, Amlund, & Ogden, 2008), lower emotional intelligence (Fernández-Berrocal & Extremera, 2009), and social hermetism (Garaigordobil, 2005). On the other hand, prosocial behavior is associated with less probability of suffering from anxiety (Delgado, Inglés, & García-Fernández, 2013), more confidence and leadership (Moraleda et al., 1998), cooperative, helpful attitudes (McMahon, Wernsman, & Parnes, 2006), greater success and better academic performance (Inglés, Martínez-González, & García-Fernández, 2013).

Finally, different constructs (interpersonal values, cognitive-social attitudes, antisocial and prosocial behaviors) and their relationships have been analyzed throughout those lines without the profile of individuals with socially appropriate attitudes and behavior becoming clear, or which interpersonal values characterize an attitude or behavior in a certain way. Both facets are proposed in the following study, the goals of which are to identify interpersonal value profiles, and find out whether there any differences in social behavior and attitude among the different interpersonal value profiles found.

**Method**

**Participants**

The sample was taken by random cluster sampling (Inglés et al., 2014) in the different geographic areas of the province of Almería (center, Levante [East] and Poniente [West]) in each of which there were at least three public schools (center 212 students (24%), Levante 333 students (37.6%), and Poniente 340 students (38.4%). At first, the total number of students in the sample was 1055 from 3rd and 4th year of high school (Educación Secundaria Obligatoria-ESO) of which 120 (11.37%) were disqualified for various reasons: not completing the
questionnaires in time or for errors or omissions, and another 50 students (4.74%) were disqualified for not attending one of the two application sessions. The final sample was made up of 885 high school students, of whom 59.8% (n = 441) were male and 50.2% (n = 444) were female, aged 14 to 17 with a mean age of 15.2 (SD = .90) for the total sample and 15.22 (SD = .92) and 15.9 (SD = .89) for males and females, respectively.

Measures

Cuestionario de Actitudes y Estrategias Cognitivo Sociales [Cognitive-Social Attitudes and Strategies Survey] (AECS; Moraleda, González, & García-Gallo, 1998). It has a Social Attitudes structure divided into three factors: asocial, antisocial and prosocial. Each of these factors is in turn made up of subfactors with an adequate Cronbach’s alpha which measure different social attitudes: prosocial [social conformity (α = .62), social sensitivity (α = .78), helpfulness and cooperation (α = .77), security and firmness (α = .61)], prosocial leadership (α = .66); antisocial [dominance (α = .62), aggressiveness-stubbornness (α = .64)], and asocial [apathy-withdrawal (α = .65) and anxiety-timidness (α = .72)]. It uses a Likert-type scale of 1 to 7 to express the level of agreement with the statement.

Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV; Gordon, 1977). Based on 90 items with two answer choices (YES-NO), the test evaluates six areas of an individual’s relationships with others: stimulation, conformity, recognition, independence, benevolence and leadership. It has Cronbach’s alphas of .78 to .89 (Gordon, 1993).

Antisocial and Delinquent Behavior Questionnaire (A-D; Seisdedos, 1995). It is comprised of a total of 40 items which evaluate the frequency of antisocial (going someplace forbidden, littering, etc.) and delinquent (taking drugs, stealing, etc.) behavior. Its reliability and validity are adequate (α = .88), as it was in our sample, with slightly higher total Cronbach’s Alpha (α = .92) as well as on each of the scales: antisocial behavior (α = .90) and delinquent behavior (α = .88).

Procedure

First, meetings were held with the directors and counselors at the different schools selected to explain the purpose of the research and show them the instruments to be used. When the schools had been informed, a meeting was held with the parents, where the researchers responsible were present, and they explained what the study was about and the pertinent consent was acquired for the participation of their children. Then questionnaire application was scheduled in group sessions in the classroom itself or someplace else at the school in two 40-50 minute sessions.
Data analysis

The SPSS 20 computer program was used for statistical analysis. Due to the large sample size, quick cluster analysis was used to identify the interpersonal value profiles of the adolescents, that is, to classify the students in homogeneous groups, (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998; Rodríguez et al., 2014). Thus the profiles were defined based on the combinations of the five interpersonal values assessed by the SIV (Gordon, 1977), where maximization of the inter-cluster differences was the selection criterion for the number of clusters. Furthermore, each of the groups formed from the different interpersonal value profiles were theoretically feasible and psychologically meaningful.

Once the groups had been formed, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to find out the differences among the groups in delinquent and antisocial behavior and on the different social attitude scales. Then the magnitude or effect size of the differences was analyzed using eta squared (η²). In the groups where the differences were statistically significant, post hoc tests were carried out to find out which groups these differences were between. The Scheffe test was used for this because it does not require samples of equal sizes, and in our case, each group was made up of a different number of subjects. And to calculate the magnitude of the differences observed, where any, the effect size was calculated, that is, the standardized mean difference or d (Cohen, 1988), which is interpreted as: d ≤ .50 means a small effect, d ≤ .79 is a medium effect, and when d ≥ .80, the effect is large.

