Supplementary Materials: Looking time results

# Table 1

Results from model comparisons for putty nosed monkeys. The final model is the best fit to the data and was used to make factor-level comparisons.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Fixed effects** | **Comparison** | **Likelihood ratio test** |  |
| M1 | None | n/a | n/a |  |
| M2 | Species (con- v. heterospecific) | M1 | Chisq = 3.051, df = 1, p = 0.081  | **∙** |
| M3\* | Trait (shared v. not shared) | M1 | Chisq = 10.473, df = 1, p = 0.001 | \*\* |
| M4 | Subject sex (male v. female) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M5 | Subject age (numerical) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M6 | Subject origin (captive v. wild) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M7\* | Presentation side (right v. left) | M1 | Chisq = 17.697, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M8 | Eye contact (yes v. no) | M1 | Chisq = 0.185, df = 1, p = 0.667 |  |
| M9 | Familiarity (ordinal: not present < present but not visible < visible) | M1 | Chisq = 3.878, df = 2, p = 0.144 |  |
| M10 | Stimulus sex (male v. female) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M11 | Trial order (categorical: first, second, third) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 2, p = 1 |  |
| M12 | Apparatus pattern (4 categories) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 3, p = 1 |  |
| M13 | ICC profile (5 categories) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| M14\* | Species + trait + presentation side | M1 | Chisq = 31.933, df = 3, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M15 | Trait + presentation side1 | M14 | Chisq = 3.055, df = 1, p = 0.081 | **∙** |
| M16 | Species + presentation side1 | M14\* | Chisq = 11.511, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M17 | Species + trait1 | M14\* | Chisq = 18.065, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Final\* | Trait + presentation side | M1 | Chisq = 28.878, df = 1, p < 0.00 | \*\*\* |

\*Denotes which of the two models was a better fit to the data when the difference was statistically significant.

1Model comparisons test the significance of the factor that was removed from the expanded model (e.g. comparing M15 to M14 tests the significance of species).

# Table 2

Results from model comparisons for mona monkeys. The final model is the best fit to the data and was used to make factor-level comparisons.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **Fixed effects** | **Comparison** | **Likelihood ratio test** |  |
| M1 | None | n/a | n/a |  |
| M2\* | Species (con- v. heterospecific) | M1 | Chisq = 179.640, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M3\* | Trait (shared v. not shared) | M1 | Chisq = 31.621, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M4 | Subject sex (male v. female) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M5 | Subject age (numerical) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M6 | Subject origin (captive v. wild) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M7 | Presentation side (right v. left) | M1 | Chisq = 0.985, df = 1, p = 0.321 |  |
| M8 | Eye contact (yes v. no) | M1 | Chisq = 0.761, df = 1, p = 0.383 |  |
| M9 | Stimulus sex (male v. female) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 1, p = 1 |  |
| M10 | Trial order (categorical: first, second, third) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 2, p = 1 |  |
| M11 | Apparatus pattern (4 categories) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 3, p = 1 |  |
| M12 | ICC profile (4 categories) | M1 | Chisq = 0, df = 3, p = 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| M13\* | Species + trait | M1 | Chisq = 209.100, df = 2, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M14 | Trait1 | M13\* | Chisq =177.480, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M15 | Species1 | M13\* | Chisq = 29.462, df = 1, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |
| M16\* | Species\*trait + species + trait | M13 | Chisq = 8.242, df = 1, p = 0.004 | \*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Final\* | Species\*trait + species + trait | M1 | Chisq = 217.340, df = 3, p < 0.001 | \*\*\* |

\*Denotes which of the two models was a better fit to the data when the difference was statistically significant.

1Model comparisons test the significance of the factor that was removed from the expanded model (e.g. comparing M14 to M13 tests the significance of species).