TEACHING AND THE LIFE HISTORY OF CULTURAL TRANSMISSION IN FIJIAN VILLAGES

Michelle Kline[a,b]

Robert Boyd[a,b,]

Joseph Henrich[c]

[a] Department of Anthropology, University of California Los Angeles, CA 90095

[b] Center for Behavior, Evolution, and Culture, University of California Los Angeles, CA 90095

[c] Departments of Psychology and Economics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4

ABSTRACT

Much existing literature in anthropology suggests that teaching is rare in non-western societies, and that cultural transmission is mostly vertical (parent-to-offspring). However, applications of evolutionary theory to humans predict both teaching and non-vertical transmission of culturally learned skills, behaviors, and knowledge should be common cross-culturally. Here, we review this work to derive the following predictions about when teaching and non-vertical transmission should be adaptive, and thus more likely to be observed empirically: (1) Teaching should be more common between closely related individuals, for high-skill domains, and for important or locally valued domains. (2) Oblique transmission should be more common and vertical and horizontal transmission less common for domains that are learned later in life and for high-skill domains. And, (3) tasks that require higher skill but not higher strength should be learned later in life. Then, we test these predictions using three interviews conducted with rural Fijian populations. Finally, we conclude that the apparent conflict between theory and empirical evidence is due to a mismatch of theoretical hypotheses and empirical claims across disciplines, and reconcile theory with the existing literature in light of our results.

KEYWORDS: Cultural transmission, Human evolution, Teaching, Learning, Childhood

INTRODUCTION

WHEN TO LEARN FROM OTHERS

Humans rely on cultural learning much more than any other animal species. Other animals primarily adapt to local environments through a variety of forms of individual learning. Each individual organism must acquire most of the knowledge it needs to thrive in the local environment on its own. In some species, social cues and even forms of scaffolding or teaching may facilitate the proliferation of local traditions (Caro and Hauser 1992, Hoppitt and Laland 2008, Thornton and Raihani, 2008). However, these are limited to behaviors that individuals could learn on their own; there is no evidence of cumulative cultural change across generations, except perhaps for bird song. Humans acquire vast amounts of information from others by imitation, teaching, and other forms of cultural learning, and this leads to the cumulative evolution of complex local adaptations that no individual could learn on her own (Boyd et al 2011).

Over the past several decades a number of researchers have developed a rich body of theory that analyzes the conditions under which natural selection will favor such a reliance on cultural learning, and how cultural learning should be structured (Boyd and Richerson 1985, Rogers 1988; Feldman et al 1996; Kameda and Nakanishi 2003; Wanako et al 2004, Enquist et al. 2007, McElreath and Strimling 2008, Rendell et al. 2010). Of particular interest here, this theory makes predictions about when individuals should learn from their parents as opposed to learning from others, and when teaching would be adaptive. Here we briefly review this theory, and then detail the predictions relevant to the current empirical study.

Much work (Boyd and Richerson 1987, 1996, McElreath and Strimling 2008, Perreault et al. in press) indicates that natural selection favors social rather than individual learning when the behavior of others is a more accurate predictor of the best behavior in the local environment than alternative non-social cues. This will be true under at least two conditions. First, models show that when environmental cues vary in quality so that they are sometimes good, but often bad indicators of the most adaptive behavior, selection can favor a psychology that causes individuals to learn selectively. Specifically, the most adaptive strategy is to learn individually when environmental cues provide clear guidance, but to learn from others when environmental cues are of low quality. Second, other models assume that individual trial-and-error learning allows individuals to make small improvements cheaply, but not big ones. In these models, selection favors cultural learning, combined with occasional marginal improvements through individual learning. In both cases, modest amounts of individual learning are sufficient to allow a population to accurately track changing environments, and thus the behavior of others provides useful information about the best behavior in the local environment. Qualitatively, this body of theory suggests that selection can give rise to an evolved psychology that includes both a strong intrinsic motivation to imitate others, as well as motivations to independently discover and adopt novel adaptive behaviors.

Researchers have also addressed the question of who should learners attend to when they do learn socially (Boyd and Richerson 1985, Henrich and Boyd 1998, Henrich and Gil-White 2001, Henrich 2009, Henrich and Broesch 2011, Nakahashi et al. forthcoming). Several different factors are likely to be important. First, a variety of cues may allow learners to identify models who are more likely to be behaving adaptively; successful individuals, widely copied individuals, older individuals, individuals whose behavior is more common, and individuals who resemble the learner in relevant dimensions are all examples. Second, it may be more costly to copy some individuals compared to others. Social learning takes time and requires access to the model individual, which means that it will usually be least costly to copy family members and others who are observed in the course of normal activities.

Indeed, especially attractive models may require learners to pay for access with resources, labor, or deference, as is often true of apprenticeships (Coy 1989). Finally, some models may be more reliable than others. Some kinds of cultural learning depend on the testimony of models (Koenig and Harris 2007, Jaswal et al 2010), and models may be motivated to lie to learners in order to increase their own fitness. Relatives are more trustworthy, as are individuals who can be observed making costly decisions consistent with their testimony (Henrich 2009).

WHEN TO TEACH

One body of work evaluates when teaching favored by natural selection (Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman 1983, Thornton and Raihani 2008, Hoppitt et al. 2008). Here teaching is defined as behavior by the model that (a) is contingent on a naïve observer being present, (b) is costly to the model, at least in the short term, and (c) facilitates or speeds up the acquisition of behavior by the learner (Caro and Hauser 1992). This definition includes a wide range of behavior ranging from explicit instruction to providing subtle cues that the model intends her behavior to be copied. Looked at this way, teaching is cooperative—more accurate learning benefits the learner, but costs the model. Thus teaching can evolve only when the model recoups fitness costs, contingent on the pupil's improved learning (Hoppitt et al. 2008). If the model and the learner are related, then inclusive fitness benefits can favor teaching (Cavalli-Sforza and Feldman 1983), and so all other things being equal, more teaching is expected among relatives. There may also be direct fitness benefits. Learners can compensate teachers through deference (Henrich and Gil-White 2001; Henrich 2009), or teachers may reciprocally teach each other's offspring. Such reciprocal arrangements may be especially effective when the cost teaching increases slowly as the number of learners increases so, that going from one to two pupils doesn't double the cost, for example.

Predictions about teaching depend critically on the costs to teachers and the benefits to learners. Researchers have argued that communication generally (Sperber and Wilson, 1995) and cultural learning specifically (Gergely and Csibra 2006, 2011) is very difficult without ostensive cues by models that vastly narrow the range of possible inferences that learners can make. If so, very low cost teaching yields very large benefits, and therefore we should expect such subtle teaching under a wide range of circumstances. Even low relatedness due to viscous population effects may have been enough to endow humans with a psychology motivated to engage in subtle teaching toward any naïve learner in their social group. For the same reason, indirect reciprocity could have easily supported the evolution of subtle, low-cost teaching. On the other hand, explicit instruction is often time consuming and may require substantial modifications of the teacher's behavior. For such high-cost types of teaching, the theory predicts that an evolved psychology should limit explicit teaching to close relatives or to contexts in which the learner or his relatives provide the teacher with direct fitness benefits that compensate the teacher for the costs she incurs.

WHEN TO LEARN FROM PEOPLE BESIDES PARENTS

This body of theory makes predictions about when selection should favor learning from parents (aka vertical transmission) and when it should favor learning from others ("oblique" and "horizontal" transmission). The following factors tend to favor learning from parents:

CULTURAL VARIATION IN FERTILITY. When cultural variation causes variation in number of offspring (McElreath and Strimling 2008, Aoki et al. 2011), children who copy parents have a greater chance of acquiring cultural variants that increase family size than children who copy randomly chosen adults. To see why consider the following simplified example: Suppose that there are two culturally transmitted behaviors, and that mothers with one behavior produce three offspring, while mothers with the alternative behavior produce only

one. Further suppose that children learn from their mothers and that the two behaviors are equally common. Three quarters of the children are in large sibships, and thus children who copy their mother have a 75% chance of acquiring the behavior that leads to large families. Children who copy random adult women have only a 50% chance. This effect will cause selection to favor cultural transmission when cultural variation has a substantial effect on variation in fertility, and the same variants do not have negative effects on other fitness components. (For example, cultural variants that lead to high fertility might also lead to high mortality.)

