PHILOSOPHICAL TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY B

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Sedentarisation and maternal childcare networks: role of risk-buffering, gender and demography

Journal:	<i>Philosophical Transactions B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSTB-2021-0435.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Page, Abigail; London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, Department of Population Health Migliano, Andrea; University of Zurich, Department of Anthropology Viguier, Sylvain; Graphcore Smith, Daniel; University of Bristol, Bristol Medical School (PHS) Dyble, Mark; University College London, Anthropology Hassan, Anushe; London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Population Health
Issue Code (this should have already been entered and appear below the blue box, but please contact the Editorial Office if it is not present):	WOMEN
Subject:	Behaviour < BIOLOGY, Evolution < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	Hunter-gatherers, Allomothering, Sedentarisation, Risk-buffering, Grandmothering, Gender-roles

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Author-supplied statements

Relevant information will appear here if provided.

Ethics

Does your article include research that required ethical approval or permits?:
Yes

Statement (if applicable):
This research was approved by UCL Ethics Committee (UCL Ethics code 3086/003) and carried out with permission from local government and tribal leaders. Informed consent was obtained from all participants (or for children aged 16 and under permission was received from their mother or father, after group and individual consultation and explanation of the research objectives in the indigenous language, Paranan. A small compensation (usually a thermal bottle or cooking utensils) was given to each participant.

Data

It is a condition of publication that data, code and materials supporting your paper are made publicly available. Does your paper present new data?:
Yes

Statement (if applicable):
The code and the data used in these analyses can be found on OSF (https://osf.io/5cghy/?view_only=c2cb9f7595ac41dbb55a430091560584).

Conflict of interest

I/We declare we have no competing interests

Statement (if applicable):
CUST_STATE_CONFLICT :No data available.

Sedentarisation and maternal childcare networks: role of risk, gender and demography

Abigail E. Page¹, Andrea B. Migliano⁵, Mark Dyble², Daniel Major-Smith³,
Sylvain Viguier⁴ and Anushé Hassan¹

Affiliations: ¹Department of Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; ²Department of Anthropology, University College London; ³Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol; ⁴Graphcore, London; ⁵Department of Anthropology, University of Zürich

Keywords: hunter-gatherers, allomothering, sedentarisation, risk-buffering, grandmothering, gender-roles

Abstract

Women cooperate over multiple domains and while research from western contexts portrays women's networks as limited in size and breadth, women receive help, particularly with childcare, from a diverse range of individuals (allomothers). Nonetheless, little exploration has occurred into why we see such diversity. Wide maternal childcare networks may be a consequence of a lack of resource accumulation in mobile hunter-gatherers –where instead households rely on risk-pooling in informal insurance networks. In contrast, when households settle and accumulate resources, they are able to *retain risk* by absorbing losses. Thus, the size and composition of mothers' childcare networks may depend on risk buffering, as captured by mobile and settled households in the Agta, a Philippine foraging population with diverse lifestyles. Across 78 children, we find that childcare from grandmothers and sisters was higher in settled camps, while childcare from male kin was lower, offering little support for risk buffering. Nonetheless, girls' workloads were increased in settled camps while grandmothers had fewer dependent children, increasing their availability. These results point to gender-specific changes associated with shifting demographics as camps become larger and more settled. Evidently, women's social networks, rather than being constrained by biology, are responsive to the changing socioecological context.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Women are frequently portrayed as having small, focused social networks due to differences in reproductive biology and childcare obligations (see Mattison *et al.* this issue; [1]). However, across time and space, from anthropological, historical and demographic sources, it is evident that a wide range of individuals support women with children[2,3]. There is no one-size-fits-all supporter or ‘allomother’ (any individual other than the mother who invests in a child). Instead, who is found to be important in terms of provisioning[4], childcare[5], child survivorship[6] and women’s fertility outcomes[7], varies. While arguments of gender-based difference in social networks suggest this will be constant across socioecological contexts, it is apparent that women’s social networks are flexible and respond to changes in subsistence and the environment (Mattison *et al.*, Kraft *et al.*, Kramer this issue; [8]). Within a human behavioural ecology paradigm, such trends are expected as the fitness returns to cooperation - for both the mother and the allomother - will be dependent on the local socioecology[9,10]. Yet, little work has explored whether specific hypotheses can successfully predict diversity in allomaternal support. Here, we seek to examine if we can predict who provides childcare by exploring if allomothering varies by different risk buffering strategies present in mobile and settled Agta hunter-gatherers.

Risk buffering

Risk is the probability of loss, losses which negatively impact fitness as they restrict organisms’ ability to survive and reproduce. Consequently, adaptations are expected to evolve to limit these losses[11,12]. Research from diverse disciplines has pointed to the multitude of behavioural adaptations humans use to reduce risk[13–18]. Individuals are able to access a number of mechanisms depending on need and circumstance[19], and specific mechanisms cluster together and strengthen one another[12,20]. Some adaptations seek to *pool* risk by transferring it between households with short-term differences in wealth and resources (similar to insurance), while others seek to absorb or *retain* risk within the household with increased resources (i.e., stored food avoids starvation when harvests fail)[16]. Some types of adaptations actively conflict with one another, suggesting a trade-off between strategies[21,22]. Why households follow certain pathways in the first place is unclear, yet once a shift is made households appear progressively locked into specific adaptation

clusters[18]. In hunter-gatherers risk buffering can be broadly grouped into either: 1) *risk-pooling* alongside residential mobility [21,23,24] or 2) *risk-retention* with sedentarisation and resource accumulation. This theoretical divide between strategies allows us to develop predictions about the composition of maternal childcare networks.

Risk pooling

Reciprocal cooperation has long been understood to reduce the risk of resource shortfalls in unpredictable and variable environments. Acting as a type of social insurance, cooperation can transfer risks - *risk pooling* - between exposure units (individuals and/or households) at a small immediate cost, mitigating the severity of future losses[16,25,26]. In the case of mobile hunter-gatherers, risks are often associated with the daily variance in food returns in a stochastic environment[13,27], in addition to longer-term shortfalls associated with illness, accidents and disability which limit production and caring capabilities[28–30]. Shortages in one domain, such as food provisioning, impact other household domains (e.g. domestic work and/or childcare) as time, and thus energy, is finite[31]Kramer this issue. For instance, mothers may increase foraging efforts if foraging returns are low due to sickness in the household, and thus require substitutive childcare support[23]. There is a wealth of literature in human behavioural ecology about the trade-off between childcare and food production, particularly for women with young children due to the lack of compatibility between childcare and economic work[32,33].

Mothers with infants reduce their investment in food production because of the constraints of breastfeeding and intensive needs of the infant[34–40], a pressure which reduces as children age[35]. Mother's reduction in food production results in shortfalls at the household level[41], which can be addressed by increased production of males[42], food sharing with other households [43,44] or by providing mothers with more childcare support. A number of studies have demonstrated that mothers who receive childcare support are able to increase the time spent in domestic and economic tasks[34,37,45–48]. For instance, Meehan[49] in a detailed study of maternal time allocation in the Aka and Ngandu found that allomothers provided the majority of childcare when the mothers were busy in domestic in food production tasks, targeting their investments. Based on this evidence then, it is reasonably to consider childcare as a *solution* to the viable foraging returns experienced by hunter-

gatherers who are dependent on stochastic resources, and face high rates of ill health and disabilities. Food sharing can never be a perfect solution because there will be times food sharing clusters are unable to address shortfalls if all have been unsuccessful[39]. In this case, childcare frees up the mother, allowing for increased food production, perhaps suggesting why we see such intra-individual variation in foraging returns [36] which are certainly dependent on the household's food acquisition at large[37].

By sharing resources when the household has these resources available (reducing the costs), the household can then reduce their losses later when this help is returned at a time of hardship (increasing the benefits). Therefore, reciprocal cooperation results in direct benefits (i.e., later received help is more valuable[50]) and takes the form of food sharing[27], domestic labour[51] and childrearing[52], as all domains require time and energy to ensure the household needs are met, and cooperation easily moves between these different domains or currencies[33,34,53](Starkweather this issue). For this 'risk-pooling' to function, risk must be uncorrelated between exposure (i.e. households) units, allowing a redistribution of risk within the community[12,17,54]. Therefore, in mobile hunter-gatherer communities who face unpredictable losses, households are expected to have wide and diverse cooperative networks[23] to pool risk outside of the household to overcome the localised risks of foraging shortages, illness and accidents[27,30]. Previous research among the Agta[55] has demonstrated that the effect of reciprocity in childcare was strongest in less related individuals –suggesting their cooperation was dependent on direct benefits. Under a system of risk pooling, we expect distant and non-kin to be more important allomothers in mobile camps – given the required for exposure units to be independent - and they would be more likely to be other mothers engaging in reciprocal childcare. Therefore, as we understand childcare to be a solution to unpredictable shortfalls, it follows that as households move away from foraging the requirement for reciprocity and diverse childcare networks diminishes as it does with food sharing.

