S1. Items used to assess reactions to the court cases.

Variables	Items
Punitiveness	The offender was sentenced to x. How appropriate do you find this sentence? (1 = Way too mild, 4 = adequate, 7 = Way too harsh)
Severity	How severe was the crime?
Offender condemnation	
Negativity offender	To what extent do you feel anger towards [the offender]? To what extent do you feel disgust towards [the offender]?
Immoral act	To what extent do you consider [the offender's] behavior immoral?
Filthy act	How filthy was the crime?
Immoral person	To what extent do you consider [the offender] to be an immoral person?
Dehumanization	To what extent do you consider that [the offender] lacks self-control, like an animal?
Offender compassion	To what extent do you feel compassion towards [the offender]? To what extent do you feel sympathy towards [the offender]?
Victim compassion	To what extent do you feel compassion towards [the victim]? To what extent do you feel sympathy towards [the victim]?
Victim blame	To what extent do you consider [the victim's] behavior immoral? To what extent do you consider [the victim] to be an immoral person? To what extent do you consider [the victim] to be responsible for what happened?
Consequences for society	To what extent do you consider that society at large risk damage due to crimes like this because people's moral compass and faith in others may be damaged? To what extent do you consider that society at large are risk damage due to crimes like this because people feel afraid and unsafe when they hear about them? To what extent do you consider that society at large risk damage due to crimes like this because the governments limited resources (police, counselors etc.) are used to fight or limit the negative effects of the crimes?
Attributions	
Unfortunate circumstances	The crime was partly due to the offender falling prey to unfortunate circumstances that led to the crime.*
Mental illness	The offender's behavior was probably partly caused by suffering from mental illness.*
Crime of passion	The offender acted spontaneously and in affect.*
Premeditated	The offender had planned the crime in advance.*
Foreseeable consequences	The offender was able to foresee the negative consequences that the crime would result in.*

Note: All items used a 1-7 Likert scale response format. If not reported, the item used a 1 = Not at all to 7 = Extremely label.

* A 1 = "To a very little degree", to 7 = "To an extremely large degree" label was used.

[the offender] = the name of the offender used in the particular court case report. [the victim] = the name of the victim used in the particular court case report.

S2. Mean, standard deviation and Cronbachs alpha for ratings of the offences.

	α	Mean	*SD*
Vandalism			
Punitiveness		5.14	1.31
Crime severity		3.10	1.16
Offender condemnation	.81	2.82	1.10
Offender compassion	.81	2.34	1.42
Victim compassion	.87	4.28	1.69
Consequences society	.82	3.24	1.44
Attribution to uncontrollable factors	.64	3.05	1.06
Murder			
Punitiveness		5.23	1.31
Crime severity		6.80	0.51
Offender condemnation	.74	5.03	1.19
Offender compassion	.78	2.03	1.25
Victim compassion	.82	5.73	1.44
Victim blame	.70	2.93	1.33
Consequences society	.79	4.73	1.59
Attribution to uncontrollable factors	.56	3.81	0.98
Drug offence			
Punitiveness		3.50	1.39
Crime severity		3.84	1.42
Offender condemnation	.83	2.83	1.25
Offender compassion	.86	2.26	1.50
Consequences society	.76	4.06	1.46
Attribution to uncontrollable factors	.64	2.04	0.94
Assault			
Punitiveness		5.27	1.22
Crime severity		5.09	1.07
Offender condemnation	.81	3.95	1.29
Offender compassion	.81	1.46	0.78
Victim compassion	.90	5.29	1.39
Victim blame	.81	1.43	0.82
Consequences society	.86	4.50	1.52
Attribution to uncontrollable factors	.50	3.71	0.85
Overall across offences			
Punitiveness	.41	4.78	0.78
Crime severity	.48	4.71	0.68
Offender condemnation	.89	3.66	0.91
Offender compassion	.79	2.02	0.88
Victim compassion	.76	5.10	1.09
Victim blame	.63	2.18	0.81
Consequences society	.85	4.01	1.12
Attribution to uncontrollable factors	.77	3.15	0.67

Note. All items used a 1-7 Likert scale response format.

Punitiveness is recoded, so that higher scores indicate that the punishment given to the offender was considered too lenient.

S3. Holm-adjusted *p*-values by hypothesis (families defined per hypothesis).