LOW LEVELS OF CULTURAL VARIATION. Cultural learning depends on access to models. If young children typically spend much more time with members of their family than other adults, it will usually be cheaper for younger children to copy their parents and other members of the immediate family. Older children and adolescents typically interact with a wider range of adults, and it thus becomes less costly to copy non-family members. Because non-parental adults provide a large sample, adaptive considerations suggest that, all other things being equal, children can benefit by being open to imitating such individuals. This predicts a two-stage model of cultural learning (Henrich and Broesch 2011; see also Aunger 2000). First, children learn from their parents and other members of their immediate family. As they get older, children they compare what they have learned to the behavior that they observe among other individuals. If there is evidence that the novel behaviors are better, learners adopt them---vertical transmission first, then horizontal and oblique transmission. However, sometimes non-parental adults will provide no new information. There may often be little cultural variation among individuals in small-scale societies (Hewlett and Cavalli-Sforza 1986). The same may be true in larger societies that have reached cultural equilibrium. When new beneficial ideas are rare, imitating non-parents may provide big benefits, but once they have spread through a society, learners can get them from their parents. These considerations predict that vertical transmission will be the norm in societies with limited cultural variation or for domains in which alternative cultural variants are equally attractive, and that a two-stage process will be common in societies or in domains with much cultural variation.

WHEN MODELS ARE MOTIVATED TO DECEIVE LEARNERS, AND CONCEAL INFORMATION. The models and learners may often have divergent interests, and this means that learners may need to evaluate what models are trying to teach them (Sperber et al, 2011). For many traits this is not a problem because learners can observe models "practicing what they preach." If a learner observes a model frequenting a particular fishing ground, then the learner can be reasonably certain that the model thinks that location is a fruitful one. More generally, if models can be seen exhibiting individually costly behavior consistent with a particular belief, then learners can reasonably infer that the model is not trying to deceive the learner (Henrich 2009). If a learner observes a model expending considerable effort to reach his preferred fishing grounds, this might be better evidence of the model's true belief in the location's value. Nonetheless, there are also situations in which detecting deception is difficult. This will especially be true of verbal instruction, and in these cases it will be safer to learn from parents and other close relatives whose reproductive interests will be more closely aligned with the learner's interests.

PRESENT STUDY

As part of a long-term study of life in rural Fijian villages, we performed a series of interviews designed to evaluate specific hypotheses about the roles of teaching and non-vertical transmission in cultural learning based on the theory outlined above. We tested three predictions about the distribution of teaching as a type of cultural learning.

1. *Teaching is most common among closely related kin, and least common where no genetic relatedness exists, all else being equal*. As a result, teaching should be more closely associated with vertical transmission than with oblique transmission.

2. *Domains that are more difficult in terms of skill—but not in terms of strength—should be associated with higher rates of teaching.* The adaptive value of teaching depends on how much the learner gains from her tutelage—the gains from teaching should be greater for tasks that are more difficult to master.

3. A *domain's importance will be positively associated with frequency of teaching.* Teaching should be most frequent where its impact on fitness is the greatest. As a proxy for impact, we use a measure of a domain's importance to achieving success and respect in village life.

We also tested three predictions about the distribution of vertical, horizontal, and oblique pathways of cultural transmission based on the body of theory discussed above.

1. *Vertical and horizontal transmission will be negatively associated with the age at which a domain is first learned, while oblique transmission will be positively associated with start age*. According to the two-stage model of cultural learning, learning that takes place early in life is likely to be based on models that are easily accessible, including parents and close kin. In contrast, domains learned later on may be learned from a broader array of acquaintances. .
2. *Low-skill domains will be associated with lower start ages, whereas high-skill domains will be associated with higher start ages.* The two-stage model of cultural learning suggests that basic skills are learned early in life, and later updated when a learner's access to models and experiences expands. Low-skill domains will not require updating and so will be associated with early learning ages. In contrast, high-skill domains may be learned later in life to begin with, and may be continuously updated throughout the life span, resulting in later reported learning ages.
3. *Domains requiring greater skill—but not greater strength—will be associated with higher levels of oblique transmission*. Domains for which there is less variation within a population—low skill domains—can be learned from nearly any adult model so are likely to be learned from those close at hand, primarily parents or close relatives. In contrast, there is likely to be greater variation in competence for high-skill tasks, so they are better learned from particular models, perhaps experts.

METHODS

We collected data about children's day-to-day lives, ways of learning, and expected work contributions to their households. Here we give a detailed explanation of the field site and interview methods for three interviews: Domains of Success, Child Learning Interview, and Difficulty Ranking Task.

ETHNOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

Data presented here were collected during 2008-2011 in two Fijian villages on Yasawa Island, located in the northwestern corner of the Fijian Islands. These villages are sustained by a primarily subsistence economy, with 23% of calories coming from the market economy (Henrich et al., 2010a), and only 2 of 84 adults in Teci and Dalomo villages in 2010 reporting work in wage labor. Political units are composed of interrelated clans, governed by a council of elders and a hereditary chief, and life is organized by a complex web of kinship relations and obligations. Each village has its own dialect. There are no local markets, broadcast television, automobiles, or public utilities in these villages, whose populations are about 100-250. Radios are common and cell phones have become increasingly prevalent since 2009,

though a lack of a reliable source of electricity, unreliable service, and the difficulty of purchasing additional minutes limits their usage. Despite the introduction of British-style formal schooling in the early 1900's (see White 2007), Fijian childhood in these relatively traditional villages remains quite different from childhood in the western world, making for a valuable cross-cultural comparison of cultural learning. This paper focuses on Fijian adults' explanations of how children learn skills and behaviors that are important to success in a traditional Fijian village, including who they learn from, at what ages, and how. For additional ethnographic detail, readers should refer to the supplemental materials from Henrich and Henrich (2010) and Henrich and Broesch (2011b).

In this and many other Fijian villages, social interactions including those relevant to cultural learning are shaped by the relative social status and kinship relationships of the actors (Sahlins 1962; Toren 1990, Brison 1999; Ravuvu 1983; Nayacakalou 1975). As in many of the traditional societies mentioned above, relationship norms structure interactions so that subordinates do not dominate an interaction nor set its terms by direct questioning (Nabobo-Baba 2006, Arno 1990). This is a recurring pattern in Polynesia (e.g., Ritchie and Ritchie 1979; Borofsky 1987). Many village rules about hierarchy do not apply to infants and very young children, who are thought to be incapable of comprehension. According to Hocart's study in the Lau region of Fiji, infants are said to be "without minds," and young children are "watery-souled" (Hocart, 1929 p146). As a result, Hocart reports that children are not expected to learn *tabus* (taboos) such as the ban on interaction with parallel cousins until the age of 7. In present-day Yasawan villages, adults say children should learn this *tabu* by 12-13 years (see Supplementary Materials, pp. 1-2).

