**Regression Analyses, Will, Where We Need to Check on Assumptions**

To consider the possibility that the relationships reported above between (a) defensive egotism and bullying, physical aggression, and social aggression (Table 1), as well as that between (b) self-esteem and victimization and defending the victim might be moderated by gender, we conducted a series of multiple regression analyses in line with the recommendations of Aiken and West (1996) that included gender as a predictor. In each case, we regressed the dependent variable onto the predictor variables, including the interaction term, and explored significant interaction effects for significant simple slopes and for significant simple effects at +1 and -1 standard deviations above and below the means of the relevant scale—either defensive egotism or self-esteem. Except in one case, we report only those analyses that included a significant interaction effect involving gender.

*Gender, defensive egotism, and bullying.* We regressed peer-rated bullying **(Column B in the Excel file, Will)** onto gender **(Column D)**, peer-rated defensive egotism **(Column F)**, and the interaction term **(Column G)**. We found no significant effect for gender, β = -.18, *t* (88) = -1.79, *p* < .08; but significant effects for peer-rated defensive egotism, β = .37, *t* (88) = 3.70, *p* < .0001; and for the interaction term, β = -.22, *t* (88) = -2.4, *p* < .02 (Figure 1). Analysis of the interaction yielded two significant simple effects. At high defensive egotism, boys were rated significantly higher on bullying (*Predicted Value [PV]* = .55) than were girls (*PV* = .25), β = -.42, *t* (88) = -2.73, *p* < .008. The slope for boys at low vs. high defensive egotism (*PV* = .11 vs. *PV* = .55, respectively) was also significant, β = .61, *t* (88) = 4.45, *p* < .0001. This same slope for girls (*PV* = .16 vs. *PV* = .25) was non-significant, β = .12, *t* (88) = .85, *ns*; as was the simple effect at low defensive egotism for boys (*PV* = .11) vs. girls (*PV* = .16), β = .06, *t* (88) = .48, *ns.*

*Gender, defensive egotism, and assists or supports the bully.* When we re-ran the analyses above with peer-rated assists or supports the bully as the dependent variable (**Column H, Will**) (rather than peer-rated bullying), the pattern was almost identical to that in Figure 1, yielding significant effects for gender, β = -.22, *t* (88) = -2.22, *p* < .03; for peer-rated defensive egotism, β = .40, *t* (88) = 4.12, *p* < .0001; and for the interaction term, β = -.18, *t* (88) = -1.94, *p* = .05. Analysis of the interaction yielded two significant simple effects. At high defensive egotism, boys were rated significantly higher on assists/supports the bully (*PV* = .56) than were girls (*PV* = .29), β = -.41, *t* (88) = -2.72, p < .008. The slope for boys at low (*PV* = .17) vs. high (*PV* = .56) defensive egotism was also significant, β = .59, t (88) = 4.43, p < .0001. This same slope for girls (*PV* = .15 vs. *PV* = .29) was non-significant, β = .21, t (88) = 1.45, *p* = .15; as was the simple effect for boys (*PV* = .17) vs. girls (*PV* = .15) at low defensive egotism, β = -.03, t (88) = -.20, *ns.*

*Gender, defensive egotism and social aggression.* We regressed teacher-rated social aggression **(Column I, Will)** onto gender **(Column D)**, teacher-rated defensive egotism **(Column K)**, and the interaction term **(Column L)**, and found significant effects for gender, β = .17, *t* (88) = 2.22, *p* < .03; for teacher-rated defensive egotism, β = .80, *t* (88) = 10.29, *p* < .0001; and for the interaction, β = .18, *t* (88) = 2.43, *p* < .02 (Figure 2). Simple effects tests at high teacher-rated defensive egotism revealed that girls (*PV* = .76) were rated higher in social aggression than boys (*PV* = .49), β = .37, *t* (88) = 2.98, *p* < .004. In contrast, at low teacher-rated defensive egotism, there was no difference between girls (*PV* = .02) and boys (*PV* = .04), β = -.03, *t* (88) = -.29, *ns*. The slope for girls at low vs. high defensive egotism (*PVs* = .02 and .76, respectively) was significant, β = 1.0, *t* (88) = 7.87, *p* < .0001; as was this slope for boys (*PVs* = .04 and .49, respectively), β = .60, *t* (88) = 6.16, *p* < .0001. Thus, although there was a positive association between teacher-rated defensive egotism and social aggression for both boys and girls, at higher levels of defensive egotism, girls were rated higher in social aggression than boys.

*Gender, self-esteem and victim of bullying.*We regressed peer-rated victim of bullying **(Column M)** onto gender **(Column D)**, peer-rated self-esteem **(Column O)**, and the interaction term **(Column P)** and found significant effects for gender, β = -.32, *t* (88) = -3.24, *p* < .002; for peer-rated self-esteem, β = -.36, *t* (88) = -3.7, *p* < .0001; and for the interaction term, β = .25, *t* (88) = 2.68, *p* < .009. Figure 3 indicates that the interaction effect was due almost completely to the high victimization ratings given to boys at low self-esteem, where boys were rated significantly higher (*PV* = .54) than girls (*PV* = .16), β = -.58, *t* (88) = -4.52, *p* < .0001. The only other significant effect in Figure 3 was the simple slope for boys at low self-esteem (*PV* = .54) vs. high self-esteem (*PV* = .13), β = -.63, *t* (88) = -4.63, *p* < .0001. As peer-reported self-esteem increased for boys, peer-rated victimization decreased.

*Gender, self-esteem and defends the victim of bullying.*We regressed peer-rated defends the victim **(Column Q)** onto gender **(Column D)**, peer-rated self-esteem **(Column O)**, and the interaction term **(Column P)** and found two significant effects: for gender, β = .29, *t* (88) = 2.79, *p* < .006; and for peer-rated self-esteem, β = .36, *t* (88) = 3.51, *p* < .001. The interaction was non-significant, β = .09, *t* (88) = .93, *p* > .30 (Figure 4). Girls overall were rated higher by peers in defending the victim (*M* = .73) than were boys (*M* = .58), and regardless of gender, students with higher peer-rated self-esteem tended to defend the victim (*PV* = .76) more than those lower in self-esteem (*PV* = .52).

Figure 1. Peer-rated bullying as a function of gender and peer-rated defensive egotism.

Figure 2. Teacher-rated social aggression as a function of gender and teacher-rated defensive egotism.

Figure 3. Peer-rated victim of bullying as a function of gender and peer-rated self-esteem.

Figure 4. Peer-rated defends the victim of bullying as a function of gender and peer-rated self-esteem.