Hypothesis	Test	*p* (raw)	*p* (Holm)
H1a	Humanism – punitiveness (assault)	.007	.056
	Individualizing – severity (assault)	.010	.070
	Humanism – severity (murder)	.020	.120
	Individualizing – severity (murder)	.068	.340
	Humanism – punitiveness (murder)	.275	>.999
	Individualizing – punitiveness (assault)	.306	>.999
	Individualizing – punitiveness (murder)	.317	>.999
	Humanism – severity (assault)	.321	>.999
H1b	Humanism – punitiveness (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – punitiveness (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – severity (drug offense)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – severity (vandalism)	.003	.015
	Humanism – severity (drug offense)	.008	.032
	Humanism – punitiveness (drug offense)	.009	.032
	Individualizing – punitiveness (drug offense)	.049	.098
	Humanism – severity (vandalism)	.092	.098
H1c	Normativism – punitiveness (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Binding – severity (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Binding – severity (drug offense)	< .001	< .001
	Normativism – severity (vandalism)	.003	.015
	Normativism – severity (drug offense)	.115	.460
	Binding – punitiveness (drug offense)	.123	.460
	Binding – punitiveness (vandalism)	.175	.460
	Normativism – punitiveness (drug offense)	.276	.460
H2a	Humanism – compassion (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – compassion (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – condemnation (overall)	.180	.360
	Humanism – condemnation (overall)	.652	.652
H2b	Normativism – condemnation (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Binding – condemnation (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Normativism – compassion (overall)	.017	.034
	Binding – compassion (overall)	.983	.983
H3a	Humanism – victim blame (overall)	.011	.044
	Individualizing – victim compassion (overall)	.086	.258
	Humanism – victim compassion (overall)	.154	.308
	Individualizing – victim blame (overall)	.360	.360
H3b	Normativism – victim blame (overall)	< .001	< .001

Hypothesis	Test	*p* (raw)	*p* (Holm)
	Binding – victim blame (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Binding – victim compassion (overall)	.293	.586
	Normativism – victim compassion (overall)	.836	.836
H4	Binding – consequences (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Binding – consequences (drug offense)	< .001	< .001
	Normativism – consequences (vandalism)	< .001	< .001
	Normativism – consequences (drug offense)	.606	.606
H5a	Humanism – uncontrollable causes (overall)	< .001	< .001
	Individualizing – uncontrollable causes (overall)	< .001	< .001
H5b	Binding – uncontrollable causes (overall)	.071	.142
	Normativism – uncontrollable causes (overall)	.092	.142

S4. Linear mixed model analyses showing interaction effects between offence type and worldviews/moral foundations.

Dependent variable	*F*	df	Df(res)	*p*
Punitiveness				
Humanism × Offence	9.86	3	1179	< .001
Individualizing × Offence	10.44	3	1179	< .001
Normativism × Offence	9.99	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	0.71	3	1179	.545
Crime severity				
Humanism × Offence	5.75	3	1179	< .001
Individualizing × Offence	14.35	3	1179	< .001
Normativism × Offence	6.55	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	8.86	3	1179	< .001
Offender condemnation				
Humanism × Offence	7.22	3	1179	< .001
Individualizing × Offence	13.87	3	1179	< .001
Normativism × Offence	10.24	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	8.97	3	1179	< .001
Offender compassion				
Humanism × Offence	12.11	3	1179	< .001
Individualizing × Offence	9.41	3	1179	< .001
Normativism × Offence	9.26	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	3.78	3	1179	.010
Victim compassion				
Humanism × Offence	4.00	2	786	.019
Individualizing × Offence	2.58	2	786	.076
Normativism × Offence	13.72	2	786	< .001
Binding × Offence	11.91	2	786	< .001
Victim blame				
Humanism × Offence	2.32	1	393	.129
Individualizing × Offence	1.32	1	393	.252
Normativism × Offence	20.79	1	393	< .001
Binding × Offence	12.12	1	393	< .001
Consequences society				
Normativism × Offence	8.59	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	4.44	3	1179	.004
Attr. uncontrollable factors				
Humanism × Offence	6.82	3	1179	< .001
Individualizing × Offence	8.05	3	1179	< .001
Normativism × Offence	10.23	3	1179	< .001
Binding × Offence	3.47	3	1179	.016

Note. Fixed Effects Omnibus Tests. Each line represent a separate linear mixed model analysis. Main effects were included in the models but only the interaction effects are reported here.