Risk retention

Material wealth (i.e. belongings) and food storage are a form of *risk retention* as by increasing resources, households can absorb losses because they have a surplus[16]. Increases in resources then reduce the opportunity for household movement as increasing storage is

associated with increasing permanence of settlements[17,22]. An increase in wealth and storage may further impact risk-pooling as well as mobility[17]. Given the abundance-shortage dynamic of reciprocal cooperation, wealthier individuals may find themselves overburdened by increased obligations to share while rarely requiring help themselves as risks are retained within the household[14,56–58] (but not consistently, see [59]). Individuals with more resources have less need for larger networks, withdrawing from them [57] as the direct benefits from reciprocal cooperation are reduced. Instead, more childcare may originate from household members (father and siblings) and grandparents, who receive indirect benefits of cooperation via inclusive fitness[60]. Schacht, Davis and Kramer[9] have suggested that among the Maya, economic development promotes the nuclearization of the household as more time is spent within the home, reducing relational wealth with wider social networks. There is good evidence that to optimise their entire multiplex social network, the same individuals will be cooperative partners in different domains, particularly if the relationships in some domains are important[61]. Therefore, we expect individuals to cooperate in childcare with the same households who provide food and other resources[62]. This dynamic is demonstrated in Starkweather *et al.* (this issue) investigation into the trade-offs between work and childcare in the Shodgar, in which women who traded together were more likely to provide childcare, increasing the range of helpers they had available to them ensuring they received the assistance required. Therefore, settlement, and its associated increase in material wealth is expected to result in smaller, more kin-focused networks as a result of wider changes to how households deal with risk. Specifically, we anticipate more childcare from close kin in wealthier, settled camps, and accordingly (beyond the father) these individuals are more likely to be pre- or post-reproductive individuals (siblings and grandmothers) who receive indirect benefits of cooperation.

Hypotheses and predictions

Previous research in the Agta has revealed that they have large childcare networks, and while mothers provide a significant proportion of childcare, this decreases with children's age as they are increasingly involved in sibling and playgroup care. Grandparents represent a very small proportion of allomaternal care, due to few being alive and present but their care, like that of playgroups actively substitutes a mother's investment, reducing her workload[48]. Here, using the same in-depth focal follow data on 78 Agta children (aged 0-5.9 years) we test

1
2
3 159 if these maternal childcare networks are related to settlement, exploring whether we can
4
5 160 predict who are important allomothers based on different risk buffering strategies. The Agta
6
7 161 from Palanan, Philippines, follow a mixed subsistence strategy which involves differing
8
9 162 involvement in foraging, wage labour and cultivation [63]. As a result, they demonstrate
10
11 163 significant variation in mobility and wealth accumulation[64], representing opposing risk-
12
13 164 buffering strategies – risk pooling in mobile camps with little material wealth and food storage
14
15 165 and risk retention in settled camps with greater accumulation of resources – which we expect
16
17 166 to influence mother’s childcare networks. Specifically, we predict that 1) in mobile camps
18
19 167 childcare will be reflective of *risk pooling strategy* as distant kin and non-kin (i.e., networks
20
21 168 comprised of independent units) will provide more childcare than in settled camps where 2)
22
23 169 more childcare will originate from the household (father and siblings) and grandparents
24
25 170 (particularly grandmothers), representing a *risk retention strategy*. Therefore, we expect
26
27 171 mother’s childcare networks to be smaller in settled camps and larger in mobile camps
28
29 172 (prediction 3). Further we predicted that 4) in mobile camps other mothers (i.e.,
30
31 173 reproductively active women) will be more involved in childcare, based on direct benefits
32
33 174 received from reciprocity, as compared to settled camps where 5) more childcare will
34
35 175 originate from post- and pre-reproductive allomothers, based on indirect fitness returns. By
36
37 176 exploring what predicts diversity in allomothering, we hope to gain insight into how
38
39 177 allomothering functions, and how women’s social networks are adaptive to major livelihood
40
41 178 transitions, rather than being fixed by reproductive constraints (Mattison *et al.* this issue).
42
43 179

43 180 **Methods**

46 181 The Agta
47
48
49 182 There are around 1,000 Agta living in the Palanan municipality of north-eastern Luzon,
50
51 183 Philippines. Riverine and marine spearfishing provides their primary source of animal protein,
52
53 184 supplemented by hunting and gathering, as well as low-intensity cultivation, wage labour and
54
55 185 trade [63,65]. This variation in subsistence is mirrored in the types of camps the Agta live in,
56
57 186 as some camps are *settled* with permanent structures, are larger and have some form of
58
59 187 infrastructure like a drinking well or church. Other camps are *mobile*, comprised of temporary
60
188 shelters, are smaller in size and the people who reside in these camps change frequently [64].

As previously demonstrated[64], camp type correlates with household wealth and food storage, therefore we use camp type (mobile vs. settled, based on definitions above) as a proxy for the different risk buffering strategies. Further ethnographic detail can be found in the SI methods.

Data collection

Data collection occurred over two field seasons from April-June 2013 and February-October 2014. In the first season we censused 915 Agta individuals (54.7% which were male) across 20 camps, capturing the majority of the population. Following relative aging protocols [66], accurate ages were established for all individuals post data collection. Relatedness was established from reproductive histories (with mothers) and household genealogies (involving both mothers and fathers; see SI methods). In the second season we stayed approximately 10-14 days in ten camps to conduct focal follows with 78 children: 34 children aged 0-1.9 and 44 children aged 2 – 5.9 (Table S3). Two researchers (A.E.P and S.V), observed each focal child for a 9-hour period broken into three 4-hour intervals (6:00 – 10:00, 10:00 – 14:00 and 14:00 – 18:00, with 15-minute breaks each hour) on non-consecutive days. During observations, researchers recorded the activities of the focal child every 20 seconds and who can within three meters of the child and engaged in low or high investment forms of childcare. Low investment activities include touching, proximity watching, supervising, being in a playgroup with a child or talking to a child. High investment activities included feeding, cleaning, holding or carrying, playing or otherwise actively engaging with the focal child (following [67]). Once accurate ages had been produced, allomothers were defined as all individuals aged above 6 years of age. Further information can be found in the SI methods and full protocols are published in[31]. It is important to note that our methodology differs from similar studies as we recorded proximity interactions at 3 meters (as compared to only holding, carrying, touching or arms-length (reviewed in [68])). We focused specifically on a wider range of low-investment behaviours because they constitute an important form for childcare[69,70] and our sample children up to the age of 6 whose care involves less high-investment engagement and more passive supervision. In comparison, previous studies often include focal children up to the age of 3 or 4 (reviewed in [68]), another consideration in terms of cross-cultural comparisons.

We (MD, DS and AEP) also conducted daily camp scans starting between 6:30 and 9:30 and then recorded three more scans at three-hour intervals (see [63]). In each scan, we recorded the current activity of every camp member. When individuals were out of camp, we asked those in camp what the absent individuals were doing and verified this when the individual returned. Time allocation categories of interest here included domestic tasks and out of camp activities (see Table S2). During household interviews we also collected data on household wealth, food stored (the amount of rice stored in the household measured in kg, range 0-14kg) and house permeance. Household wealth is a continuous variable based on a weighted count of the number of objects (see Table S1 for a breakdown) within the household (range 0.18-5.5). Household permeance was a 0-1 scoring system to quantify the type of houses individuals lived in; simple lean-tos were allocated 0, while permanent cement constructions were allocated 1 (range 0-0.88).

Data analysis

Maternal childcare networks

To look at the characteristics of mothers' childcare networks we detailed all the allomothers children interacted with (at least once during focal follows) from the mother's perspective. This created an unweighted network (i.e., a link between two individuals) broken into four key kin categories: distant kin (mother's brother, sisters, nieces and nephews, cousins and aunts and uncles), household (mother's partner and children) and parents/parents-in-law and grandparents (if surviving) and non-kin ($r < 0.0325$). Using the count of individuals within mothers' childcare networks we explored whether the size (separated into low investment and high investment networks) of mothers' childcare networks was predicted by camp settlement using t-tests.

Kinship and reproductive status models

We ran negative binominal (due to overdispersion) mixed-effect models in R version 4.0.3[71] using the *glmmTMB* package[72] to predict the number of interactions between a child and allomother by their kinship relationship, reproductive status and sex, and whether they lived in a settled or mobile camp. Due to the structure of data collection, allomothers are only entered into the models if they were observed investing in a child at least once during the focal follows. Individuals present in camp, but never witnessed to invest in a child were unable

to be included in the models as we did not keep a daily record on who was present in camp to provide this care. Two sets of models were run: 1) kinship models – testing if household care was more common in settled camps and 2) reproductive and sex status models – testing if more care originated from post- and pre-reproductive individuals in settled camps. In the following analyses, childcare by mothers and allomothers has been categorised into low-investment (passive engagement) or high-investment childcare (active engagement). Therefore, each of the two model sets had two outcome variables: i) sum of high-investment interactions and ii) sum of low-investment interactions. This produced a total of four pre-planned models to test our hypothesis, for which full results are presented in the SI results alongside model diagnostics conducted in *DHARMA*[73].

While the majority of children were watched for a total of 1080 observational periods there was some variability. As a result, the models were offset by the total number of interaction periods. All interactions between mothers and children were removed from the dataset. The unit of analysis in the model was the dyadic relationship ($n = 1,522$) between a child ($n = 78$) and allomother ($n = 362$). Random effects captured clustering at the camp ($n = 10$) level, as well as the repeated observations from children and alloparents in different dyads. We originally intended to include household as a random effect, however, we encountered convergence issues. The random effect variance attributed to the child household level was nil, thus its removal had no impact on the model.

