**Supplement B: Results of CFA’s for Several Six-factor Solutions in Comparison to the Seven-Factor Solution Used in the Study**

Table B1. Fit statistics for six-factor solutions combining highly correlated factors as well as seven-factor solution (model 1b from the manuscript)

| Parameter |  | ST+COM | ST+SC | AC+CP | ST+CP | TS+AC | Model 1b |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| χ2 |  | 1732.547 | 1810.612 | 1766.375 | 1843.443 | 1859.608 | 1633.357 |
| *df* |  | 762 | 762 | 762 | 762 | 762 | 756 |
| χ2/*df* |  | 2.274 | 2.376 | 2.318 | 2.419 | 2.440 | 2.161 |
| *CFI* |  | 0.879 | 0.870 | 0.875 | 0.866 | 0.864 | 0.891 |
| *TLI* |  | 0.864 | 0.853 | 0.859 | 0.848 | 0.846 | 0.876 |
| *SRMR* |  | 0.055 | 0.053 | 0.056 | 0.056 | 0.070 | 0.053 |
| *RMSEA* |  | 0.049 | 0.051 | 0.050 | 0.052 | 0.052 | 0.047 |
| *RMSEA* 90% CI |  | [0.046; 0.052] | [0.048; 0.054] | [0.047; 0.053] | [0.049; 0.055] | [0.049; 0.055] | [0.044; 0.050] |
| *AIC* |  | 77389.355 | 77448.147 | 77431.548 | 77496.063 | 77541.247 | 77271.188 |
| *BIC* |  | 78171.636 | 78230.428 | 78213.830 | 78278.345 | 78323.528 | 18079.118 |
| Comparison to model 1b (χ2 test) |  | 0.000\*\*\* | 0.000\*\*\* | 0.000\*\*\* | 0.000\*\*\* | 0.000\*\*\* | - |
| *r* |  | 0.65 | 0.70 | 0.68 | 0.65 | 0.61 | - |

*Note*. *N* = 531. These analyses were based on the second half of the sample which was used for cross-validation. *r* refers to the correlation of the two respective scales. \*\*\* *p* < .001. \*\*\* indicates that the respective six-factor solution had a poorer fit than model 1b (which represents the seven-factor solution as reported in the manuscript).