Sensitivity power analysis

Because power estimation for linear mixed-effects interaction terms is not directly supported in G*Power, we conducted a sensitivity analysis approximating the design as a repeated-measures ANOVA with one group, four within-person measurements (offence types), and N = 395. Assuming α = .05, power = .80, correlation among repeated measures r = .50, and ε = 1, the minimum detectable effect size was f = 0.059, indicating sensitivity to small effects. This analysis should be interpreted as an approximation of the mixed-model tests.

S5. Correlation between moral foundations, ideology, perceived crime severity and punitiveness.

	Individualizing	Binding	Humanism	Normativism
Individualizing	-	.17**	.56***	-.21***
Binding		-	-.01	.35***
Humanism			-	-.28***
Normativism				-

S6. Descriptive statistics for the wordview and moral foundations scales.

	α	Mean	*SD*
Individualizing	.74	4.55	0.64
Binding	.83	2.80	0.72
Humanism	.82	5.27	0.80
Normativism	.77	4.07	0.76

S7. Vandalism, descriptive statistics.

	α	Mean	SD
Vandalism			
Punitiveness		5.14	1.31
Severity		3.10	1.16
Immoral act		4.29	1.60
Filthy act		2.68	1.47
Immoral person		3.09	1.61
Responsibility		6.53	0.87
Dehumanization		2.82	1.71
Negativity offender	.62	2.03	1.21
Sympathy offender	.81	2.34	1.42
Sympathy victims	.87	4.28	1.69
Negative consequence of crime on society	.82	3.24	1.44
Perceived offender suffering		2.67	1.55
Unfortunate circumstances		2.31	1.61
Mental illness		2.25	1.54
Crime of passion		3.69	1.78
Premeditated		3.76	1.74
Forseeable consequences		5.24	1.65

S8. Murder, descriptive statistics.

	α	Mean	SD
Murder			
Punitiveness		5.23	1.31
Severity		6.80	0.51
Immoral act		6.40	1.13
Filthy act		5.29	1.85
Immoral person		4.61	1.79
Responsibility		6.71	0.69
Dehumanization		5.21	1.77
Negativity offender	.72	4.35	1.83
Sympathy offender	.78	2.03	1.25
Sympathy victim	.82	5.73	1.44
Victim blame	.70	2.93	1.33
Negative consequence of crime on society	.79	4.73	1.59
Perceived offender suffering		4.37	1.99
Unfortunate circumstances		2.77	1.82
Mental illness		2.65	1.75
Crime of passion		5.59	1.42
Premeditated		2.38	1.47
Forseeable consequences		5.57	1.66

S9. Drug offence, descriptive statistics.

	α	Mean	SD
Drug offence			
Punitiveness		3.50	1.39
Severity		3.84	1.42
Immoral act		4.08	1.92
Filthy act		3.44	1.81
Immoral person		3.02	1.71
Responsibility		6.61	0.86
Dehumanization		2.59	1.69
Negativity offender	.76	1.93	1.36
Sympathy offender	.86	2.26	1.50
Negative consequence of crime on society	.76	4.06	1.46
Perceived offender suffering		3.73	1.89
Unfortunate circumstances		2.09	1.55
Mental illness		1.91	1.45
Crime of passion		2.14	1.49
Premeditated		5.92	1.46
Forseeable consequences		6.00	1.40

S10. Assault, descriptive statistics.

	α	Mean	SD
Assault			
Punitiveness		5.27	1.22
Severity		5.09	1.07
Immoral act		5.54	1.46
Filthy act		3.82	1.74
Immoral person		3.83	1.77
Responsibility		6.54	0.80
Dehumanization		4.39	1.90
Negativity offender	.73	3.07	1.71
Sympathy offender	.81	1.46	0.78
Sympathy victim	.82	5.29	1.39
Victim blame	.81	1.42	0.81
Negative consequence of crime on society	.86	4.50	1.52
Perceived offender suffering		2.66	1.59
Unfortunate circumstances		2.05	1.49
Mental illness		1.74	1.19
Crime of passion		5.52	1.39
Premeditated		1.89	1.37
Forseeable consequences		4.90	1.82

S11.

Correlation between Moral Preferences, Worldviews, Punitiveness and Perception of the Criminal Act.