We used Directed Acyclic Graphs (DAGs) to illustrate the hypothesised causal relationships between variables and identify confounders to adjust for (see Figures S4-5) using the *dagitty* package[74]. In the kinship analysis we controlled for child age, if the camp was coastal or inland and how many siblings the child had. In the reproductive and sex status models we controlled for the same variables in addition to kinship (captured continuously with r , the coefficient of relatedness) and the sex of the child. In the kinship models, relatedness was from the child's perspective and expressed as a seven-level categorical variable: father, brother, sister, grandmother, grandfather, distant kin ($r \geq 0.03125$ & $r \leq 0.25$, but excluding grandparents as named above) and non-kin ($r < 0.0325$). The reproductive and sex status models were expressed as a six-level categorical variable: boy, girl (aged 6 – 14.9 years), man, woman (aged 15 – 45 years) and post-reproductive man and post-reproductive woman (aged

45 plus years). All models were run with an interaction between the predictor variable and camp status. Camps were defined as either settled ($n_{camp} = 7$, $n_{children} = 60$) or mobile ($n_{camp} = 3$, $n_{children} = 18$); the difference in sample size between the two was a product of visiting more settled camps, who had more inhabitants on average (settled = 56 ± 30 vs. mobile = 38 ± 11).

Post hoc models: grandmaternal care load and gendered activities

To further explore our results from the mixed-effect models, we conducted two post-hoc analyses. Firstly, to explore grandmaternal care load, we ran a Poisson generalised linear model to test whether settlement predicted the number of biological children aged under 11 grandmothers currently had (as reported in birth histories). This model controlled for grandmaternal age ($n = 24$). The second analysis explored the relationship between gender and settlement for juveniles. Here, using camp scan data of daily activities we ran a mixed effects model (clustered by camp) to test if an interaction between age and sex of the child (aged 6 to 15.9 years) predicted the proportion of activities spent in either i) domestic tasks or ii) out of camp activities. These models controlled for child age and whether or not the camp was coastal as daily activities were influenced by if the camp was inland or on the coast ($n = 108$). The code and the data used in these analyses can be found on OSF (https://osf.io/5cghy/?view_only=c2cb9f7595ac41dbb55a430091560584).

Results

Summary statistics, separated by mobile and settled camps, are presented in Table S1. The focal children's age ($t_{(24)} = -0.236$, $p = 0.816$) and sex ($c^2 = 0.189$, $p = 0.663$) did not differ significantly by camp type, nor did number of siblings ($t_{(24)} = -1.488$, $p = 0.146$). However, settled camps were significantly more likely to be found on the coast than inland ($c^2 = 4.622$, $p = 0.032$). As expected, household permanence ($t_{(24)} = -6.763$, $p < 0.001$) and wealth ($t_{(24)} = -3.271$, $p = 0.002$) were higher in settled camps. While the proportion of activities spent in hunting-gathering was higher (mother $t_{(24)} = 1.067$, $p = 0.296$; father $t_{(24)} = 0.433$, $p = 0.669$) and food storage ($t_{(29)} = -0.245$, $p = 0.808$) lower in mobile camps these were not strong results, highlighting less difference between mobile and settled households than expected. The lack of strength between these associations for food storage and hunter-gathering,

contrary to previous findings[64], may reflect the small number of households in mobile camps.

Maternal childcare networks

Our sample is comprised of 50 mothers of 78 children whose low-investment childcare networks, on average, comprised of 25 allomothers (SD = 11.67), ranging from 10 to 65 separate helpers. The high-investment childcare networks were predictably smaller, with on average 9.9 allomothers (SD = 3.8, min = 2, max = 19). Non-kin made up a large proportion of the unweighted links in the childcare network (i.e., if at least one instance of allomothering occurred), accounting for 46.6% (95% CI = 41.40-50.31%) of ties, household members (partner and children) consisted of 10.5% of the network (95% CI 8.3-12.1%) followed by parents and grandparents (including in-laws) (5.0%, 95% CI 3.5-6.3%, Figure 1a). Mothers' childcare networks were predominantly comprised of other reproductively active females (20.7%, 95% CI 18.8-22.1%) and males (19.6%, 95% CI 16.9-22.2%), while post-reproductive individuals had the lowest representation (females = 11.9%, 95% CI 9.9%-13.8% and males = 11.7%, 95% CI 10.0-13.3%, Figure 1b).

We ran two T-tests to test if mothers in mobile camps had larger childcare networks than mothers in settled camps. These tests indicated inconsistent results, contra predictions. For low investment childcare, mothers in settled camps had, on average, significantly larger childcare networks than mobile mothers: 25.4 versus 18.8 (95% CI [-11.2, -2.0.], $p = 0.006$, $t_{(47)} = -2.873$). The size of the childcare network based on high investment activities showed no such difference: 10.2 versus 9.1 (95% CI [-3.2, 1.0], $p = 0.287$, $t_{(47)} = -1.079$).

Kinship, settlement and childcare

Children, on average received 122.5 instances of low investment (SD = 147.4, max = 960.0) and 10.3 instances of high investment (SD = 30.8, min = 0.0, max = 440.0) childcare from any given allomother. Controlling for child's age, number of siblings and whether the camp was inland or coastal, consistent with our predictions, children's grandmothers provided significantly more high investment childcare (Figure 2A) in settled camps as compared to mobile camps (RR = 3.960, 95% CI [1.168, 13.429], $p = 0.027$). Grandmothers in settled camps were predicted to provide 36.1 instances of high investment childcare, compared to 9.1 in

mobile camps. Children’s sisters followed a similar trend, providing more high investment childcare in settled camps (RR = 1.630, 95% CI [0.663, 4.008], $p = 0.287$), however the strength of evidence was weaker. No trends were apparent for grandmothers and sisters in the low investment models. Contra predictions, the children’s fathers and brothers were not found to provide more childcare in settled camps, and in fact were found to be 16.5% and 38.8% less likely, respectively, to provide further care in settled than mobile camps (but non-significantly so).

The low-investment models repeated the trend of male relatives providing less childcare in settled camps as compared to mobile camps, contra predictions. Brothers were predicted to provide 207.3 instances of low investment childcare in settled camps, compared to 329.7 instances in mobile camps (RR = 0.629, 95% CI [0.414, 0.956], $p = 0.030$), an effect which was evidenced, but with less strength, in fathers (RR = 0.778, 95% CI [0.531, 1.140], $p = 0.198$) and grandfathers (RR = 0.704, 95% CI [0.365, 1.355], $p = 0.293$). Furthermore, we witnessed no trends of receiving less childcare from distant and non-kin in settled camps, as predicted.

Reproductive status, settlement and childcare

The reproductive and sex status models highlighted similar gendered differences, offering little support for our hypotheses (Figure 2B). While little variance was apparent in the high-investment models, the low-investment models showed that settled boys were predicted to provide 92.4 instances of childcare, which was significantly less than 124.8 instances in mobile camps (RR = 0.740, 95% CI [0.569, 0.962], $p = 0.025$). In line with the kinship models, adult males were less engaged in childcare in settled camps, however the confidence intervals overlap (RR = 0.791, 95% CI [0.584, 1.070], $p = 0.128$). There was no evidence that reproductively active allomothers provided more care in mobile camps, or pre- or post-reproductive individuals provided more in settled camps, as predicted.

Gender, settlement and daily activities

We conducted a follow-up analysis on the relationship between gender, daily activities and camp type for juveniles aged 6-16 years. These models highlighted that gendered division of labour in the juvenile period differed by camp type, matching the childcare models (Figure 3). In mobile camps the percentage of domestic tasks (out of all daily activities) boys and girls

conducted was broadly similar (boys = 10.9%, 95% CI [6.6, 15.2]; girls = 9.9%, 95% CI [9.9, 18.5], $p = 0.277$). In contrast, in settled camps girls spent 19.8% (95% CI [17.01, 22.64]) of activities in domestic tasks, while boys remained relatively unchanged at 12.2% (95% CI [9.8, 14.7]). Consequently, girls spent significantly more activities in domestic tasks in settled than mobile camps ($B = 5.631$, 95% CI [0.633, 10.629], $p = 0.027$). Out of camp activities highlighted a similar trend. In settled compared to mobile camps, girls were less frequently out of camp ($B = -16.179$, 95% CI [-25.784, -6.610], $p = 0.001$), as well as compared to boys in settled camps ($B = -10.287$, 95% CI [-17.627, -2.929], $p = 0.006$). There was no sex difference in mobile camps.

Grandmothers, settlement and number of dependents

While the sample of grandmothers was small ($n=24$), given their absence in the population at large[31], we nonetheless find significant differences between the number of dependents (children aged 11 years or less) grandmothers have in settled camps (average of 1.0 dependent, $SD = 1.86$) as opposed to mobile camps (2.3 dependents, $SD = 1.66$, $B = -1.059$, 95% CI [-1.541, -0.351], $p = 0.005$).

Discussion

Contra predictions, we find no evidence that settlement in the Agta was associated with alternative risk-buffering strategies in mothers' childcare networks. Specifically, while we find that receiving childcare in settled camps (a proxy for risk retention) was more likely from some closer family members, grandmothers and sisters, it was less likely from others – brothers and fathers. Maternal childcare networks did not become narrower, nor were they more nuclearized[9], with decreased mobility and increased wealth. This suggests that increasing wealth and settlement is not a like-for-like substitute to risk-pooling in this context[59], or at least, this is not captured in childcare networks.