As is typical in the Pacific (Ritchie and Ritchie 1979) and across the world, Fijian parents are not expected to directly instruct very young children (see also Ochs and Schieffelin 1984), children are not encouraged to ask questions, and they are expected to contribute to household chores from the age of 7-8 (see "milestones" in the Supplement; see also Lancy 2008, Bock 2002, c.f. hunter-gatherer groups: Hewlett and Lamb 2007). In traditional villages in Fiji, legitimate ways of learning include: learning by (a) listening either to an established elder's telling or chatting *(talanoa)* or to rules as frequently repeated by parents (Nabobo-Baba 2006), (b) learning by experience either as a helper who is sometimes corrected (Ritchie and Ritchie 1979), or (c) individually, through pseudo-experimental trial-and-error (Nabobo-Baba 2006). Participants in our interviews occasionally mentioned schooling as a means of learning. However, as elsewhere in Fiji, parents in these villages seem to think of schooling mainly as a means for gaining future employment rather than for success within traditional village life (Brison 2007; Veramu 1992), so that villagers generally rate more-educated individuals as having less knowledge of important domains of work within the village (Henrich and Broesch 2011a). Children must still fulfill an economic role in the household, with priority apparently given to chores over homework (Dakuidreketi 2006, Veramu 1992). This suggests that though formal schooling is admired by many in Fiji, growing up in a Yasawan village is still quite different from growing up in a western, educated, industrialized and rich society (see Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan 2010 for other comparisons).

DOMAINS OF SUCCESS INTERVIEW

To document which domains are the most important for success in village life, we conducted interviews with a randomly selected sample of adults (n = 72), drawn from three villages on Yasawa Island—Teci, Dalomo, and Bukama. In this interview, we asked participants: (Q1) "What are the areas of skill, knowledge or success that make one a well-respected member of the community here?" We also asked participants (Q2) to tell us the most important areas of life for a boy to learn, and (Q3) the same for a girl. Finally, we asked (Q4) how children

learn these skills, and (Q5) what aspects of life parents teach to their children. We use data from this interview in three ways, and review each below. The interview script and additional results are published in Henrich and Broesch (2011b). This interview was completed in Teci and Dalomo villages in 2006-2007, and Bukama village in 2009. The Child Learning Interview was conducted in 2009 in Teci and Dalomo, so that the interviews did not overlap.

First, we used answers to Question 1 make a list of target domains for our Child Learning Interview. This interview was completed in Teci and Dalomo village in 2006-2007, and in Bukama village in 2009. From the list of domains participants mentioned, we selected all those domains that must be learned, eliminating inherited traits (e.g., chiefly status), personal attributes (e.g., kindness), or institutional domains (church and formal education). We also eliminated domains that were so general as to make it infeasible to ask questions about stages of learning, or degree of difficulty (for instance, *sasamaki*, a term which means "cleaning" in general and encompasses a number of more specific chores). To the remaining list, we added two domains we knew to be high skill, and that not every villager is expected to master: captaining a boat (*kavetanitaki ni boto*; males) and traditional medicine (*wainimate vakaviti;* females). Our final list includes eight target domains. For males, the remaining domains are farming *(laulau),* traditional house-building *(tara sue),* and diving *(riu)*. For females they are reef gathering *(vivili) ,* mat-weaving *(tali loga),* and cooking *(vakatoko).*

Second, we used responses about which domains are most important for boys and girls to learn (Q2 and Q3) in order to calculate an "importance to success" variable for each of our target domains. We calculated *importance* as the total number of times a given domain was mentioned in response to Q2 and Q3 (see Table 1). The mean importance score is approximately 27 and the standard deviation is 9.3; the highest possible score is 72. Traditional medicine and boat captaining were never mentioned, so received scores of zero. We suspect that participants neglected to list these domains because only a few men and women in the village master them, so they are not prerequisites for achieving success even if mastering them might be sufficient to command respect among villagers (see Henrich and Broesch 2011b).

Domain	Importance	Gender
Farming	65	M
Weaving	53	F
Cooking	51	F
Diving	23	M
House-building	19	M
Reef gathering	8	F
Trad. Medicine	0	F
Captaining boat	0	M

TABLE 1 Target domains of success, the number of participants who listed each domain as important, and the gender category to which the task typically belongs.

Finally, we coded responses to question four in terms of the *process* by which children learn. We coded for 5 possible learning processes: (1) hearing/listening (*rogoca*), (2) seeing/observing *(tolavia/raica),* (3) doing/practice *(cakava, vuli tara, vakatovotovotaka)*, (4) imitating (*muria*), and (5) being taught. Terms coded as *being taught* include Fijian terms that translate as "taught" *(vakavulica)*, "told" *(tukuni vua, talanoataki)*, "corrected" (*vakadodonutaki),* or "shown" *(vakaraitaki vua).* Of 72 participants, 75% (n = 54) named at least one learning process. Many participants listed more than one learning process, for a total 101 listed learning processes. Some participants described specific learning processes for particular domains, rather than replying generally about all domains. We developed the Child Learning interview with a focus on documenting this type of domain-specific variation in the processes, sources, and life history trajectory of cultural learning.

CHILD LEARNING INTERVIEW

In a structured interview we asked a random sample of adults in Teci and Dalomo villages (n=44; 21 male) questions about how boys and girls learn different skills that are crucial to success in village life, from whom they learn, and at what age. We asked specifically about the eight target skills from the Domains of Success interview. We also asked about the expected ages for a number of developmental milestones, as well as more open-ended questions about what sort of work children should do for the household, and at what ages (see Supplementary Materials).

We present several types of data from this interview. First, participants were asked eight questions in the format "How does a boy/girl learn to do X?," where X is one of the target domains. The question is intentionally vague, so that participants could name a process of learning (see/hear/do/imitate/teach), a source or pathway of transmission (parents/grandparents/friends/elders), or both. Participants were not compelled to answer in terms of social learning, but most did. Participants could have provided zero, one, or more than one pathway of transmission and/or process for each domain about which we asked. Three participants never suggested any pathways of transmission so were dropped from these analyses. We collected a total of n = 293 responses about transmission pathways for the target domains. The minimum number of responses about pathways for any domain in our sample was 34 and the maximum was 38. For responses about processes of learning, we collected a total of n = 105 instances. The minimum number of responses about process for any domain in our sample was 9 and the maximum was 17. To code processes of learning, we used the same coding scheme as in the Domains of Success interview. To transform data on sources of learning into data on pathways of transmission, we coded

learning from parents and grandparents as “vertical” transmission, learning from peers or siblings as “horizontal” transmission, and learning from more distant relatives, elders, villagers, experts, and others as “oblique” transmission.

For both the process and pathway data, we calculated the frequency of our focal variable (e.g., vertical transmission) over all relevant responses (e.g., all responses mentioning any source of learning), per domain. This created the *pathway* variables: frequency of vertical, oblique, and horizontal transmission, and the *process* variables: frequency of transmission through seeing, hearing, doing, imitating, or by teaching. For data on the rates of teaching by kin category, we calculated the number of times teaching was mentioned in conjunction with that kin type, divided by the total number of times that kin type was mentioned as the source or pathway of learning in conjunction with any process of learning, for each domain.

We also asked, for each target domain: “At what age should a boy/girl begin to learn to do X?” We use these data as “start age” estimates for the target domains. In a separate open-ended question, we asked: “What type of work should a boy/girl do for the household? At what age should they begin?” Participants provided as many domains of work as they pleased, along with an age estimate. We use these data as “start age” estimates for 10 additional domains. We also asked participants about whether parents “should directly teach it” *(e dodonu me vakatavulica ga)* their children anything, whether there is anything boys and girls must learn from peers, and whether there is anything that boys and girls must learn from adults other than their parents (see Supplementary Materials). The question on teaching was asked using a Fijian translation for “teach” *(vakavulica)* that is roughly equivalent to the every-day use of the word teach in English. Literally, *vakavulica* translates as “cause to learn it.” This meaning is achieved by using a causative particle, “vaka,” and the transitive form of the base that means “learn,” *(vulica).* In contrast, the response “learn by doing” is “vuli tara,” translating literally as *learn-do.* We used the Fijian intensifier “directly” *(ga)* in order to encourage participants to focus on the act of teaching rather than the expected general influence of adults on children’s learning. This treatment of teaching is meant to parallel what anthropologists mean by teaching.

