

Appendix

Multilevel Model Specification

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ENG}_{ij} &= \beta_{0ij} \text{cons} + \beta_{\text{BW}j} + \beta_{\text{PCA}j} + \beta_{\text{BASEO}2j} + \beta_{\text{READY}ij} + \beta_{\text{EPIO}2ij} + \beta_{\text{MEANO}2ij} \\ &+ \beta_{\text{STILL}ij} + \beta_{\text{PH}2ij} + \beta_{\text{PH}3i} \\ \beta_{0ij} &= \text{constant} + \mu_{0j} + e_{0ij} \end{aligned}$$

Let ENG_{ij} denote the proportion of engagement for the i th feeding episode within the j th dyad. The regression coefficients included a constant together with explanatory variables measured at two levels (β_0, β_{1-n}). These coefficients combined to define the average line across all episodes in all dyads and were considered fixed effects. The model was made multilevel by allowing each dyad's summary line to vary from the average line by an amount μ_{0j} . The i th episode in the j th dyad also varied from its dyad's summary line by an amount e_{0ij} . The random variations between dyads (one μ_{0j} for each dyad) were the dyad level residuals; the random variations between episodes (one e_{0ij} for each episode) were the episode level residuals. Together the residuals constituted the random effects of the model. Residuals were assumed to be normally distributed with a mean of zero.

Model assumptions were assessed by examining the residuals. The residuals were approximately normally distributed, falling between -2.1 and 2.1 and randomly distributed about zero. There were no distinct patterns of variation in the plots. There were no major violations of the assumptions, therefore, the parameter estimates can be considered with confidence.