Discussing null results is always challenging as there may be a number of ecological, theoretical and methodological reasons for why our predictions were not supported.. Ecologically, it may be in the Agta that (fishing-focused) food production is not as incompatible with childcare we have assumed - as compatibility depends on the types of

1
2
3 410 economic tasks (see Starkweather *et al.* this issue for discussion) - reducing the need to use
4
5 411 childcare as a solution to food shortfalls. Certainly, in the coastal population women often
6
7 412 engaged in marine foraging in the inter-tidal zones, collecting shrimps, crabs, mollusc and
8
9 413 octopus. Such tasks are more compatible with childcare than other forms of fishing in the
10
11 414 population, and young children were often brought along[75]. Nonetheless, Agta women did
12
13 415 reduce their workload[63] and calories produced[39] when they had young, dependent
14
15 416 children, suggestive of a trade-off. Another, consideration is that whether mothers reduce or
16
17 417 increase their childcare in the face of allomaternal investments is dependent on the
18
19 418 environment; the skills required for childcare and efficient food production and the risk to
20
21 419 children when mothers were absent[37]. Therefore, childcare may not act as a solution to
22
23 420 variability in food production if mothers optimise by increasing childcare. This consideration,
24
25 421 however, seems unlikely because we have previously demonstrated that allomaternal
26
27 422 childcare substitutes maternal care, increasing mothers time in domestic and economic
28
29 423 tasks[48] as documented in other populations [34,45–47].
30
31 424
32 425 Turning to the theoretical issues, another consideration is that cooperative childcare may not
33
34 426 function to risk-pool in the Agta but reflect alternative motivations for cooperation. Here, we
35
36 427 have not explored the gains acquired from cooperation – be those indirect benefits associated
37
38 428 with relatedness, direct benefits associated with reciprocity, or increased returns associated
39
40 429 with mutualist turn-taking. For instance, rather than one woman helping another when her
41
42 430 household has a surplus and the other a shortage (as predicted by risk-pooling), two
43
44 431 households might take-turns in crèching their children, leaving one mother to watch the
45
46 432 children so the other can more efficiently forage. Jaeggi and colleagues[53] found such trends
47
48 433 in the Tsmaine, in which childcare (unlike other domains like food sharing) were exchanged
49
50 434 in-kind, suggestive of turn-taking. In addition, it may not be that risk strategy varies as a
51
52 435 function of sedentarisation (as predicted), but rather childcare networks respond to
53
54 436 environmental risks associated with sedentism. Levels of infectious disease morbidity and
55
56 437 mortality are higher in settled camps[64] which may foster wider cooperative networks
57
58 438 beyond the household and close kin if associated sickness associated losses cannot be
59
60 439 absorbed within the household[29,76]. In the face of high levels of infectious disease,
440 mothers with diverse and independent networks may receive help when most needed[23].
441

Finally, in terms of methodological issues it may be that our study is limited by the consideration of only one cooperative domain. Specifically, reciprocal cooperation has been documented to functions across different domains, or currencies to ensure that households are buffered from shortfalls[53]. As we have not included in our analysis cooperation in food sharing, production and domestic labour we are ignoring the links between the layers in women's multiplex social networks. As argued by Alkisson and colleagues ([61]) this means we risk drawing the wrong conclusions as the cooperation which occurs in one domain can structure another (Starkweather *et al.* this issue). Relatedly, a further issue is that the distinction between mobile and settled camps is not great enough in our sample. Certainly, while there are some differences between settled and mobile camps, the level of wealth accumulation is still relatively minor and residence in settled camps does not preclude residential mobility[64]. Therefore, our measures of risk-buffering strategy may not be adequate as the process of sedentarisation - which is frequently non-linear - may not be far enough along. Further research to explore these considerations and questions is necessary if we are to better understand these null findings.

Overall, mothers in this study had access to diverse social networks and received childcare help from a wide number of related and unrelated individuals, echoing previous findings in the Agta[23,77], and elsewhere[1,78–81]. The wide range of kin and non-kin who provide childcare has now been documented in a number of small-scale societies [40,46,82] across different subsistence types. This suggests that's Hrdy's[83] assertion was well founded, that mothers require large, flexible networks to ensure they receive the help required. Therefore, in line with other contributions to this special issue, women are constrained to small, dyadic networks (Mattison *et al.*, Seabright *et al.*, Kraft *et al.*). Interestingly, the low investment networks were large, comprising of, on average, 25 different allomothers over the course of the three days of observations. Similar studies have found much smaller network sizes, averaging around 11 or 12 allomothers[40,68,82]. This is likely a function of our focus on more 'passive' forms of childcare, in the form of proximity watching, playgroups or supervision at a distance, as well as the inclusion of older children aged up to 6 years, who interact with more people in less labour-intensive ways[48]. In line with this, the Agta's high-investment networks are in line with the cross-cultural literature, with an average of 10 allomothers. It is of particular note, in line with the relative absence of grandmothers in the population at

1
2
3 474 large[31], that post-reproductive individuals were least represented in mothers' childcare
4
5 475 networks. Childcare networks were mainly comprised of pre-reproductive juveniles and
6
7 476 reproductive aged adults, contra cooperative breeding models focused on the post-
8
9 477 reproductive lifespan[84,85]. However, we saw no variation in the reproductive status on
10
11 478 allomothers by camp type as predicted, which suggests the relative importance of direct
12
13 479 (reciprocity) and indirect (kin selection) benefits did not vary by sedentism. Nonetheless, the
14
15 480 role of both grandmothers and siblings appeared to be particularly responsive to degree of
16
17 481 settlement, a potential function of demographic strategies influencing who mothers have
18
19 482 access to as allomothers.
20 483
21 484 Camps did not vary in terms of levels of relatedness (perhaps related to the multilevel nature
22
23 485 of Agta camps, in which more related households form their own clusters in camp[39]), but
24
25 486 there appeared to be changes in grandmothering trends. Our strongest results demonstrated
26
27 487 that levels of grandmaternal care appeared dependent on sedentarisation. Previous research
28
29 488 shows that who cares, or who is available to care, varies by market integration[86], degree of
30
31 489 market access [9] and level of urbanisation[87]. The extent to which certain relatives help (or
32
33 490 not) can be attributed to different levels of competition and/or cooperation within groups;
34
35 491 co-resident or nearby kin can be both competitors as well as provisioners, with chances of
36
37 492 conflict more likely when local resources are limited[88–93]. For instance, among the
38
39 493 horticulturalist Pimbwe population in Tanzania, Hadley[56] found that wealthier women with
40
41 494 larger kin networks suffered excessive demands on their resources, with negative effects on
42
43 495 their children's nutritional status. In the case of the Agta, as settled camps had increased
44
45 496 levels of household wealth and food storage, local resource competition may have been
46
47 497 reduced due to greater resources availability. Furthermore, grandmothers in settled camps
48
49 498 had fewer dependents reducing their own caregiving needs, the degree of reproductive
50
51 499 conflict[31,94,95], potentially increasing 'grand-allomothering'. Previous research has
52
53 500 demonstrated that previously mobile Agta women residing in sedentarised camps
54
55 501 experienced both higher childhood mortality rates (associated with settled camps) and lower
56
57 502 fertility (associated with residential mobility), reducing the number of surviving children[64].
58
59 503 Therefore, the demographic trends associated with the health costs of sedentarisation may
60
504 underpin alterations to allomothering. Research among pre-industrial Finnish populations
505 similarly highlighted the importance of demographics, specifically that older grandmothers

1
2
3 506 were negatively associated with grandchild survival as their ill-health increased reducing their
4
5 507 ability to help[96]. These findings underline the importance of considering both the costs and
6
7 508 benefits of cooperation, and how demographic transitions impact maternal networks[86,97].
8
9 509

10 510 Beyond grandmothering, clear gender-based changes in childcare were apparent in our data.
11
12 511 Specifically, high investment care from sisters appeared increased in settled camps and low
13
14 512 investment care from brothers decreased. As a result, while sisters' and brothers' childcare
15
16 513 did not significantly differ in mobile communities, it did in settled ones. In line with these
17
18 514 findings, our analysis on children's time allocation demonstrated relatively little sex
19
20 515 differentiation in mobile camps, while in settled camps girls conducted significantly more
21
22 516 domestic tasks and were out-of-camp significantly less. Similar findings are apparent
23
24 517 throughout the hunter-gatherer literature[98,99]. For instance, in settled !Kung communities
25
26 518 children's involvement in unskilled tasks increased as did the gendered division of labour.
27
28 519 Girls were more involved in childcare and household tasks, while boys spent more time away
29
30 520 from camp, herding or seeking water or wood[100,101]. Such findings are in line with a wide
31
32 521 range of cross-cultural research[102,103]
33

34 522
35 523 Why gender roles shift so significantly may be a function of the changing nature of household
36
37 524 economy. Agricultural food production is commonly associated with an increasing
38
39 525 workload[63], which frequently fall into the women's domain[101,104] (given compatibility
40
41 526 with childrearing, though the sex division of labour is more fluid in foraging communities
42
43 527 [105]). These tasks are also increasing possible for children with less skill and strength to
44
45 528 complete[94,99,106–108], increasing children's workload[100,109]. Thus, increasing gender
46
47 529 segregation occurs, with downstream effects for children's work. For instance, in a cross-
48
49 530 cultural analysis Lew-levy and colleagues[110] find that sex differences in children's work
50
51 531 increased in societies with stricter sexual divisions of labour. Cross-culturally girls tend to
52
53 532 prefer more face-to-face time with adults, particularly, women, than boys (who more often
54
55 533 assort with male peers)[94,101,111]. Consequently, Draper[101] called girls 'pre-adapted' to
56
57 534 take on these increasing domestic and childcare duties of women because they are proximate
58
59 535 and ready targets to be assigned household tasks by mothers[99,103,111] who have more to
60
536 do and are keen to reduce their workload[94]. In comparison, boys are more frequently out-

of-camp and spend less time with adults (and infants) and more time with male peers, giving them greater freedom from adults and domestic work[99–101,111].