DIFFICULTY RANKING INTERVIEW

We used responses from the Child Learning interview to create an inclusive list of domains to be learned, including the eight target domains and any categories of work listed in response to the open-ended question about types of work children should do for the household. We then asked randomly selected adult participants (n=16) to rank these 25 tasks according to difficulty in terms of (a) skill and (b) strength. Since these participants are not familiar with pen and paper rankings, we used a stack of index cards with task names printed on them, and guided participants through a series of forced pair-comparisons for each successive domain. The end result is a linear ranking from most difficult to least difficult. Participants were then asked to look over the entire ranking from “high difficulty” to “low difficulty,” and were permitted to make changes. Finally, we recorded the ranks on a paper data sheet. The index cards were shuffled between tasks, and the order in which participants did the skill and strength difficulty rankings was counterbalanced. We use the mean skill and physical difficulty rankings per domain in our analyses, reverse-scored so that a larger number indicates higher difficulty, with a possible range of 1 to 25.

All three interviews were translated and back-translated by research assistants who are native speakers of Standard Fijian. The interviews were administered with the help of these research assistants. Some of the terms used for the difficulty ranking task were in the local Teci dialect of Fijian, which differs from Standard Fijian. The first author coded responses to the Domains of Success and Child Learning interviews, using both the original Fijian

responses as well as English translations done by research assistants. She resolved discrepancies in translation using Gatty's (2009) Fijian to English dictionary when necessary.

RESULTS

We combined data from the Domains of Success, Child Learning, and Difficulty Ranking interviews to test key predictions drawn from theory on the evolution of teaching and social and cultural learning. First, we focus on predictions about the prevalence and strategic use of teaching. Second, we examine the roles of vertical and oblique transmission with respect to the two-stage model of the life history of cultural learning.

TEACHING

We found substantial variation in reports of teaching across the domains we studied. In the Child Learning interview, across all eight target domains, we found that teaching was listed as a learning process an average 42.6% of the time, ranging from 21.4% for boat piloting to 66.6% for mat-weaving. This is roughly equivalent to the cross-domain average for learning by "seeing" (43.3%), which was the most common process of transmission listed for boat piloting (78.6%), farming (tied with "doing" at 41.7%), house-building (52.9%), and traditional medicine (tied with teaching at 44.4%). In our Domains of Success interview, where we only asked *generally* how children learn important skills or knowledge, participants named teaching as a process less often (17.8%), and were more likely to list "seeing" (33.6%) or "imitating" (22.7%). Learning by doing was also a common response (18.8%). These results demonstrate that teaching rates are variable across domains, even if teaching is generally rare.

We also asked participants whether there are things parents must teach their children directly. The most common response, made by 42 of 44 participants, translates as the "customs/ways of the people of the land," (*i tovo/i valavala vakavanua)* and refers generally to knowledge of ritual traditions, and respectful behavior expected from those living in a Fijian village. Participants could name more than one domain—the next most common response was "ways of dress" (*sulusulu,* n = 13). All other responses were named by fewer than 10 participants: to speak well (*vosavosa vinaka;* n = 8), school-related behaviors or habits (*vuli;* n = 5), church or religious beliefs (*lotu,* n = 5), hairstyles (*kotikoti*; n = 4), knowledge of kinship or relatives (*veiwekani;* n = 2), and to listen, which sometimes implies both listening and obeying (*rogoca*, n = 2). In a follow-up question in the same interview, many participants said that if parents did not teach these things to their children, the results could be social conflict, drug use, and even jail time. None of the target domains was mentioned even once in response to this question, despite the relatively high reported rates of teaching when we asked specifically about how each domain is learned. This illustrates the importance of using a variety of interview approaches.

To test hypothesis 1, we examined the relationship between the frequency of vertical, horizontal, and oblique transmission with the frequency of teaching, using linear regressions on data for the target domains (n = 8; see Table 2). As predicted, we found that domains that are more likely to be transmitted vertically are also more likely to be taught (see Fig. 1a), and that domains that are more likely to be transmitted obliquely are less likely to be taught (see Fig. 1b). We found no effect for horizontal transmission on teaching rates—this is expected given the rarity of horizontal transmission for the target domains.



FIGURE 1A Results from a linear regression predicting rates of teaching from rates of vertical transmission. **1B** The results of a linear regression predicting rates of teaching from rates of oblique transmission. Data for both graphs are based on n = 8 domains, and error bars represent standard error. Letters indicate particular domains. B = boat piloting, H = housebuilding, D = diving, F = farming, R = reef gathering, M = Fijian medicine, C = cooking, and W = weaving.

IV	Coeff.	P	R^2	Bootstrap SE
% vertical transmission	.3754	.026	.59	.1326
% oblique transmission	-.3178	.048	.51	.1449
% horizontal transmission	-.4076	.312	.17	1.9525

TABLE 2 Results of linear regressions predicting teaching rates for each domain (n = 8) from rates of transmission by a given pathway within each domain. Bootstrap standard errors are based on 10,000 repetitions.

We also examined whether relatedness between teacher and pupil is positively associated with rate of teaching. We found that parents were the most likely to teach, with teaching mentioned 74.3 percent of the time that parents were listed as a source of social learning (n = 250). Elders were the next most common teachers (50%, n = 85), followed by grandparents (43%, n = 53), and experts (33.3%, n = 59) and peers (33.3%, n = 36). Formal schooling (n = 7), villagers in general (n = 6), siblings (n = 2), uncles (n = 2), and other individuals (n = 3) were never associated with teaching (see Fig. 3). In calculating these figures, we treated responses with no mention of pathway as missing data. Only parents were positively associated with teaching at a statistically significant level (χ^2= 16.98, p = 0.000). We also tested for an overall effect of genetic relatedness on the rate of teaching

across all kin types. Three levels of relatedness are represented in the kin types participants offered: r = 0.50 (parents), r = 0.25 (siblings, grandparents), and r = 0, or background relatedness (elders, experts, peers, villagers in general, school, others). Testing across these kin types (n = 9) using a linear regression, we did not find that relatedness predicts teaching rates (Coeff = 44.15, p = 0.348, R^2 = 0.13). The results do not change qualitatively if we cluster our analysis by clustering according to the transmission pathway for each kin type, or if we control for pathway of transmission using dummy variables.



FIGURE 3 The rates of teaching, for each kin type. Typical genetic relatedness *(r)* for a kin type is indicated by shading. Error bars represent standard error.

For hypothesis 2, we tested whether high-skill domains were positively associated with teaching, using linear regressions on data for the target domains (n=8). Because small sample sizes render p-values unreliable, we also calculated the bootstrapped Standard Errors. We found that neither skill difficulty nor strength difficulty ratings alone predict a greater role for teaching (see Table 3). However, when we control for the pathway of transmission by including the rate of vertical transmission in the models, the coefficient for skill difficulty nearly doubles in size, and the p-values become marginally significant. In addition, the bootstrapped SE suggests our findings are statistically significant, and the regression accounts for 77 percent of the variation. As expected, controlling for transmission pathway does not alter the results for models of physically demanding tasks, and none of the results we present here change qualitatively if we control for rate of oblique transmission rather than for vertical transmission. Controlling for domain importance does not change the outcome of the models. However, boat piloting is an outlier in the skill difficulty model, and removing boat piloting improves the model results (see caption, Table 3). This may be because, like learning to drive a car, learning to drive a boat requires automatizing a number of complex, embodied routines. Thus actually learning to drive the boat requires hours of practice, whether or not certain principles are taught.

For hypothesis 3, we investigated whether the importance of a domain is associated with higher rates of teaching, using linear regressions based on data for our target domains (n = 8). As predicted, we found that the importance of a domain to success in village life is a strong predictor of rates of teaching (see Table 3). Controlling for importance does not improve the regression models testing the effects of skill difficulty on teaching rates.