	Humanism	Normativism	Individualizing	Binding	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
Vandalism									
1. Punitiveness	-.20***	.25***	-.26***	.07	-.15**	-.29***	.04	.21***	-.01
2. Severity	-.09	.15**	-.16**	.23***	-.10*	-.17***	.15**	.29***	.12*
3. Immoral act	-.05	.23***	-.13**	.22***	-.11*	-.12*	.15**	.26***	.14**
4. Filthy act	-.08	.18***	-.07	.32***	-.04	-.08	.22***	.27***	.28***
Murder									
1. Punitiveness	-.06	.03	-.05	.00	.03	-.12*	-.04	.02	.02
2. Severity	.12*	-.12*	.09	-.02	.13**	.02	-.05	.01	-.01
3. Immoral act	.15**	-.09	.13*	-.07	.12*	.10*	-.06	-.08	-.03
4. Filthy act	.09	.05	.08	.20***	.11*	.04	.13*	.11*	.23***
Drug offence									
1. Punitiveness	.13**	-.06	.10*	.08	.15**	.03	.09	.04	.07
2. Severity	.13**	-.08	.18***	.19***	.24***	.07	.19***	.14**	.14**
3. Immoral act	.10*	.08	.14**	.22***	.16**	.07	.18***	.22***	.14**
4. Filthy act	.07	.11*	.13*	.31***	.15**	.07	.21***	.27***	.27***
Assault									
1. Punitiveness	-.14**	.14**	-.05	.02	-.03	-.06	-.05	.08	.02
2. Severity	.05	.03	.13*	.04	.17***	.05	-.01	.07	.03
3. Immoral act	.03	.06	.07	.09	.04	.08	.00	.07	.15**
4. Filthy act	.05	.10*	.11*	.18***	.12*	.08	.10	.15**	.19***

Note. Punitiveness was recoded, so that a high score reflects the view that the punishment given to the offender was to lenient.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

S12.

Correlation between Moral preferences, Worldview and Perception of the Offender.

	Humanism	Normativism	Individualizing	Binding	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
Vandalism									
1. Immoral person	-.22***	.35***	-22***	.31***	-.17***	-.21***	.21***	.33***	.21***
2. Responsibility	-.06	.18***	-.11*	.01	-.09	-.09	-.10	.18***	-.06
3. Dehumanization	-.15**	.37***	-.09	.27***	-.05	-.10	.16**	.25***	.24***
Murder									
1. Immoral person	-.04	.11*	.03	.11*	.06	.00	.06	.11*	.11*
2. Responsibility	.11*	-.05	.09	-.13*	.09	.06	-.12*	-.08	-.11*
3. Dehumanization	-.02	.12*	.05	.13**	.11*	-.02	.08	.10*	.14**
Drug offence									
1. Immoral person	-.01	.19***	.11*	.27***	.16**	.03	.23***	.21***	.21***
2. Responsibility	.03	-.03	.00	-.07	-.02	.02	-.12*	.05	-.11*
3. Dehumanization	-.02	.20***	.00	.21***	.04	-.03	.15**	.19***	.17***
Assault									
1. Immoral person	-.10*	.25***	.08	.17***	.08	.06	.10	.16**	.16**
2. Responsibility	-.01	.05	.01	-.03	.03	-.01	-.12*	.05	-.01
3. Dehumanization	-.08	.31***	.01	.17***	.03	-.02	.06	.18***	.16**

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

S13.

Correlation between moral preferences, worldview and attitudes towards the offender and the victim.

	Humanism	Normativism	Individualizing	Binding	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
Vandalism									
1. Negativity offender	-.15**	.25***	-.14**	.25***	-.07	-.17***	.19***	.29***	.14**
2. Sympathy offender	.29***	-.21***	.30***	-.09	.22***	.30***	.00	-.20***	-.02
3. Sympathy victims	-.01	.12*	-.02	.09	.07	-.09	.05	.14**	.03
Murder									
1. Negativity offender	.07	-.02	.14**	.02	.14**	.10*	.00	.01	.04
2. Sympathy offender	-.01	.07	.08	.09	.06	.08	.10	.04	.09
3. Sympathy victim	.16**	-.18***	.11*	-.20***	.14**	.06	-.12*	-.18***	-.18***
4. Victim blame	-.12*	.30***	-.05	.32***	-.04	-.04	.17***	.25***	.35***
Drug offence									
1. Negativity offender	.02	.19***	.08	.26***	.09	.04	.22***	.18***	.23***
2. Sympathy offender	.13*	-.06	.11*	-.01	.08	.11*	.06	-.10	.03
Assault									
1. Negativity offender	.01	.15**	.10*	.07	.10	.07	.02	.03	.12*
2. Sympathy offender	.09	-.14**	.09	.03	.08	.07	.06	-.03	.04
3. Sympathy victim	.02	.02	.10*	-.03	.16**	.02	-.05	-.01	-.03
4. Victim blame	-.06	.08	.03	.20***	.01	.05	.22***	.15**	.14**