These sex-based changes to mobility and assortment may further be related to demographic changes which alter the nature of playgroups. Mixed-age and mixed-sex playgroups are a ubiquitous feature of mobile hunter-gathering populations[79,112,113]. Arguably, they are the consequence of small camp sizes which cannot support significant clustering by age and sex[100,114,115] despite children preferring to play with similar aged and same-sex peers because of shared interests and behaviours[116]. In particular, cross culturally boys are much more frequently engaged in more physical and rough-and-tumble play than girls[109,111]. In mixed-age, mixed-sex playgroups these interests are modified and less gender-specific and competitive play occurs[112,117], supporting the integration of younger children[31] and limiting the distance travelled from camp. Therefore, in mobile camps there are few gender differences in childcare within playgroups, and spatial mobility in and around camp. However, as camp sizes get larger with settlement (we note that Table 1 shows no significant difference in mean camp sizes between the two camp types in this sample however mobile camps are smaller on average, and the range is much larger in settled camps. Further, in a more complete sample of Agta camps, settlement is clearly associated with camp size[64]), children increasingly cluster into same-sex, similar-aged groups as the availability of playmates increases[115]. In settled camps, it was common to witness boy-only playgroups, without the toddlers, which would roam further from camp and engage in riskier activities[118]. In contrast, given the reasons above, girls remained in camp and thus were more readily engaged in childcare and domestic tasks. These findings underscore that mother's childcare networks not only change due to maternal interests or strategies (e.g., risk buffering), but due to exogenous factors, such as the demographic composition of camps. As with the grandmother specific findings this suggests that we must pay attention to population specific demographic composition and trends.

Limitations

The major limitation of this study is similar to other observational studies in hunter-gatherers: sample size and study duration. Due to the intensive nature of data collection, we were only able to observe 78 children, each over a nine-hour period. Furthermore, given the smaller

size of mobile camps, which contained less eligible children for the study, our sample only includes 18 children from mobile camps which has increased the uncertainty about mobile-specific trends. This effect is apparent when looking at the descriptive statistics divided by camp type, where mobile and settled camps do not differ in terms of food storage and time spent in hunter-gathering, a finding which has been reported in the same population with a larger sample[64]. Finally, while our exploratory findings are in line with a wider literature on gendered changes with sedentism these research questions should be explored more extensively in a dedicated study to this question to examine these processes in-depth.

Conclusion

We found little evidence that different livelihood strategies associated with mobile and settled camps mapped on to specific behavioural adaptations to buffer risk. There was no evidence in wealthier, settled camps – as a proxy for risk retention strategies – that mother’s social networks were smaller, or more nuclearized. Nor was there any evidence that in resource-poorer mobile camps – as a proxy for risk pooling strategies – that mother’s social networks were larger, or that non-household individuals were more important allomothers. Our results nonetheless pointed to gendered specific changes occurring alongside sedentism, supporting findings in the wider literature on gender roles in transitioning societies. As camps become more settled girls’ childcare and household tasks increase while boys, being out of camp more, decreased investment in childcare. Our results point to the importance of shifting demographics in larger, more settled, camps as playgroups composition change and grandmothers have fewer dependents, increasing their availability as allomothers. Who provides childcare is dependent on who is present and their wider obligations, features arguably impacted by demography. Overall, while the ‘settled’ and ‘mobile’ Agta communities are part of the same population with a continuous gradient of livelihood change, it is of note how flexible human childcare is as who cared did vary. This highlights the flexibility of women’s social networks which, rather than being constrained, have been documented here, and elsewhere to be the outcome of demographic trends, gender roles, post-martial residence norms (Seabright *et al.* this issue) and different modes of subsistence (Kraft *et al.*; Mattison *et al.*; Starkweather *et al.* this issue). Future research should keep digging at the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

structure of this flexibility to help us better understand how women’s social networks and allomothering functions and how it is expected to change within transitioning populations.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge all the Agta families who participated in this study and whose goodwill and patience made the study possible. We are extremely thankful for Sheina Lew-Levy’s insights on gender roles in childhood and comments from the Evolutionary Demography Lab at LSHTM and Sarah Myers. Our thanks also go to Karen Kramer for her editorial guidance and the useful insights from the anonymous reviewers. A.E.P received funding from the MRC & DFID (MR/P014216/1). A.B.M received funding from the Leverhulme Trust (RP2011-R 045). AH was supported by the John Templeton Foundation (grant ID: 61426) and DS was supported by the John Templeton Foundation (grant ID: 61917)

Figure legends

Figure 1: Distribution of unweighted ties in mother's childcare networks (n = 50) separated by kinship **(A)** and age and sex category **(B)** from the mother's perspective. Here distant kin include the mother's brothers, sisters, nieces and nephews, cousins and aunts and uncles, while household includes their partner and children, and GP is grandparents which includes their parents, parents-in-law and their own grandparents if surviving.

Figure 2: predicted probabilities for the percentage of dyadic interactions separated low (top facet) and high investment (bottom facet) and camp type (settled = blue circles; mobile = yellow squares) for allomothers separated by either **A)** kinship or **B)** sex and reproductive status. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals, n = 1522. GM = grandmothers, GF = grandfathers and distant = distant kin. Boy and girls are juveniles aged 6-16 years, adults are aged 17 to 44.9 years and post-reproductive adults are aged 45 years plus. Please note the different y-axis scales.

Figure 3: Predicted probabilities for the percentage of activities spent in domestic tasks (top facet) and out of camp activities (bottom facet), dependent on camp type (mobile = yellow circles, settled = blue triangles) and the sex of the individuals on the x-axis. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals, n = 108 of children aged 6 – 16 years. Please note the different y-axis scales.

Tables

Table 1: Descriptives of key camp variables separated by camp settlement type. P-values are reported based on ANOVA or chi-squared tests dependent on data type. Sample sizes are consistent across variables, expect for household wealth (n = 71, 18 mobile and 53 settled), camp size (n = 10, 3 mobile and 7 settled) and measures of relatedness (n= 74, 17 mobile and 57 settled)

1
2
3 665
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 666

	Mobile (n = 18)	Settled (n = 60)	Total (n = 78)	p
Age of child				
Mean (SD)	2.26 (1.81)	2.37 (1.52)	2.35 (1.58)	0.796
Median (Min, Max)	1.62 (0.08, 5.75)	2.21 (0.08, 5.92)	2.08 (0.08, 5.92)	
Sex of child				
Male	11 (61.1%)	40 (66.7%)	51 (65.4%)	0.664
Female	7 (38.9%)	20 (33.3%)	27 (34.6%)	
Mother hunter-gatherer				
Mean (SD)	0.50 (0.48)	0.37 (0.40)	0.40 (0.42)	0.242
Median (Min, Max)	0.67 (0.00, 1.00)	0.23 (0.00, 1.00)	0.25 (0.00, 1.00)	
Father hunter-gatherer				
Mean (SD)	0.72 (0.37)	0.68 (0.32)	0.69 (0.33)	0.637
Median (Min, Max)	0.85 (0.00, 1.00)	0.75 (0.00, 1.00)	0.79 (0.00, 1.00)	
House storage				
Mean (SD)	1.72 (3.12)	1.93 (3.29)	1.88 (3.23)	0.812
Median (Min, Max)	0.50 (0.00, 10.00)	1.00 (0.00, 14.00)	1.00 (0.00, 14.00)	
House wealth				
Mean (SD)	1.58 (0.59)	2.30 (1.26)	2.12 (1.17)	0.022
Median (Min, Max)	1.45 (0.83, 2.80)	2.23 (0.18, 5.50)	2.05 (0.18, 5.50)	
House score				
Mean (SD)	0.28 (0.11)	0.53 (0.20)	0.47 (0.21)	< 0.001
Median (Min, Max)	0.31 (0.00, 0.44)	0.50 (0.13, 0.88)	0.44 (0.00, 0.88)	
Camp location				
Inland	13 (72.2%)	26 (43.3%)	39 (50.0%)	0.032
Coastal	5 (27.8%)	34 (56.7%)	39 (50.0%)	
Number of siblings				
Mean (SD)	2.50 (1.86)	3.28 (2.27)	3.10 (2.20)	0.186
Median (Min, Max)	3.00 (0.0, 6.00)	3.00 (0.0, 8.00)	3.00 (0.0, 8.00)	
Mean relatedness to camp				
Mean (SD)	0.13 (0.03)	0.14 (0.09)	0.13 (0.08)	0.784
Median (Min, Max)	0.13 (0.09, 0.19)	0.11 (0.05, 0.40)	0.11 (0.05, 0.40)	
Proportion of camp r = 0				
Mean (SD)	0.29 (0.17)	0.33 (0.25)	0.32 (0.23)	0.549
Median (Min, Max)	0.23 (0.12, 0.64)	0.29 (0.00, 0.82)	0.26 (0.00, 0.82)	
Proportion of camp r > & r = 0.25				
Mean (SD)	0.57 (0.23)	0.49 (0.23)	0.51 (0.23)	0.236
Median (Min, Max)	0.64 (0.09, 0.80)	0.49 (0.03, 0.92)	0.54 (0.03, 0.92)	
Proportion of camp r > 0.25 & r = 0.5				
Mean (SD)	0.14 (0.08)	0.17 (0.18)	0.17 (0.16)	0.401
Median (Min, Max)	0.09 (0.04, 0.27)	0.12 (0.00, 0.77)	0.12 (0.00, 0.77)	
Camp size				
Mean (SD)	38.33 (11.24)	55 (31.08)	50 (27.15)	0.250
Median (Min, Max)	41 (26, 48)	46 (30, 119)	43.50 (26, 119)	