Independent Variables	Coef.	P	R^2	Bootstrap SE	ß
skill difficulty	.0085	.503	.08	.0193	.279
physical difficulty	-.0003	.973	.00	.0090	-.014
importance to success	.0039	.038	.54	.0020	.734
skill difficulty	.0132	.104	.77	.0151	.432
% vertical transmission	.4135	.012		.1861	.846
skill difficulty	.0056	.563	.57	.0238	.183
importance to success	.0038	.062		.0037	
physical difficulty	.0032	.646	.61	.0386	.139
% vertical transmission	.3885	.039		2.5159	
physical difficulty	-.0058	.426	.60	.0651	-.257
importance to success	.0043	.041		.0071	.811

TABLE 3 Results of linear regressions predicting teaching rates per domain (n = 8) from skill and physical difficulty per domain, and from the domain's importance to success. Bootstrap standard errors are based on 10,000 repetitions. Without boat piloting in the sample, the regression of teaching on skill difficulty improves (r = .013, SE = .0066, p = .108; n = 7).

LIFE HISTORY AND PATHWAYS OF TRANSMISSION

We now evaluate three additional hypotheses based on the two-stage model of the life history of cultural learning. Here, we use logistic regressions with individual-level data on the target domains to test whether the age at which a domain is first learned affects the probability of its being learned through a particular pathway of transmission—vertical, oblique, or horizontal (see Table 4). As predicted, we found that domains that are learned later in life are less likely to be transmitted vertically, and more likely to be transmitted

obliquely (see Fig. 4). Horizontal transmission remains rare compared to oblique and vertical transmission, and has a weak negative association with start age. Responses that included no information about transmission pathway were treated as missing data, so that 3 participants were dropped and responses from 41 participants were included. We calculated bootstrap standard errors using 10,000 repetitions.



FIGURE 4 The results of a logistic regression predicting the probability of transmission by three possible pathways from the age at which individuals start to learn a task, clustered by individual. Pathways are distinguishable by shading, which represents 95% confidence intervals.

Dependent variables	OR	P	*Pseudo* R^2	Bootstrap SE
Probability of vertical transmission	.8329	.000	.08	.0336
(clustered by domain)		(.000)		(.0385)
(clustered by individual)		(.000)		(.0433)
Probability of oblique transmission	1.1645	.000	.07	.0389
(clustered by domain)		(.001)		(.0531)
(clustered by individual)		(.001)		(.0566)
Probability of horizontal transmission	.9109	.048	.02	.0395
(clustered by domain)		(.011)		(.0395)
(clustered by individual)		(.019)		(.0385)

TABLE 4 Results from logistic regressions predicting rates of transmission by a given pathway within each domain (n = 8) from the age at which each domain is first learned. DV = dependent variables and IV = independent variables. Bootstrap standard errors are based on 10,000 repetitions. Both bootstrap SE and p-values are clustered first by domain (n = 8) and then by participant (n = 41).

We used linear regressions to examine the effect of skill and physical difficulty on the age at which children begin to learn a given domain (see Table 5). We found that later start ages are associated with tasks requiring greater skill, but not with task requiring greater physical strength (see Fig. 5). We used estimates of starting age (n = 499) for 18 domains of learning, including our eight target domains. We also calculated bootstrap standard error using 10,000 repetitions.



FIGURE 5 The results of a linear regression predicting skill difficulty for each domain (n = 18) from the age at which individuals start to learn each domain. Regressions are based on n = 499 total start age estimates, but we plot only the mean of each domain here. Error bars represent standard error.

Dependent variables	Coeff.	P	R^2	Bootstrap SE
Skill difficulty	*.5867226*	0.000	*0.23*	.0521202
(clustered by domain)		0.001		.1468016
(clustered by individual)		0.000		.0627212
Strength difficulty	*-.0074517*	0.889	*0.00*	.0547475
(clustered by domain)		0.969		.1828365
(clustered by individual)		0.861		.0418773

TABLE 5 Results for linear regressions predicting skill and strength difficulty of each domain from the age at which each domain is first learned. Bootstrap standard errors are based on 10,000 repetitions. Bootstrap SE and p-values are clustered first by domain (n = 8) and then by participant (n = 41).

Finally, we used logistic regressions to examine the effect of skill and physical difficulty on the probability of the target domains being transmitted through a given pathway (see Table 6). We found that vertical transmission is common for tasks of all skill levels, but less so as task difficulty increases. In contrast, oblique transmission is unlikely for low-skill tasks, and becomes more likely with increasing task difficulty. Horizontal transmission is common for low-skill tasks but quickly becomes rare as task difficulty increases (see Fig. 6). Participants could and often did name more than one pathway of transmission per domain. This suggests that multiple pathways of transmission are often active for a single domain, and that the pathways are not mutually exclusive. As a result, the probabilities for all three pathways do

not sum to 1. Three participants did not provide any information on transmission pathways, so the analysis was based on 293 responses from 41 participants. To correct for non-independence of data, we clustered our analyses first by domain and then by individual. We calculated bootstrap standard error using 10,000 repetitions.



FIGURE 6 The results of a logistic regression predicting the probability of transmission by three possible pathways within a domain from skill difficulty of each domain (n = 8), clustered by individual. Pathways are distinguishable by shading, which represent 95% confidence intervals.

IV	DV	OR	P	Pseudo R^2	Bootstrap SE
Skill difficulty	Probability of vertical transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	.9572423	0.173 0.619 0.165	*0.01*	.0072105 .0459718 .00583
Skill difficulty	Probability of oblique transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	1.1645	0.000 0.001 0.009	*0.07*	.0072678 .0495895 .0058486
Skill difficulty	Probability of horizontal transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	.7854974	0.000 0.000 0.000	*0.19*	.0325593 .2081045 .0337617
Strength difficulty	Probability of vertical transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	.9670268	0.130 0.614 0.104	*0.01*	.0217899 .1231131 .0199454
Strength difficulty	Probability of oblique transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	1.052263	0.019 0.515 0.008	*0.01*	.0231051 .0822643 .0197153
Strength difficulty	Probability of horizontal transmission (clustered by domain) (clustered by individual)	.9589141	0.216 0.627 0.215	*0.01*	.0343322 .2270903 .0339041

TABLE 6 The results of logistic regressions predicting the probability of transmission by a given pathway within a domain from the skill and strength difficulty of each domain. Bootstrap standard errors are based on 10,000 repetitions. Both bootstrap SE and p-values are clustered first by domain (n = 18) and then by participant (n = 41).

DISCUSSION

TEACHING IS IMPORTANT

Our efforts illustrate the value of bringing specific evolutionary hypotheses to bear on the question of teaching. We found that teaching is more common than the existing ethnographic literature would (qualitatively) suggest, for instance in discussions of "the absence of teaching" outside western societies (Lancy and Grove 2010, see Hewlett et al. 2011 for review). Our findings are based on interviews about cultural learning in a fishing and horticultural village in the Yasawa region of the Fijian Islands. This region of the world contrasts with western societies in that teaching is not a privileged way of learning. Our findings are in this sense surprising. Across village "domains of success," 43% of responses about *process* of transmission elected teaching. However, our findings are reconcilable with the existing literature on teaching, especially when considered in the light of the evolutionary hypotheses we test. We found teaching was more common in domains that were more important to success in village life. Because our investigation was already limited to areas

that villagers deemed important to success in village life, this may help to explain our generally high rates of reported teaching across domains. In addition, our rates may be higher than those in the existing literature on human teaching because we used a broad definition of teaching, including Fijian terms for being told, being shown, being corrected, and the literal translation of "teach." This approach focuses on the adaptive function of teaching—to facilitate learning in others—and is more like that used by researchers in animal behavior (e.g., Hoppitt & Laland 2008) than those used by either psychologists or anthropologists. In addition, in the Child Learning interview we asked specific questions about how particular domains are learned, and as a result we obtained a number of different rates of teaching. In response to a more general question about how children learn in our Domains of Success interview, participants were much less likely to talk about teaching—82% of the learning processes named by participants were something other than teaching. The discrepancy between reported rates of teaching for specific domains versus learning in general highlights one source of disagreement between theory and empirical research on teaching—while the theory focuses on the specific conditions under which teaching is adaptive and should therefore be common, the empirical record consists mostly of general claims made at the level of entire cultural groups.