S14.
Correlation between moral foundations, ideology, and perceived consequences of the crime and the punishment.

	Humanism	Normativism	Individualizing	Binding	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
Vandalism									
1. Negative consequence of crime on society	-.17***	.28***	-.19***	.24***	-.13*	-.20***	.14**	.30***	.14**
2. Perceived offender suffering	.28***	-.11*	.18***	.04	.13*	.19***	.15**	-.08	.04
Murder									
1. Negative consequence of crime on society	.13*	.03	.10*	.09	.14**	.03	.04	.07	.09
2. Perceived offender suffering	.20***	-.04	.11*	.01	.08	.11*	.07	-.01	-.03
Drug offence									
1. Negative consequence of crime on society	.11*	.03	.14**	.23***	.18***	.06	.18***	.20***	.19***
2. Perceived offender suffering	.00	.18***	-.01	.12*	-.03	.01	.12*	.09	.09
Assault									
1. Negative consequence of crime on society	.07	.09	.12*	.08	.17***	.05	.04	.08	.07

2. Perceived offender suffering	.22***	.03	.14**	.12*	.07	.17***	.19***	.01	.12*

S15.
Correlation between moral foundations, ideology, punitiveness and attributions regarding offender behavior

	Humanism	Normativism	Individualizing	Binding	Care	Fairness	Loyalty	Authority	Purity
Vandalism									
1. Unfortunate circumstances	.22***	-.12*	.27***	.09	.22***	.24***	.12*	-.04	.15**
2. Mental illness	.07	.10*	.10*	-.02	.05	.13**	.01	-.03	-.02
3. Crime of passion	.23***	-.13*	.22***	-.03	.17***	.21***	-.01	-.11*	.06
4. Premeditated	-.20***	.17***	-.13*	.05	-.07	-.15**	.01	.16**	-.05
5. Forseeable consequences	-.15**	.22***	-.19***	.05	-.15**	-.18***	-.01	.17***	-.03
Murder									
1. Unfortunate circumstances	.03	.19***	.12*	.28***	.06	.16**	.21***	.18***	.31***
2. Mental illness	.12*	-.01	.11*	.01	.11*	.09	.04	-.03	.01
3. Crime of passion	.10*	.05	.09	.02	.07	.08	-.01	.00	.06
4. Premeditated	-.07	-.02	.01	.02	.04	-.02	.02	.04	-.01
5. Forseeable consequences	-.14**	.08	-.07	-.08	-.04	-.07	-.08	.00	-.13*
Drug offence									
1. Unfortunate circumstances	.13**	.02	.14**	.15**	.13*	.10*	.13*	.05	.18***
2. Mental illness	.07	-.05	.09	.01	.08	.07	.03	-.04	.04
3. Crime of passion	.08	-.02	.09	.13*	.07	.09	.13*	.01	.17***
4. Premeditated	.04	.00	.03	-.09	.07	-.02	-.10*	-.02	-.10
5. Forseeable consequences	.04	.01	.05	-.01	.07	.02	-.01	-.03	.01

Assault									
1. Unfortunate circumstances	.05	.04	.14**	.20***	.13*	.12*	.20***	.11*	.19***
2. Mental illness	-.02	.11*	.05	.02	.05	.03	.02	.05	-.01
3. Crime of passion	.08	-.04	.06	-.08	.05	.04	-.15**	-.02	-.03
4. Premeditated	-.01	.06	.08	.13*	.08	.06	.13*	.07	.12*
5. Forseeable consequences	-.11*	.10*	-.03	-.02	-.03	-.03	-.01	.02	-.05

S16

Hierarchical Linear Mixed-Effects Model Comparisons for Crime Perception Outcomes