Results

Identification of interpersonal value profiles

The cluster analysis attempted to achieve the most homogeneous groups with the widest intergroup differences possible while maintaining their theoretical fit. The results enabled us to differentiate three groups characterized by different levels of the five interpersonal values analyzed (Figure 1). This three-cluster solution was chosen because it underlines the roles of stimulation, recognition, benevolence and leadership. These groups are: Cluster 1 (AE-BCL) with a total of 288 students (32.5% of the sample) was characterized by high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity. Cluster 2 (ARL-BCB) was comprised of 236 students (26.7% of the sample) and had high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence. Cluster 3 (ACB-RSLI) was comprised of 323 students (36.5% of the sample) who had high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition.
When antisocial and delinquent behavior in each of the groups was analyzed, statistically significant differences were observed for both, depending on the group or cluster. The group with the most antisocial and delinquent behavior was ARL-BCB, which has a profile with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence, with effect sizes varying from \(d = 0.33\) and \(d = 0.4\), which are both small.

Specific ANOVA results for antisocial behavior show the existence of statistically significant differences in the scores of the three groups \(F(2, 844) = 16.59, p < .00, \eta^2 = .04\). When the post hoc comparisons were examined, means were significantly lower in the ACB-RSLI group (profile with high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition) than the ARL-BCB group (profile with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) or the AE-BCL (profile with high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity).
Table 1

Differences in Means in Antisocial and Delinquent Behavior among the Interpersonal Value Profile Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>Scheffé</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antisocial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-BCL (G1)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL-BCB (G2)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>16.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G3)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delinquent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE-BCL (G1)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARL-BCB (G2)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G3)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. AE-BCL (G1) = profile with high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity, ARL-BCB (G2) = Profile with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence, ACB-RSLI (G3) = Profile with high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition.

with small size effects for these differences ($d = 0.35$ and $d = 0.33$, respectively).

The ANOVA again showed the presence of statistically significant differences in the scale that evaluated delinquent behavior ($F_{(2, 844)} = 20.55, p < .00, \eta^2 = .05$). Post hoc comparisons showed that the ARL-BCB group (profile with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) scored significantly higher than the means of the other two groups, AE-BCL (profile with high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity) or the ACB-RSLI group (profile with high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition) with small effect sizes of these differences ($d = 0.4$ and $d = 0.39$, respectively).

**Intergroup differences in social attitudes**

As seen in Table 2, when the differences in the social attitude scales are examined, the prosocial leadership and anxiety-timidity are the only scales where there are no statistically significant differences in clusters or groups. In the rest of the scales, there are significant differences in their mean scores, where the ARL-BCL group, with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence, showed a trend toward antisocial and asocial attitudes on practically all of the scales, with effect sizes ranging from low ($d = 0.1$) to medium ($d = 0.77$).

With respect to the first and second factors, which evaluate social sensitivity and helpfulness-co-
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations, $\eta^2$ and Scheffe Test Values for the Three Groups on Each Social Attitude Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actitud</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$DT$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>Scheffe</th>
<th>$d$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sen</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>44.17</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>40.19</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>31.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>44.66</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>50.64</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>46.28</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>31.34</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>51.82</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>14.82</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sf</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>48.68</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>30.51</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>25.18</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ans</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>22.01</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>22.48</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>AE-BCL (G₁)</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>43.36</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARL-BCB (G₂)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>39.98</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACB-RSLI (G₃)</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>45.03</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sen = Social Sensitivity; Ac = Helpfulness and Cooperation; Lid = Prosocial Leadership; Dom = Dominance; Sf = Security and Firmness in Interaction; Agr = Aggressiveness-Stubbornness; Ap = Apathy-Withdrawal; Ans = Anxiety-Timidity; Con = Social Conformity; AE-BCL (G₁) = Profile with high levels of Stimulation and low Leadership and Conformity; ARL-BCB (G₂) = Profile with high levels of Recognition and Leadership and low Conformity and Benevolence; ACB-RSLI (G₃) = Profile with high levels of Conformity and Benevolence and low Stimulation and Recognition.
operation, ANOVA results show the existence of statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the three groups ($F_{(2, 844)} = 31.44, p < .00, \eta^2 = .07$) and ($F_{(2, 844)} = 31.34, p < .00, \eta^2 = .07$), respectively. When the post hoc comparisons are examined, the scores of the ARL-BCB group (with high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) are observed to be significantly lower than in AE-BCL (high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity) or ACB-RSLI (high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition), with small size effect of these differences for both factors ($d = 0.49$ y $d = 0.48$, respectively).