Our data on teaching shows that its frequency is predicted by several factors. First, the identity of the potential teacher matters: vertical transmission is strongly associated with teaching, and parents are especially likely to teach. These findings are consistent with evolutionary predictions based on inclusive fitness and kin selection, despite the fact that we did not find a statistically significant main effect of relatedness on teaching rates. This may be because the open-ended nature of our questions resulted in only seven kin types being mentioned, and a significant effect is unlikely with such a small sample size. Alternatively, relatedness effects may in reality be small compared to the effects of proximity to available teachers, domain skill level, age of the pupil, and the importance of the domain. A study that more specifically targets questions of who teaches whom, or one that includes the costs incurred by teachers might clarify this result. We focused instead on open-ended questions about "how" children learn in order to allow participants to indicate that children learn-by-doing or through other non-social means.

We found evidence that tasks which are more difficult in terms of skill but not in terms of strength are more likely to be taught, controlling for transmission pathway. We also found that importance of the domain for success is a strong predictor of rates of teaching. These findings suggest that teaching should be most common in domains that are important for every child to master, and that are also difficult to learn. In short, teaching should be most prevalent in domains that have the greatest impact on the pupil's evolutionary fitness.

NON-VERTICAL TRANSMISSION IS IMPORTANT

We found that domains for which learning begins early in life are more likely to be vertically transmitted, while domains for which learning begins later in life are more likely to be transmitted obliquely. This supports what has been called the two-stage life history of learning (Henrich and Broesch 2011; Henrich 2004), or the more general view that as patterns of social interaction change over the lifespan, so do sources of social and cultural learning, and the resulting patterns of cultural variation (Aunger 2000). This finding is important because it resolves the apparent contradiction between theory, which suggests that non-vertical transmission should be common, and the empirical record, which documents that in non-western small-scale societies, everything is learned from the parents. It also supports a more complex interpretation of the existing literature, suggesting that when people are asked "who did you learn X from," they are likely to list the person they first learned from, without mentioning the people from whom they later learned additional skills.

This explains why early research found such a strong role for parents—it is likely that participants were thinking only of early learning experiences. By asking about societal norms and by including skills that are acquired late in life—such as traditional medicine, piloting a boat, and house-building—we were able to circumvent this issue and get a broader view of cultural learning across the life history.

We found that domains learned later in life were also more difficult in terms of skill, but not in terms of physical strength. This impacts the study of the life history of cultural learning in several ways. First, this suggests that the long juvenile period is not primarily an adaptation for learning high-skill tasks, since the most difficult tasks in terms of skill are learned the latest in life. Alternatively, high-skill tasks may come with many prerequisite skills, and those skills might be learned during the juvenile period. This does not rule out the juvenile period as an adaptation for learning other aspects of a complex cultural world, however, because our questions focused on tangible tasks like horticulture, gathering, manufacturing artifacts, and other household work. On the other hand, this complicates the debate about whether skill or strength constrains children's subsistence efforts. It may be that for a given task, strength rather than skill limitations prevent a child from being as efficient as an adult (e.g., in reef-gathering: Bird and Bliege-Bird 2002, Bliege-Bird and Bird 2002). However, this may be the case only because high skill tasks are not attempted in early and middle childhood, so that the skill constraint is demonstrated through *which tasks* children attempt rather than their performance in any particular task. However, this explanation ought to apply equally to high-strength tasks—a trend which our data do not support. Finally, the delayed onset of learning complex skills, paired with the finding that such skills are more likely to be transmitted obliquely, suggests an alternative interpretation. If high-skill tasks are best learned from experts, and experts are rare and hard to approach, high-skill tasks may be learned later in life not only because of children's cognitive constraints, but rather due to social constraints in children's access to experts.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, our findings support predictions made by theories of cultural evolution, and the two-phase approach to the life history of cultural learning. We found that teaching was a strategic component of cultural transmission, and was spontaneously offered by interviewees as one process of learning among many. We also found that patterns in the frequency of teaching can be explained by evolutionary reasoning—teaching is more common among kin, and when the expected benefits to the pupil are high. We also found that vertical transmission is important, but not the only means by which key domains are learned. In fact, high-skill domains or domains learned late in life are learned primarily from non-parents. Given our findings here, future research should focus on examining the tradeoffs between the cost of teaching and the benefits that may be derived by the teacher—including kinship benefits or prestige deference exchange. In addition, researchers should focus on how different pathways of transmission correspond to changes in social interaction networks throughout the life history, and how these changes may affect the likelihood of teaching. Since teaching is in theory a cooperative problem (Thornton and Raihani 2008), further progress might be made in studying the social norms which promote or discourage teaching and other information-sharing behaviors (see Henrich 2009). Further, anthropologists and psychologists can benefit from the literature on teaching in non-human animals, and on research into the cognitive bases of teaching, both of which uses evolutionary theory to classify different types of teaching. Since both these fields lack a thorough cross-cultural perspective on the range of teaching behaviors and the variety of situations in which humans do teach, ethnographers have a great deal to offer in return. This would lead to a richer, more accurate picture of cross-cultural variation in teaching and the life history of cultural transmission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was completed as part of a project funded by a National Institute of Health Challenge Grant, a National Science Foundation GRFP, National Science Foundation PECASE, Social Science Research Council (Canada), and a Leakey Foundation General Research Grant. We thank the UCLA Experimental Behavioral Anthropology lab group for useful feedback, and Cristina Moya for sharing scripts for plotting in R. We thank Melaia Velamei, Paula Tekei, and Joji Savou for their excellent work as research assistants, and the people of Teci, Dalomo, and Bukama villages for their participation and generous hospitality.

REFERENCES

Aoki, K., Lehmann, L., Feldman M.W., 2011. Rates of cultural change and patterns of cultural accumulation in stochastic models of social transmission. *Theoretical Population Biology* 79, 192-202.

Aunger, R. (2000). The Life History of Culture Learning in a Face-to-Face Society. *Ethos*.

Arno, A. Disentangling Indirectly: The Joking Debate in Fijian Social Control. In: Watson-Gegeo, K.A. and White, G.M (Eds.) *Disentangling, Conflict Discourse in Pacific Societies.* Stanford U Press, Stanford. 1990.

Bender, C., D. Herzing, and D. Bjorklund. 2009. Evidence of teaching in atlantic spotted dolphins (Stenella frontalis) by mother dolphins foraging in the presence of their calves. *Animal cognition* 12:43-53.

Bird, D. W., and Bliege-Bird, R. (2002). Children on the reef: slow learning or strategic foraging *Human Nature*, *13*(2), 269–297.

Bliege-Bird, R., and Bird, D. W. (2002). Constraints of knowing or constraints of growing?: Fishing and collecting by the children of Mer. *Human Nature*, *13*(2), 239–267.

Boesch, C. 1991. Teaching among wild chimpanzees. *Anim. Behav.* 41:830.

Bock, J. 2002. Learning, Life History, and Productivity: Children's Lives in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *Human Nature* 12:161-197.

Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. (1995). Why does culture increase human adaptability? *Ethology and Sociobiology* 16, 125-143.

Boyd, R., & P. J. Richerson (1996) Why culture is common but cultural evolution is rare, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 88: 73–96.

Boyd, R. and P.J. Richerson. (2005). *Not by Genes Alone: How Culture Transformed Human Evolution.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Boyd, R., Richerson, P.J., & Henrich, J. (2011) The Cultural Niche: Why social learning is essential for human adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*. *108,* 10918-10925.

