**L-*MAOA*: β = .08, *p* = .444**

H-*MAOA*: β = .12, *p* = .444

Caucasian Men’s Official Arrests

**L-*MAOA* R2 = .29**

H-*MAOA* R2 = .02

Hostile Attributional Bias at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

Δχ2(1) = 4.71, *p* = .030

**L-*MAOA*: β = –.06, *p* = .632**

H-*MAOA*: β =.28, *p* = .025

Aggressive Response Generation at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

Δχ2(1) = 16.47, *p* < .001

**L-*MAOA*: β = .53, *p* = .002**

H-*MAOA*: β = .06, *p* = .520

*Figure S.1*. Model χ2(1) = .01, *p* = .912; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00 [.00, .15]; SRMR = .004. Path coefficients forCaucasian men with low-activity *MAOA* (L-*MAOA*, *n* = 32) are displayed in bold text above estimates for Caucasian men with high-activity *MAOA* (H-*MAOA*, *n* = 72). A significant chi-square difference test (Δχ2) indicates *MAOA* genotype differences in model fit. Standardized path coefficients and unstandardized *p*-values are shown. Dashed lines indicate nonsignificant coefficients for both groups. Hostile attributional bias and aggressive response generation were correlated with each other only for H-*MAOA* Caucasian men. Hostile attributional bias only predicted L-*MAOA* Caucasian men’s official arrests. The path coefficient from aggressive response generation to official arrests did not differ by *MAOA* genotype, Δχ2(1) = .01, *p* = .919, so one coefficient was estimated for both groups (standardized estimates slightly differ but are statistically equivalent in unstandardized form).

Δχ2(1) = 4.78, *p* = .029

**L-*MAOA*: β = –.06, *p* = .652**

H-*MAOA*: β =.29, *p* = .025

Caucasian Men’s Violent Attitudes at Age 17

**L-*MAOA* R2 = .20**

H-*MAOA* R2 = .05

Hostile Attributional Bias at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

Aggressive Response Generation at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

**L-*MAOA*: β = .14, *p* = .150**

H-*MAOA*: β = .19, *p* = .150

Δχ2(1) = 4.36, *p* = .037

**L-*MAOA*: β = .44, *p* = .031**

H-*MAOA*: β = .06, *p* = .631

*Figure S.2*. Model χ2(1) = .77, *p* = .979; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00 [.00, .35]; SRMR = .031. Path coefficients forCaucasian men with low-activity *MAOA* (L-*MAOA*, *n* = 31) are displayed in bold text above estimates for Caucasian men with high-activity *MAOA* (H-*MAOA*, *n* = 72). A significant chi-square difference test (Δχ2) indicates *MAOA* genotype differences in model fit. Standardized path coefficients and unstandardized *p*-values are shown. Dashed lines indicate nonsignificant coefficients for both groups. Hostile attributional bias and aggressive response generation were correlated with each other only for H-*MAOA* Caucasian men. Aggressive response generation only predicted L-*MAOA* Caucasian men’s violent attitudes. The path coefficient from hostile attributional bias to violent attitudes did not differ by *MAOA* genotype, Δχ2(1) = .95, *p* = .330, so one coefficient was estimated for both groups (standardized estimates slightly differ but are statistically equivalent in unstandardized form).

**L-*MAOA*: β = .25, *p* = .006**

H-*MAOA*: β = .25, *p* = .006

Caucasian Men’s Antisocial Behavior at Ages 20 and 22

**L-*MAOA* R2 = .06**

H-*MAOA* R2 = .06

Hostile Attributional Bias at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

Δχ2(1) = 4.77, *p* = .029

**L-*MAOA*: β = –.06, *p* = .651**

H-*MAOA*: β =.29, *p* = .026

Aggressive Response Generation at Age 10-by-*MAOA* Genotype

**L-*MAOA*: β = .01, *p* = .972**

H-*MAOA*: β = .01, *p* = .972

*Figure S.3*. Model χ2(1) = 1.22, *p* = .544; CFI = 1.00; RMSEA = .00 [.00, .24]; SRMR = .049. Path coefficients forCaucasian men with low-activity *MAOA* (L-*MAOA*, *n* = 32) are displayed in bold text above estimates for Caucasian men with high-activity *MAOA* (H-*MAOA*, *n* = 72). A significant chi-square difference test (Δχ2) indicates *MAOA* genotype differences in model fit. Standardized path coefficients and unstandardized *p*-values are shown. Dashed lines indicate nonsignificant coefficients for both groups. Hostile attributional bias and aggressive response generation were correlated with each other only for H-*MAOA* Caucasian men. There was no *MAOA* genotype difference in the path coefficient from hostile attributional bias to antisocial behavior, Δχ2(1) = .13, *p* = .719, or the path coefficient from aggressive response generation to antisocial behavior, Δχ2(1) = 2.40, *p* = .121, so one coefficient was estimated for both groups for each of these paths.