The differences in the dominance factor observed in the ANOVA, are statistically significant with respect to the mean scores of all three groups ($F_{(2, 844)} = 75.87, p < .00$, $\eta^2 = .15$). In the post hoc comparisons, the ARL-BCB group (high recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) show significantly higher scores than the means of the other two groups, AE-BCL (high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity) or ACB-RSLI (high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition), with a medium effect size for these differences ($d = 0.58$ and $d = 0.57$, respectively).

The ANOVA shows statistically significant differences in the mean scores of all three groups on the security and firmness in interaction scale ($F_{(2, 844)} = 3.01, p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$), but when the post hoc comparisons are examined, the Scheffe test does not show any statistically significant differences among the groups, although the ARL-BCB group had lower mean scores than ACB-RSLI or AE-BCL.

The scale that evaluates aggressiveness-stubbornness, shows statistically significant differences in the means cores of the three groups ($F_{(2, 844)} = 43.65, p < .00$, $\eta^2 = .09$). When the post hoc comparisons are examined, the ARL-BCB group (high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) presents significantly higher scores than the means scores of the other two groups, the AE-BCL (high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity) and ACB-RSLI (high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition), with a medium effect size for these differences ($d = 0.58$ and $d = 0.57$, respectively). These differences are also exist between the two groups with lower scores, AE-BCL and ACB-RSLI, where this last group scored significantly lower, again with a medium effect size for these differences ($d = 0.54$).

There are also statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the three groups ($F_{(2, 844)} = 4.95, p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .01$) on the apathy-withdrawal scale. When post hoc comparisons are examined,
the ARL-BCB group (high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) is found to have significantly higher scores than the mean scores in the AE-BCL group (high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity), and in this case, the effect size of the difference was small ($d = 0.2$).

Finally, the mean scores in three groups on the conformity factor also show statistically significant differences ($F_{(2, 844)} = 30.28, p < .00, \eta^2 = .07$). In the post hoc comparisons, the ARL-BCB group (high levels of recognition and leadership and low conformity and benevolence) shows significantly lower scores than the means of the other two groups, AE-BCL (high levels of stimulation and low leadership and conformity) and ACB-RSLI (high levels of conformity and benevolence and low stimulation and recognition), and the size effects of these differences are small ($d = 0.48$ and $d = 0.47$, respectively). Similarly, there were differences between the two groups with the highest scores, AE-BCL and ACB-RSLI, where this last group’s scores were significantly higher, again with a small effect size ($d = 0.45$).

**Discussion**

In line with some studies relating values to antisocial and delinquent behavior (López-Romero & Romero, 2010), and in response to the first of the goals of this study, each one of the three interpersonal value profiles identified corresponds to different levels of antisocial and delinquent behavior. Thus the presence of both antisocial and delinquent behaviors is more frequent in subjects who exert authority, who are much admired by others, who are not very generous and do not respect the norms. On the contrary, lower levels of antisocial and delinquent behavior are present among generous subjects who respect social norms with scant recognition and consideration by others, respectively.

Values have also been related to behavior (Benson et al., 2006; Oliva et al., 2010; Wallace et al., 2006), but there are few studies which analyze the presence of differences between the subject’s value profile and his behavior or social attitude, which is one of the basic contributions of this study. Analyzing each of the social attitude scales individually, the subjects who exert authority, are much admired by others, are not very generous, and do not respect the norms, show low social sensitivity, conformity and helpfulness-cooperation, but high dominance, aggressiveness-stubbornness and apathy-withdrawal. This profile coincides, as we have seen, with the presence of more antisocial and delinquent behavior, and as in other studies, although evaluated with other instruments, antisocial behavior is related with less empathy (Ga-raigordobil, 2005), more impulsive-
ness (Luengo et al., 2002), more neuroticism, and less kindness and responsibility (Garaigordobil et al., 2013), etc.

It may therefore be affirmed that values have a basic role in prevention of violent behavior (Benson et al., 2006) and the development of socially competent individuals (Oliva et al., 2010). Thus the group with prosocial attitudes (high levels of *social sensitivity, conformity and helpfulness-cooperation, low dominance and aggressiveness-stubbornness*) corresponds to generous subjects who respect social norms, with scant recognition and consideration for others (ACB-RSLI group). In this study, the profiles of prosocial students described in other studies are perfected as individuals who show confidence and leadership (Moraleta et al., 1998), are cooperative and helpful (McMahon et al., 2006), etc.

One of the limitations of this study is that it uses different instruments from other studies, which affects the capacity for its comparison with other previous studies. Nevertheless, this study’s contribution should be highlighted, because it shows the values to be worked on and detected for early and preventive intervention in student behavior (antisocial and delinquent) and social attitudes. Therefore, it is a first approach to interpersonal value profiles and to the analysis of their differences with respect to behavior and social attitudes. We cannot conclude without mentioning that this study, which was purely correlational, was intended to be a basis for proposing new research and integrative theoretical models where such aspects as emotional intelligence could be included.
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