References

1. Mattison SM *et al.* 2021 Gender Differences in Social Networks Based on Prevailing Kinship Norms in the Mosuo of China. *Soc. Sci.* **10**, 253. (doi:10.3390/socsci10070253)
2. Sear R, Coall D. 2011 How Much Does Family Matter? Cooperative Breeding and the Demographic Transition. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* **37**, 81–112. (doi:10.1111/j.1728-4457.2011.00379.x)
3. Emmott EH, Myers S, Page AE. 2021 Who cares for women with children ? Crossing the bridge between disciplines. *Philos Trans R Soc L. B Biol Sci* **376**, 20200019. (doi:doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0019)
4. Hooper PL, Demps K, Gurven M, Gerkey D, Kaplan HS, Hooper PL. 2015 Skills, division of labour and economies of scale among Amazonian hunters and South Indian honey collectors. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.* **370**, 20150008. (doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0008)
5. Kramer KL. 2010 Cooperative Breeding and its Significance to the Demographic Success of Humans. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* **39**, 417–436. (doi:10.1146/annurev.anthro.012809.105054)
6. Sear R, Mace R. 2008 Who keeps children alive? A review of the effects of kin on child survival. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **29**, 1–18. (doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.10.001)
7. Sear R. 2018 Family and fertility: does kin help influence women's fertility, and how does this vary worldwide? *Popul. Horizons* **14**, 18–34. (doi:10.1515/pophzn-2017-0006)
8. Padilla-Iglesias C, Kramer KL. 2021 The Role of Language in Structuring Social Networks Following Market Integration in a Yucatec Maya Population. *Front. Psychol.* **12**, 1–16. (doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2021.656963)
9. Schacht R, Davis HE, Kramer KL. 2018 Patterning of paternal investment in response to socioecological change. *Front. Ecol. Evol.* **6**, 1–12. (doi:10.3389/fevo.2018.00142)
10. Hassan A, Lawson DW, Schaffnit SB, Urassa M, Sear R. In press. Impact of urbanisation on allomaternal childcare provision in north-western Tanzania.
11. Jones JH, Ready E, Pisor AC. 2020 Want climate-change adaptation? Evolutionary theory can help. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* , 1–17. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.23539)
12. Pisor AC, Jones JH. 2020 Do people manage climate risk through long-distance

- relationships? *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* , 1–19. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.23525)
- 699 13. Winterhalder B. 1986 Diet choice, risk, and food sharing in a stochastic environment.
700 *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* **5**, 369–392. (doi:10.1016/0278-4165(86)90017-6)
- 701 14. Fafchamps M. 1992 Solidarity Networks in Preindustrial Societies: Rational Peasants
702 with a Moral Economy. *Econ. Dev. Cult. Change* **41**, 147–174.
- 703 15. Caudell M, Rotolo T, Grima M. 2015 Informal lending networks in rural Ethiopia. *Soc.*
704 *Networks* **40**, 34–42. (doi:10.1016/j.socnet.2014.07.003)
- 705 16. Aktipis CA, Cronk L, de Aguiar R. 2011 Risk-Pooling and Herd Survival: An Agent-Based
706 Model of a Maasai Gift-Giving System. *Hum. Ecol.* **39**, 131–140. (doi:10.1007/s10745-
707 010-9364-9)
- 708 17. Cashdan EA. 1985 Coping with Risk: Reciprocity Among the Basarwa of Northern
709 Botswana. *Man* **20**, 454–474. (doi:10.2307/2802441)
- 710 18. Halstead P, O'Shea J. 1989 Introduction: cultural responses to risk and uncertainty. In
711 *Bad year economics: Cultural responses to risk and uncertainty* (eds P Halstead, J
712 O'Shea), pp. 1–7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 713 19. Legge K. 1989 Changing responses to drought among the Wodaabe of Niger. In *Bad*
714 *year economics: Cultural responses to risk and uncertainty*¹ (eds P Halstead, J
715 O'Shea), pp. 81–86. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 716 20. Douglass K, Rasolondrainy T. 2021 Social memory and niche construction in a
717 hypervariable environment. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* , 1–22. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.23557)
- 718 21. Kelly RL. 2013 *The Lifeways of Hunter-Gatherers: The Foraging Spectrum*. second.
719 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 720 22. Rowley-Conwy P, Zvelebil M. 1989 Saving it for later: storage by prehistoric hunter-
721 gatherers in Europe. In *Bad year economics: Cultural responses to risk and uncertainty*
722 (eds P Halstead, J O'Shea), pp. 40–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 723 23. Page AE, Chaudhary N, Viguier S, Dyble M, Thompson J, Smith D, Salali GD, Mace R,
724 Migliano AB. 2017 Hunter-Gatherer Social Networks and Reproductive Success. *Sci.*
725 *Rep.* **7**, 1153. (doi:10.1038/s41598-017-01310-5)
- 726 24. Wiessner P. 1981 Measuring the impact of social ties on nutritional status among
727 the !kung San. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* **20**, 641–678.
- 728 25. Gurven M. 2004 To give and to give not: The behavioral ecology of human food
729 transfers. *Behav. Brain Sci.* **27**, 543–583. (doi:10.1017/S0140525X04000123)

- 1
- 2
- 3 730 26. Nolin DA. 2010 Food-Sharing Networks in Lamalera, Indonesia: Reciprocity, Kinship,
- 4 731 and Distance. *Hum. Nat.* **21**, 243–268. (doi:10.1016/j.micinf.2011.07.011.Innate)
- 5 732
- 6 733 27. Jaeggi A V, Gurven M. 2013 Natural cooperators: Food sharing in humans and other
- 7 734 primates. *Evol. Anthropol.* **22**, 186–195. (doi:10.1002/evan.21364)
- 8 735
- 9 736 28. Gurven M, Allen-Arave W, Hill K, Hurtado M. 2000 'It's a Wonderful Life'. signaling
- 10 737 generosity among the Ache of Paraguay. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **21**, 263–282.
- 11 738 (doi:S1090513800000325)
- 12 739
- 13 740 29. Sugiyama LS. 2004 Illness, injury, and disability among Shiwiar forager-
- 14 741 horticulturalists: Implications of health-risk buffering for the evolution of human life
- 15 742 history. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* **123**, 371–389. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.10325)
- 16 743
- 17 744 30. Sugiyama LS, Chacon R. 2000 Effects of illness and injury on foraging among the Yora
- 18 745 and Shiwiar: pathology risk as adaptive problem. *Hum. Behav. Adapt. an ...* , 371–395.
- 19 746
- 20 747 31. Page AE, Emmott EH, Dyble M, Smith D, Chaudhary N, Viguier S, Migliano AB. 2021
- 21 748 Children are important too: juvenile playgroups and maternal childcare in a foraging
- 22 749 population, the Agta. *Philos Trans R Soc L. B Biol Sci* **376**, 20200026.
- 23 750 (doi:doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0026)
- 24 751
- 25 752 32. Brown J. 1970 A Note on the Division of Labor by Sex. *Am. Anthropol.* **72**, 1073–78.
- 26 753
- 27 754 33. Kramer KL. 2021 The human family: Its evolutionary context and diversity. *Soc. Sci.*
- 28 755 **10**, 191. (doi:10.3390/socsci10060191)
- 29 756
- 30 757 34. Hames R. 1988 The allocation of parental care among the Ye'kawana. In *Human*
- 31 758 *Reproductive Behavior: A Darwinian Perspective* (eds L Betzig, M Borgerhoff Mulder, P
- 32 759 Turke), pp. 237–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 33 760
- 34 761 35. Hawkes K, O'Connell JF, Blurton Jones NG. 1997 Hadza Women's Time Allocation,
- 35 762 Offspring Provisioning and the Evolution of Long Postmenopausal Life Spans. *Curr.*
- 36 763 *Anthropol.* **38**, 551–577.
- 37 764
- 38 765 36. Hurtado AM, Hawkes K, Hill K, Kaplan H. 1985 Female subsistence strategies among
- 39 766 Ache hunter-gatherers of Eastern Paraguay. *Hum. Ecol.* **13**, 1–28.
- 40 767 (doi:10.1007/BF01531086)
- 41 768
- 42 769 37. Hurtado AM, Hill K, Hurtado I, Kaplan H. 1992 Trade-Offs between female food
- 43 770 acquisition and child care among Hiwi and Ache foragers. *Hum. Nat.* **3**, 185–216.
- 44 771 (doi:10.1007/BF02692239)
- 45 772
- 46 773 38. Kramer KL. 2009 Does it take a family to raise a child? Cooperative breeding and the
- 47 774
- 48 775
- 49 776
- 50 777
- 51 778
- 52 779
- 53 780
- 54 781
- 55 782
- 56 783
- 57 784
- 58 785
- 59 786
- 60 787

