

Supplemental Online Materials

**Psychopathy and Moral Dilemma Judgment: An Analysis using the Four-Factor Model of
Psychopathy and the CNI Model of Moral Decision-Making**

Dillon M. Luke¹, Craig S. Neumann², & Bertram Gawronski¹

¹University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX

²University of North Texas, Denton, TX

Table S1

Regression estimates and 95% Bayesian credibility intervals obtained from latent-trait Bayesian hierarchical multinomial model.

Predictor	C Parameter		N Parameter		I Parameter	
	β	95% BCI	β	95% BCI	β	95% BCI
SRP-INT	.08	[-.02, .18]	-.25	[-.43, -.07]	-.05	[-.15, .05]
SRP-AFF	-.04	[-.16, .07]	-.44	[-.65, -.23]	-.08	[-.20, .03]
SRP-LIF	.03	[-.06, .12]	.01	[-.16, .18]	.04	[-.05, .14]
SRP-ANT	-.02	[-.17, .13]	-.32	[-.62, -.03]	-.14	[-.28, .01]

Note: SRP = Self-report psychopathy scale score. INT = interpersonal facet. AFF = affective facet. LIF = lifestyle facet. ANT = antisocial facet.

Table S2

Partial correlations (controlling for gender) between psychopathy and moral judgment variables.

Psychopathy	Traditional	<i>C</i> Parameter	<i>N</i> Parameter	<i>I</i> Parameter
SRP	.26***	.08 [†]	-.34***	-.01
SRP-INT	.24***	.09 [†]	-.31***	-.02
SRP-AFF	.24***	.06	-.32***	-.04
SRP-LIF	.14**	.05	-.21***	.03
SRP-ANT	.19***	.06	-.24***	-.02

Note: Traditional = traditional dilemma score. SRP = Self-report psychopathy scale score. INT = interpersonal facet. AFF = affective facet. LIF = lifestyle facet. ANT = antisocial facet. [†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table S3

Zero-order correlations and partial correlations (controlling for gender) between psychopathy and moral judgment variables, with parameters estimated excluding responses to the abduction dilemma.

Psychopathy	Traditional	C Parameter	N Parameter	I Parameter
<i>Zero-order</i>				
SRP	.31***	.07	-.41***	-.09*
SRP-INT	.28***	.08	-.35***	-.08†
SRP-AFF	.29***	.04	-.39***	-.14**
SRP-LIF	.19***	.05	-.27***	-.03
SRP-ANT	.24***	.06	-.30***	-.05
<i>Partial</i>				
SRP	.26***	.09†	-.34***	-.02
SRP-INT	.24***	.09†	-.30***	-.02
SRP-AFF	.24***	.06	-.31***	-.07
SRP-LIF	.15**	.05	-.23***	.01
SRP-ANT	.20***	.08†	-.24***	.01

Note: Traditional = traditional dilemma score. SRP = Self-report psychopathy scale score. INT = interpersonal facet. AFF = affective facet. LIF = lifestyle facet. ANT = antisocial facet. † $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table S4

Multiple regression analyses regressing moral judgment variables on psychopathy facets and gender, with parameters estimated excluding responses to the abduction dilemma.

Predictor	Traditional Score		C parameter		N parameter		I parameter	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	B	95% CI	β	95% CI
SRP-INT	.11 [†]	[-.01, .24]	.07	[-.06, .20]	-.13*	[-.25, -.02]	.01	[-.12, .14]
SRP-AFF	.15*	[.02, .28]	.01	[-.13, .14]	-.18**	[-.30, -.06]	-.11	[-.24, .02]
SRP-LIF	-.01	[-.13, .10]	-.01	[-.13, .11]	-.04	[-.15, .07]	.04	[-.08, .16]
SRP-ANT	.09	[-.02, .20]	.05	[-.07, .17]	-.07	[-.18, .03]	.02	[-.09, .14]
Gender	-.11*	[-.20, -.01]	.07	[-.04, .17]	.21***	[.12, .30]	.18***	[.08, .28]
Adjusted R^2	.11		.00		.21		.04	

Note: [†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. For gender, 1 = male, 2 = female.

Table S5

Zero-order correlations and partial correlations (controlling for gender) between psychopathy and moral judgment variables, with parameters calculated in a linear, non-hierarchical manner using the CAN algorithm (Liu & Liao, 2021).

Psychopathy	Traditional	C Parameter	N Parameter	A Parameter
<i>Zero-order</i>				
SRP	.30***	.04	-.42***	.01
SRP-INT	.28***	.06	-.39***	.01
SRP-AFF	.29***	-.00	-.40***	.01
SRP-LIF	.17***	.05	-.25***	-.04
SRP-ANT	.22***	.03	-.30***	.04
<i>Partial</i>				
SRP	.26***	.08	-.36***	-.02
SRP-INT	.24***	.09 [†]	-.35***	-.01
SRP-AFF	.24***	.03	-.34***	-.01
SRP-LIF	.14**	.06	-.21***	-.06
SRP-ANT	.19***	.06	-.25***	.02

Note: Traditional = traditional dilemma score. SRP = Self-report psychopathy scale score. INT = interpersonal facet. AFF = affective facet. LIF = lifestyle facet. ANT = antisocial facet. [†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table S6

Multiple regression analyses regressing moral judgment variables on psychopathy facets and gender, with parameters calculated in a linear, non-hierarchical manner using the CAN algorithm (Liu & Liao, 2021).

Predictor	Traditional Score		C parameter		N parameter		A parameter	
	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI	β	95% CI
SRP-INT	.14*	[.01, .26]	.09	[-.04, .22]	-.20***	[-.31, -.08]	.00	[-.13, .13]
SRP-AFF	.15*	[.02, .28]	-.05	[-.18, .09]	-.19**	[-.31, -.08]	-.00	[-.14, .13]
SRP-LIF	-.03	[-.14, .09]	.03	[-.09, .15]	.01	[-.09, .12]	-.09	[-.21, .03]
SRP-ANT	.08	[-.04, .19]	.02	[-.10, .14]	-.08	[-.19, .03]	.07	[-.05, .19]
Gender	-.08	[-.18, .02]	.10 [†]	[-.01, .20]	.15**	[.06, .24]	-.06	[-.17, .04]
Adjusted R^2	.10		.00		.21		-.00	

Note: [†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. For gender, 1 = male, 2 = female.

Table S7

Differences in moral dilemma judgment between groups with and without normatively elevated levels of psychopathic traits (i.e., SRP-SF ≥ 70).

	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t</i> -value	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Traditional	Low: 4.40 (2.37) High: 5.62 (2.63)	$t(441) = -3.97, p < .001$	$d = .51$
<i>C</i> Parameter	Low: .27 (.16) High: .25 (.18)	$t(441) = 0.67, p = .503$	$d = -.09$
<i>N</i> Parameter	Low: .60 (.30) High: .33 (.30)	$t(441) = 7.08, p < .001$	$d = -.90$
<i>I</i> Parameter	Low: .69 (.28) High: .65 (.21)	$t(129.65) = 1.31, p = .192$	$d = -.14$