Boyer, P. (1998). Cognitive tracks of cultural inheritance: how evolved intuitive ontology governs cultural transmission. *American Anthropologist*, *100*(4), 876–889.

Borofsky, R. 1987. *Making History: Pukapukan and anthropological constructions of knowledge.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brison, K. T. 1999. Hierarchy in the World of Fijian Children. *Ethnology*, *38*(2), 97–119.

Brison, K. T. 2007. Imagining Modernity in Rural Fiji. *Ethnology* 42:335-348.

Caro, T. 1980. Predatory behaviour in domestic cat mothers. *Behaviour* 74:128-148.

Caro, T., and Hauser, M. 1992. Is there teaching in nonhuman animals *Quarterly Review of Biology*, *67*(2), 24.

Cavalli-Sforza, L.L., and M.W. Feldman. Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative Approach, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1981.

Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. & M. W. Feldman. 1983. Paradox of the evolution of communication and social interactivity. Proceedings of the National Academies of Science (USA), 80, 2017-2021.

Coy, M. 1989. *Apprenticeship: from Theory to Methods and Back Again.* Albany: SUNY Albany Press.

Csibra, G. (2007). Teachers in the wild. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(3), 95–96.

Csibra, G., and Gergely, G. (2009). Natural pedagogy. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *13*(4), 148–153.

Dakuidreketi, M.R. 2006. *Contexts of Science Teaching and Learning in Fiji Primary Schools: A Comparative Study of Ethnic Fijian and Indo-Fijian Communities.*

Gaskins, S., and Paradise, Ruth. (2010). Learning through Observation in Daily Life. In D. F.

Enquist, M., Eriksson, K., et al. (2007). Critical Social Learning: A Solution to Rogers's Paradox of Nonadaptive Culture. *American Anthropologist* 109, 727-734.

Ewer, R. 1969. The Instinct to Teach. *Nature* 222: 698.

Feldman, M. W., K. Aoki and J. Kumm, (1996) Individual versus social learning: Evolutionary analysis in a fluctuating environment, Santa Fe Institute Working Paper

Gatty, Ronald. (2009). Fijian-English Dictionary: with notes on Fijian Culture and Natural History. Suva, Fiji: Oceania Printers Ltd.

Gergely, G. & G. Csibra. 2006. Sylvia's The role of imitation and pedagogy in the transmission of cultural knowledge. In: N.J. Enfield & S.C. Levenson (Eds.) *Roots of Human*

Sociality: Culture, Cognition, and Human interaction (pp. 229-255), Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Gergely, G. & G. Csibra. (2011) Natural pedagogy and an evolutionary adaptation. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 366, 1149-1157.

Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the child's environment? A group socialization theory of development. *Psychological Review*, *102*(3), 458–489.

Harris, J.R. (1998) The Nurture Assumption: *Why Children Turn Out the Way They Do.* New York: The Free Press.

Henrich, J. (2009) The evolution of costly displays, cooperation, and religion: Credibility enhancing displays and their implications for cultural evolution. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 30,* 244-260.

Henrich, J. & Boyd, R. (1998). The evolution of conformist transmission and the emergence of between-group differences. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 19, 215-241.

Henrich, J, and Broesch, J. (2011a). On the nature of cultural transmission networks: evidence from Fijian villages for adaptive learning biases. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *366*(1567), 1139–1148.

Henrich, J., & Broesch, J. (2011). Electronic Supplementary Information (ESM) for On the Nature of Cultural Transmission Networks. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*: Biological Sciences, 366(1567).

Henrich, J, Ensminger, J., Mcelreath, R., Barr, A., Barrett, C., Bolyanatz, A., Cardenas, J. C., et al. (2010a). Markets, Religion, Community Size, and the Evolution of Fairness and Punishment. *Science*, *327*(5972), 1480–1484. doi:10.1126/science.1182238

Henrich, Joseph, and Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: freely conferred deference as a mechanisms for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *22*, 165–196.

Henrich, J.& Henrich, N. (2010) The Evolution of Cultural Adaptations: Fijian food taboos protect against dangerous marine toxins. *Proceedings of the Royal Society: Biological Sciences*, *277,* 3715-3724

Henrich, Joseph, and Mcelreath, Richard. (2003). The evolution of cultural evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology Issues News and Reviews*, *12*(3), 123–135.

Henrich, Joseph, Heine, S. J., and Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *33*(2-3), 61–83.

Hewlett, Barry S, and Cavalli-Sforza, L. L. (1986). Cultural Transmission among Aka Pygmies. *American Anthropologist*, *88*(4), 922–934.

Hewlett, B.S., and M.E. Lamb. (2007) *Hunter-Gatherer Childhoods: Evolutionary, Development, and Cultural Perspectives.*New Brunswick, N.J: Aldine Transactions.

Hewlett, B S, Fouts, H. N., Boyette, A. H., and Hewlett, B L. (2011). Social learning among Congo Basin hunter-gatherers. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *366*(1567), 1168–1178.

Hocart, A.M. *Lau Islands, Fiji.* Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum, 1929

Hoppitt, W., & Laland, K. (2008). Social processes influencing learning in animals: a review of the evidence. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*.

Hoppitt, W. J. E., G. R. Brown, R. Kendal, L. Rendell, A. Thornton, M. M. Webster & K. N. Laland (2008) Lessons from animal teaching, *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 23, 486-493.

Jaswal, Vikram K, Croft, A Carrington, Setia, Alison R, & Caitlin A Cole, 2010. Young children have a specific, highly robust bias to trust testimony. Psychological Science, 21, 1541-1547.

Kameda, T. & Nakanishi, D. (2003). Does social/cultural learning increase human adaptability? Rogers's question revisited. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 24, 242-260.

Koenig, M., & Harris, P. (2007). The Basis of Epistemic Trust: Reliable Testimony or Reliable Sources *Episteme*, *4*(3), 264–284.

Kruuk, H. and and M. Turner. 1967. Comparative notes on predation by lion, leopard, cheetah and wild dog in the Serengeti area, East Africa. *Mammalia* 31: 1-127.

Lancy, D. Anthropology of childhood: cherubs, chattel, changelings, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.

Lancy, D. and Grove, M.A. The role of adults in children's learning. (2010). In D. F. Lancy, J. Bock, and S. Gaskins (Eds.), *The Anthropology of Learning in Childhood*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Lopez, J.C. and D. Lopez. 1985. Killer whales of Patagonia and the behavior of intentional stranding while hunting nearshore. *Mammalia* 66: 181-183.

Macdonald, K. (2007). Cross-cultural Comparison of Learning in Human Hunting. *Human Nature*, *18*(4), 386–402.

McElreath, R, and Strimling, P. (2008). When natural selection favors imitation of parents. *Current Anthropology*, *49*(2), 307–316.

McElreath, Richard, Boyd, R., and Richerson, P. J. (2003). Shared norms and the evolution of ethnic markers. *Current Anthropology*, *44*(1), 122–129.

Nabobo-Baba, U. (2006). *Knowing & Learning: An Indigenous Fijian Approach.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies Press.

Nakahashi W., Wakano, J. & Henrich, J. (forthcoming) Conditions for Conformist Transmission: Spatial Variation and the number of cultural traits favors conformist biases over individual learning, unbiased transmission, and payoff biased transmission. *Human Nature.*

Nayacakalou, R. *Leadership in Fiji.* Oxford U Press, Melbourne, 1975

Ochs, E., B.B. Schieffelin. Language Acquisition and Socialization. In: RA Shweder and RA Levine (Eds), *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion*. Cambridge U Press, Cambridge, 1984.

Ohmagari, K., and Berkes, F. (1997). Transmission of indigenous knowledge and bush skills among the Western James Bay Cree women of subarctic Canada. *Human Ecology*, *25*(2), 197–222.

Perreault, Charles, Moya Cristina, and Boyd Robert. In press. A Bayesian approach to the evolution of social learning, *Evolution and Human Behavior*.