- contributions of Maya siblings, parents and older adults in raising children. In
*Substitute Parents: Biological and Social Perspectives on Alloparenting across Human
 Societies* (eds GR Bentley, R Mace), pp. 76–98. London: Berghahn Books.
39. Dyble M, Thompson J, Smith D, Salali GD, Chaudhary N, Page AE, Vinicius L, Mace R,
 Migliano AB. 2016 Networks of Food Sharing Reveal the Functional Significance of
 Multilevel Sociality in Two Hunter-Gatherer Groups. *Curr. Biol.* **26**, 2017–2021.
 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.064)
40. Ivey PK. 2000 Cooperative reproduction in Ituri forest Hunter-Gatherers: Who cares
 for Efe infants? *Curr. Anthropol.* **41**, 856–866. (doi:10.1086/317414)
41. Lee RD, Kramer KL. 2002 Children's Economic Roles in the Maya Family Life Cycle:
 Cain, Caldwell, and Chayanov Revisited. *Popul. Dev. Rev.* **28**, 475–499.
 (doi:10.2307/3092837)
42. Marlowe FW. 2003 A critical period for provisioning by Hadza men. Implications for
 pair bonding. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **24**, 217–229. (doi:10.1016/S1090-5138(03)00014-X)
43. Kaplan H, Gurven M. 2005 The natural history of human food sharing and
 cooperation: a review and a new multi-individual approach to the negotiation of
 norms. *Moral Sentim. Mater. Interes. Found. Coop. Econ. life* , 75–113.
44. Hill K, Hurtado AM. 2009 Cooperative breeding in South American hunter-gatherers.
Proc. Biol. Sci. **276**, 3863–3870. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.1061)
45. Starkweather KE, Shenk MK, McElreath R. 2020 Biological constraints and
 socioecological influences on women's pursuit of risk and the sexual division of
 labour. *Evol. Hum. Sci.* **2**. (doi:10.1017/ehs.2020.60)
46. Kramer KL, Veile A. 2018 Infant allocare in traditional societies. *Physiol. Behav.* **193**,
 117–126. (doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2018.02.054)
47. Meehan CL, Quinlan R, Malcom CD. 2013 Cooperative breeding and maternal energy
 expenditure among aka foragers. *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **25**, 42–57.
 (doi:10.1002/ajhb.22336)
48. Page AE, Emmott EH, Dyble M, Smith D, Chaudhary N, Viguier S, Migliano AB. 2021
 Children are important too: juvenile playgroups and maternal childcare in a foraging
 population, the Agta. *Philos Trans R Soc L. B Biol Sci* , 20200026.
 (doi:doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2020.0026)
49. Meehan CL. 2009 Maternal Time Allocation in Two Cooperative Childrearing

- 794 Societies. *Hum. Nat.* **20**, 375–393. (doi:10.1007/s12110-009-9076-2)
- 795 50. Axelrod R, Hamilton WD. 1981 The Evolution of Cooperation. *Science* (80-.). **211**,
796 1390–1396.
- 797 51. Kramer KL, Ellison PT. 2010 Pooled energy budgets: Resituating human energy
798 allocation trade-offs. *Evol. Anthropol. Issues, News, Rev.* **19**, 136–147.
799 (doi:10.1002/evan.20265)
- 800 52. Martin JS, Ringen EJ, Duda P, Jaeggi A V. 2020 Harsh environments promote
801 alloparental care across human societies. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **287**, 20200758.
802 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.0758rspb20200758)
- 803 53. Jaeggi A V., Hooper PL, Beheim BA, Kaplan H, Gurven M. 2016 Reciprocal Exchange
804 Patterned by Market Forces Helps Explain Cooperation in a Small-Scale Society. *Curr.*
805 *Biol.* **26**, 2180–2187. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.06.019)
- 806 54. Jaeggi A V., Hooper PL, Beheim BA, Kaplan H, Gurven M. 2016 Reciprocal Exchange
807 Patterned by Market Forces Helps Explain Cooperation in a Small-Scale Society. *Curr.*
808 *Biol.* **26**, 2180–2187. (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.06.019)
- 809 55. Page AE *et al.* 2019 Testing adaptive hypotheses of alloparenting in Agta foragers.
810 *Nat. Hum. Behav.* (doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0679-2)
- 811 56. Hadley C. 2004 The Costs and Benefits of Kin: Kin Networks and Children's Health
812 among the Pimbwe of Tanzania. *Hum. Nat.* **15**, 377–395. (doi:10.1007/s12110-004-
813 1015-7)
- 814 57. Kasper C, Borgerhoff Mulder M. 2015 Who Helps and Why? *Curr. Anthropol.* **56**, 701–
815 735. (doi:10.1086/683024)
- 816 58. La Ferrara E. 2002 Inequality and group participation: theory and evidence from rural
817 Tanzania. *J. Public Econ.* **85**, 235–273.
- 818 59. Gurven M, Jaeggi A V., von Rueden C, Hooper PL, Kaplan H. 2015 Does Market
819 Integration Buffer Risk, Erode Traditional Sharing Practices and Increase Inequality? A
820 Test among Bolivian Forager-Farmers. *Hum. Ecol.* **43**, 515–530. (doi:10.1007/s10745-
821 015-9764-y)
- 822 60. Hamilton WD. 1964 The genetical evolution of social behaviour. I. *J. Theor. Biol.* **7**, 1–
823 16. (doi:10.1016/0022-5193(64)90038-4)
- 824 61. Atkisson C, Górski PJ, Jackson MO, Hołyst JA, D'Souza RM. 2020 Why understanding
825 multiplex social network structuring processes will help us better understand the

- 826 evolution of human behavior. *Evol. Anthropol.* **29**, 102–107.
 827 (doi:10.1002/evan.21850)
- 828 62. Panter-Brick C. 1989 Motherhood and Subsistence Work: The Tamang of Rural Nepal.
 829 *Hum. Ecol.* **17**, 205–228.
- 830 63. Dyble M, Thorley J, Page AE, Smith D, Migliano AB. 2019 Engagement in agricultural
 831 work is associated with reduced leisure time among Agta hunter-gatherers. *Nat.*
 832 *Hum. Behav.* (doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0614-6)
- 833 64. Page AE *et al.* 2016 Reproductive trade-offs in extant hunter-gatherers suggest
 834 adaptive mechanism for the Neolithic expansion. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **113**, 4694-
 835 4699.
- 836 65. Minter T. 2010 The Agta of the Northern Sierra Madre: Livelihood strategies and
 837 resilience among Philippine hunter-gatherers. Leiden University.
- 838 66. Diekmann Y, Smith D, Gerbault P, Dyble M, Page AE, Chaudhary N, Bamberg Migliano
 839 A, Thomas MG. 2017 Accurate age estimation in small-scale societies. *Proc. Natl.*
 840 *Acad. Sci.* , 1619583114. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1619583114)
- 841 67. Meehan CL. 2005 The effects of residential locality on parental and alloparental
 842 investment among the Aka foragers of the central African Republic. *Hum. Nat.* **16**,
 843 58–80. (doi:10.1007/s12110-005-1007-2)
- 844 68. Kramer KL. 2019 How There Got to Be So Many of Us: The Evolutionary Story of
 845 Population Growth and a Life History of Cooperation. *J. Anthropol. Res.* , 000–000.
 846 (doi:10.1086/705943)
- 847 69. Emmott EH, Page AE. 2019 Alloparenting. In *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary*
 848 *Psychological Science* (eds TK Shackelford, VA Weekes-Shackelford), pp. 1–14. Cham:
 849 Springer International Publishing. (doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6_2253-1)
- 850 70. Page AE *et al.* 2019 Testing adaptive hypotheses of alloparenting in Agta foragers.
 851 *Nat. Hum. Behav.* **3**, 1154–1163. (doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0679-2)
- 852 71. Team RC. 2012 R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- 853 72. Brooks ME, Kristensen K, von Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug
 854 HJ, Maechler M, Bolker BM. 2017 glmmTMB. , 378–400.
- 855 73. Hartig F. 2020 DHARMA: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed)
 856 Regression Models.
- 857 74. Textor J, von der Zander B, Gilthorpe MK, Liskiewicz M, Ellison GTH. 2016 Robust