Dependent Variable	LRT χ^2 Model 1	*df*1	LRT χ^2 Model 2	*df*2	$\Delta\chi^2$	*p*	Marginal R^2 M1	Marginal R^2 M2	ΔMarginal R^2
Punitiveness	493.90	8	507.68	12	13.77	.008	.250	.259	.009
Severity	1641.15	8	1658.56	12	17.40	.002	.634	.640	.006
Offender condemnation	1053.13	8	1107.82	12	54.69	<.001	.377	.422	.045
Offender compassion	300.15	8	335.97	12	35.81	<.001	.087	.124	.037
Victim compassion	267.11	7	272.74	11	5.63	.230	.146	.152	.006
Perceived consequences	468.91	8	492.21	12	23.29	<.001	.128	.155	.027
Uncontrollable factors	900.24	8	943.26	12	43.01	<.001	.376	.406	.030

Note. Model 1 includes age, gender, education, justice-system experience, and offence type as fixed effects. Model 2 additionally includes humanism, normativism, individualizing, and binding moral foundations. Models were estimated using maximum likelihood (ML) for comparison purposes. $\Delta\chi^2$ reflects the difference in −2 log likelihood (LRT χ^2) between nested models.

Justice-system experience was coded as 0 (no experience) and 1 (any experience across the four items).

S17

Confirmatory Factor Analysis of MFQ and Worldview Measures

Fit indices for the four-factor CFA model (DWLS estimator)

Fit Index	Value
χ^2	4950.448
df	1704
p	< .001
RMSEA	.070
90% CI RMSEA	[.067, .072]
SRMR	.101
CFI	.641

Latent factor correlations (standardized estimates)

Factors	β	*p*
Individualizing – Binding	.221	< .001
Individualizing – Humanism	.664	< .001
Binding – Normativism	.433	.003
Humanism – Normativism	−.579	.002

Confirmatory factor analysis

To evaluate convergent and discriminant validity, a confirmatory factor analysis specifying four correlated latent constructs (Individualizing, Binding, Humanism, and Normativism) was estimated using DWLS with ordered indicators ($N = 395$).

Global fit indices indicated acceptable but not optimal fit. The scaled RMSEA (.070, 90% CI [.067, .072]) fell within conventional thresholds for reasonable fit, whereas incremental fit indices were comparatively low (scaled CFI = .641). The scaled SRMR (.101) was slightly above common cutoffs. Thus, while the model did not demonstrate strong global fit, it was not incompatible with the data.

The latent correlations indicated that the constructs were related but empirically distinguishable. The correlation between Individualizing and Binding was modest ($r = .22$), consistent with discriminant validity between the two moral foundation dimensions. Humanism showed a substantial positive association with Individualizing ($r = .66$), and Normativism was positively associated with Binding ($r = .43$), in line with theoretical expectations. The negative association between Humanism and Normativism ($r = -.57$) further supports conceptual differentiation between these constructs.

Modification indices suggested several item-level cross-loadings, particularly among MFQ indicators across the individualizing and binding dimensions. Some MFQ items also showed potential cross-loadings onto the worldview factors, indicating partial empirical overlap at the item level. Overall, although the four-factor model demonstrated suboptimal global fit, the latent correlations and loading patterns suggest that the constructs are empirically separable, supporting their use as theoretically motivated composite indices in the main analyses.

S18

Comparison of one- and two-factor CFA models of offender condemnation

Offense	Model	*df*	χ^2	CFI	RMSEA	SRMR	Latent *r* (act–person)
Vandalism	One-factor	2	7.982	.992	.087	.023	
Vandalism	Two-factor	1	5.482	.994	.107	.019	.842
Murder	One-factor	2	13.541	.971	.121	.027	
Murder	Two-factor	1	9.811	.978	.150	.022	.845
Drug offense	One-factor	2	18.541	.988	.145	.017	
Drug offense	Two-factor	1	6.031	.996	.113	.009	.879
Assault	One-factor	2	5.062	.996	.062	.010	
Assault	Two-factor	1	4.342	.996	.092	.010	.974

The $\Delta\chi^2$-test indicated that the two-factor model was marginally better for the vandalism ($p = .011$), murder ($p = .005$), and drug offense ($p < .001$) cases, but not the assault case ($p = .40$). Nevertheless, the fit indices indicate that the differences were very small, and the latent correlations between act- and person-focused factors were extremely high across cases.