- causal inference using directed acyclic graphs: the R package 'dagitty'. *Int. J. Epidemiol.* **45**, 1887–1894.
75. Dyble MJ. 2016 The behavioural ecology and evolutionary implications of hunter-gatherer social organisation. University College London.
76. Cashdan EA. 1990 Introduction. In *Risk and uncertainty in tribal and peasant economies* (ed EA Cashdan), pp. 1–16. London: Westview Press.
77. Smith D *et al.* 2019 A friend in need is a friend indeed: Need-based sharing, rather than cooperative assortment, predicts experimental resource transfers among Agta hunter-gatherers. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **40**, 82–89. (doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.08.004)
78. Meehan CL, Hawks S. 2013 Cooperative breeding and attachment among the Aka foragers. In *Attachment reconsidered: Cultural perspectives on a western theory* (eds N Quinn, JM Mageo), pp. 85–113. New York: Palgrave macmillan.
79. Ivey PK, Morelli GA, Tronick EZ. 2005 Child caretakers among Efe foragers of the Ituri forest. In *Hunter-Gatherer Childhoods: Cultural, Developmental, & Evolutionary Perspectives* (eds BS Hewlett, ME Lamb), pp. 191–113. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
80. Crittenden AN, Marlowe FW. 2008 Allomaternal care among the Hadza of Tanzania. *Hum. Nat.* **19**, 249–262. (doi:10.1007/s12110-008-9043-3)
81. Meehan CL, Helfrecht C, Malcom CD. 2016 Implications of length development and maternal life history: allomaternal investment, peer relationships and social networks. In *Childhood: Origins, evolution and implications* (eds CL Meehan, AN Crittenden), pp. 199–220. Santa Fe: SAR Press.
82. Helfrecht C, Roulette JW, Lane A, Sintayehu B, Meehan CL. 2020 Life history and socioecology of infancy. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* , 1–11. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.24145)
83. Hrdy SB. 2005 Cooperative breeders with an ace in the hole. In *Grandmotherhood: The evolutionary significance of the second half of the female life* (eds E Voland, A Chasiotis), pp. 295–317. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
84. Blurton Jones NG, Hawkes K, O'Connell JF. 2002 Antiquity of postreproductive life: Are there modern impacts on hunter-gatherer postreproductive life spans? *Am. J. Hum. Biol.* **14**, 184–205. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.10038)
85. Hawkes K, O'Connell JF, Jones NGB, Alvarez H, Charnov EL, Blurton Jones NG, Alvarez

- 890 H, Charnov EL. 1998 Grandmothering, menopause, and the evolution of human life
891 histories. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **95**, 1336–1339.
- 892 86. Colleran H. 2020 Market integration reduces kin density in women's ego-networks in
893 rural Poland. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–10. (doi:10.1038/s41467-019-14158-2)
- 894 87. Valeggia CR. 2009 Flexible caretakers: responses of Toba families in transition. In
895 *Substitute Parents: Biological and Social perspective on alloparenting across human*
896 *societies* (eds GR Bentley, R Mace), pp. 100–114. New York: Berghahn Books.
- 897 88. Borgerhoff Mulder M. 2007 Hamilton's rule and kin competition: the Kipsigis case.
898 *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **28**, 299–312. (doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2007.05.009)
- 899 89. Strassmann BI. 2011 Cooperation and competition in a cliff-dwelling people. *Proc.*
900 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **108**, 10894–10901. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1100306108)
- 901 90. Sear R. 2008 Kin and child survival in rural Malawi : Are matrilineal kin always
902 beneficial in a matrilineal society? *Hum. Nat.* **19**, 277–293. (doi:10.1007/s12110-008-
903 9042-4)
- 904 91. Mace R. 2013 Cooperation and conflict between women in the family. *Evol.*
905 *Anthropol.* **22**, 251–258. (doi:10.1002/evan.21374)
- 906 92. Scelza BA. 2011 The Place of Proximity. *Hum. Nat.* **22**, 108–127. (doi:10.1007/s12110-
907 011-9112-x)
- 908 93. Shenk MK *et al.* 2021 Social support , nutrition and health among women in rural
909 Bangladesh : complex tradeoffs in allocare , kin proximity and support network size.
910 *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **376**.
- 911 94. Bradley C. 1993 Women's Power, Children's labor. *Cross-Cultural Res.* **27**, 70–96.
- 912 95. Tymicki K. 2004 Kin influence on female reproductive behavior: The evidence from
913 reconstitution of the Bejsce parish registers, 18th to 20th centuries, Poland. *Am. J.*
914 *Hum. Biol.* **16**, 508–522. (doi:10.1002/ajhb.20059)
- 915 96. Chapman SN, Pettay JE, Lummaa V, Lahdenperä M. 2019 Limits to Fitness Benefits of
916 Prolonged Post-reproductive Lifespan in Women. *Curr. Biol.* **29**, 645–650.
917 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.12.052)
- 918 97. Hassan A, Lawson DW, Schaffnit SB, Urassa M, Sear R. 2021 Childcare in transition:
919 evidence that patterns of childcare differ by degree of market integration in north-
920 western Tanzania . *OSF Prepr.* , 1–41. (doi:10.31219/osf.io/gtc6k)
- 921 98. Lew-Levy S, Lavi N, Reckin R, Cristóbal-Azkarate J, Ellis-Davies K. 2018 How Do Hunter-

- 922 Gatherer Children Learn Social and Gender Norms? A Meta-Ethnographic Review.
 923 *Cross-Cultural Res.* **52**, 213–255. (doi:10.1177/1069397117723552)
- 924 99. Reckin R, Lew-Levy S, Lavi N, Ellis-Davies K. 2020 Mobility, autonomy and learning:
 925 could the transition from egalitarian to non-egalitarian social structures start with
 926 children? In *Social Inequality Before Farming?* (ed L Moreau), pp. 33–50. Cambridge:
 927 McDonaold Institute for Archaeological Research.
- 928 100. Draper P, Cashdan E. 1988 Technological change and child behavior among the! Kung.
 929 *Ethnology* **27**, 339–365. (doi:10.2307/3773398)
- 930 101. Draper P. 1975 Cultural Pressure on Sex Differences. *Am. Ethnol.* **2**, 602–616.
 931 (doi:10.1525/ae.1975.2.4.02a00020)
- 932 102. Boyette AH. 2016 Children's Play and Culture Learning in an Egalitarian Foraging
 933 Society. *Child Dev.* **87**, 759–769. (doi:10.1111/cdev.12496)
- 934 103. Morelli GA. 2014 Growing Up Female in a Farmer Community and a Forager
 935 Community. In *The Evolving Female: A life history perspective* (eds ME Morbeck, A
 936 Galloway, A Zihlman), pp. 209–219. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 937 (doi:10.1515/9781400822065.209)
- 938 104. Ember CR. 1983 The Relative Decline in Women's Contribution to Agriculture with
 939 Intensification. *Am. Anthropol.* **85**, 285–304. (doi:10.1525/aa.1983.85.2.02a00020)
- 940 105. Condon RG, Stern PR. 1993 Gender-Role Preference , Gender Gender Identity ,
 941 Socialization among Youth Inuit. *Am. Anthropol. Assoc.* **21**, 384–416.
- 942 106. Bock J. 2002 Learning, life history and productivity: Children's Lives in the Okavango
 943 Delta Botswana. *Hum. Nat.* **13**, 161–197.
- 944 107. Kramer KL. 2002 Helping Behavior among Maya Children. *Hum. Nat.* **13**, 299–325.
- 945 108. Hames R, Draper P. 2004 Women's work, child care, and helpers-at-the-nest in a
 946 hunter-gatherer society. *Hum. Nat.* **15**, 319–341. (doi:10.1007/s12110-004-1012-x)
- 947 109. Ember CR, Cunnar CM. 2015 Children's play and work: The relevance of cross-cultural
 948 ethnographic research for archaeologists. *Child. Past* **8**, 87–103.
 949 (doi:10.1179/1758571615Z.000000000031)
- 950 110. Lew-Levy S *et al.* 2022 Socioecology shapes child and adolescent time allocation in
 951 twelve hunter-gatherer and mixed-subsistence forager societies. *Sci. Rep.* , 1–16.
 952 (doi:10.1038/s41598-022-12217-1)
- 953 111. Whiting B, Edwards CP. 1973 A cross-cultural analysis of sex differences in the

- 954 behavior of children aged three through 11. *J. Soc. Psychol.* **91**, 171–188.
955 (doi:10.1080/00224545.1973.9923040)
- 956 112. Konner MJ. 1976 Relations among infants and juveniles in comparative perspective.
957 *Soc. Sci. Inf.* **15**, 371–402.
- 958 113. Konner M. 2005 Hunter-Gatherer Infancy and Childhood: The !Kung and Others. In
959 *Hunter-Gatherer Childhoods: Cultural, Developmental, & Evolutionary Perspectives*
960 (eds BS Hewlett, ME Lamb), pp. 19–64. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- 961 114. Hewlett BS. 1991 Demography and Childcare in Preindustrial Societies. *J. Anthropol.*
962 *Res.* **42**, 1–37.
- 963 115. Lew-Levy S, Boyette AH, Crittenden AN, Hewlett BS, Lamb M. 2019 Gender-typed and
964 gender-segregated play among Tanzanian Hadza and Congolese BaYaka hunter-
965 gatherer children and adolescents. *Child Dev.* , 1–44.
966 (doi:doi.org/10.17863/CAM.41339)
- 967 116. Pellegrini AD, Bjorklund DF. 2004 The ontogeny and phylogeny of children's object
968 and fantasy play. *Hum. Nat.* **15**, 23–43. (doi:10.1007/s12110-004-1002-z)
- 969 117. Fabes RA, Martin CL, Hanish LD. 2003 Young Children's Play Qualities in Same-, Other-
970 , and Mixed-Sex Peer Groups. *Child Dev.* **74**, 921–932. (doi:10.1111/1467-
971 8624.00576)
- 972 118. Page AE, Myers S, Dyble M, Migliano AB. 2019 Why so many Agta boys ? Explaining '
973 extreme ' sex ratios in Philippine foragers. *Evol. Hum. Sci.* **1**, e5.
974 (doi:10.1017/ehs.2019.4)

A

B