Ravuvu, A. *The Fijian Way*. U South Pacific Press, Suva, 1983.

Rendell, L., Fogarty, L., et al. (2010). Rogers' paradox recast and resolved: Population structure and the evolution of social learning strategies. *Evolution* 64, 534-548.

Reyes-Garcia, V., Broesch, J., Calvet-Mir, L., Fuentes-Peláez, N., McDade, T. W., Parsa, S., Tanner, S., et al. (2009). Cultural transmission of ethnobotanical knowledge and skills: an empirical analysis from an Amerindian society. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *30*(4), 274–285. Elsevier Inc. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.02.001

Richerson, P.J. and R. Boyd. (1985). *Culture and the Evolutionary Process*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ritchie, JB, JE Ritchie. *Growing up in Polynesia.* Little Hampton Book Svc, 1979

Rogers, A. R. (1988). Does biology constrain culture? *American Anthropologist* 90, 819-831.

Rogoff, B., Paradise, R, Arauz, R., Correa-Chávez, M., and Angelillo, C. (2003). Firsthand learning through intent participation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*(1), 175–203.

Sahlins, M.D. (1962). Moala: Culture and nature on a Fijian island. *University of Michigan Press.*

Schaller, G.B. 1967. *The deer and the tiger*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Shennan, S., and Steele, J. (1999). Cultural learning in hominids: A behavioural ecological approach. *Mammalian Social Learning: Comparative and Ecological.*

Sperber, D. Explaining culture: A naturalistic approach. Blackwell Publishing, London, 1996.

Sperber, D., F. Clement, C. Heintz, O. Mascaro, H. Mercier, G. Origgi & D. Wilson (2010) Epistemic vigilance, *Mind & Language*, 25, 359–393

Sperber, D. & D. Wilson. 1995. *Relevance: communication and cognition, 2nd edition.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Strauss, C. 1984. Beyond" formal" versus" informal" education: uses of psychological theory in anthropological research. *Ethos*:195-222.

Thornton, A., and N. Raihani. 2008. The evolution of teaching. *Animal Behaviour* 75:1823-1836.

Thornton, A., and K. McAuliffe. 2006. Teaching in wild meerkats. *Science* 313:227-229.

Thornton, A., Raihani, N., and Radford, A. (2007). Teachers in the wild: some clarification. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*(7), 272–273.

Tomasello, M., Carpenter, M., Call, J., Behne, T., and Moll, H. (2005). Understanding sharing intentions: the origins of cultural cognition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *28*, 675–735.

Toren, C. *Making Sense of Hierarchy*. Atlantic Highlands: Athlone Press, 1990

Toren, C. *Mind, Materiality, and History.* Taylor and Francis, 1999.

Veramu, J. 1992. *Let's Do it Our Way: A Case Study of Participatory education in a Rural Fijian School and Community.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies Press.

Wakano, J. Y. & Aoki, K. (2007). Do social learning and conformist bias coevolve? Henrich and Boyd revisited. *Theoretical Population Biology* 72, 504-512.

White, C.M. (2007). Schooling in Fiji. In: C Campbell and G Sherington (Eds) *Going to School in Oceania.* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

ELECTRONIC SUPPLEMENT for

TEACHING AND THE LIFE HISTORY OF CULTURAL TRANSMISSION IN FIJIAN VILLAGES

Michelle Kline[a,b]

Robert Boyd[a,b,]

Joseph Henrich[c]

[a] Department of Anthropology, University of California Los Angeles, CA 90095

[b] Center for Behavior, Evolution, and Culture, University of California Los Angeles, CA 90095

[c] Departments of Psychology and Economics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z4

DEVELOPMENTAL MILESTONES

In the Child Learning interview, we asked participants (n = 44, 21 male) about the ages at which children should reach a variety of developmental milestones. We present those responses in terms of age in years, below. This background information may help readers to appropriately interpret our data as presented in the paper, and in comparison to phenomena at their own field sites.

We also asked at what age boys and girls should learn about proper relationships with their *veitacini*. While this Fijian term can mean more generally siblings of the same sex (see Gatty 2009), in the Yasawa Islands it also refers to a *tabu* (taboo) relationship between parallel cousins. *Parallel cousins* here are defined as the children of two same-sex siblings, so this category includes the children of two brothers, or the children of two sisters. In some cases, the descendants of two *veitacini* may also consider each other *veitacini*. Adults whose relationship falls into this category are prohibited from making social contact with each other, including talking or looking at each other, as well as referring to one another in their absence. Hocart (1929) reported that Fijian children in the Lau Islands were supposed to learn this *tabu* by the age of 7–our data show that Yasawan children are currently expected to learn these social restrictions much later in life, on average.

For our questions on the ages at which children "become a man/woman," we used culturally relevant categories of "young man" (*sauravou*) and "young woman" (vulau). These terms are used in daily life to refer to young, unmarried individuals from teenagers to until approximately age 35. We did not ask a question about the age range for attending school, but most children begin Class 1 primary school at the age of 7, and complete Class 8 at the age of 14. For Class 1-2 especially, children may attend school only occasionally, as is convenient for their parents or guardians.

Developmental Milestone	**Min.**	**Max.**	**Mean**	**SD**
Begin to crawl	0.25	1.00	0.55	0.17
Stand up independently	0.50	3.00	0.97	0.46
Begin to walk	1.00	11.50	1.68	1.96
Child talks	0.67	5.00	1.47	0.80
Adult talks to child	0.33	5.00	1.48	1.16
First menses (females only)	11.50	16.00	12.92	1.20
Become young man (saravou)	13.00	21.00	15.92	1.62
become woman (vulau)	12.00	21.00	14.68	2.57
Man should marry	20.00	28.50	23.18	2.14
Man should have kids	18.00	30.00	23.13	2.90
Woman should marry	16.00	28.50	21.08	2.38
Woman should have kids	14.00	32.00	21.33	3.44
Boy should learn values	10.00	32.00	15.72	4.30
Girl should learn values	10.00	23.00	15.23	3.07
Boy should learn cross-cousin taboo	6.00	31.00	14.87	4.75

Girl should learn cross-cousin taboo	6.00	21.00	14.43	4.04

TABLE 1. Descriptive Statistics for Reported Ages of Dev. Milestones. This shows the age, in years, at which adults expect children to reach particular milestones, including the youngest (min) and oldest (max) age listed by participants, as well as the mean response and the standard deviation across responses. Based on (n = 44).

CHORES AND START AGES

In addition to asking about developmental milestones, we asked what sorts of chores or work children should do for the household (separately for boys and girls), and at what age they should begin to do each type of chore listed. Along with our 8 target domains, participants offered 10 additional domains of work that children ought to do for the household. See Table 2 for summary statistics on the appropriate start ages for each domain.

Domain	Min	Max	Mean	SD	n
fetch water	5	9	7.0	1.83	4
take care of a child	7	7	7.0	.	1
wash dishes	6	12	8.6	1.97	7
collect coconuts	6	12	9.0	2.16	7
collect firewood	6.5	16	9.3	2.39	34
cut grass	5	14	9.7	1.99	33
wash laundry	5	16	11.0	2.37	33
farm	5	21	12.0	3.38	44
cook	4	18	12.1	3.11	44
gather reef foods	3	27	12.8	4.62	44
dive for fish	5	20	14.3	3.81	44
line fish	7	20	14.5	4.42	21
traditional medicine	1	25	15.3	5.11	44
sew	9	20	15.3	3.78	6
hunt for land crabs	16	16	16.0	.	1
weave mats	7	25	16.1	3.39	44
build a house	6	21	16.6	3.46	44
pilot a boat	8	30	16.9	4.27	44

TABLE 2. Table shows the age, in years, at which adults expect children to begin working or learning in each domain. The table includes the youngest age (Min.) and the oldest age (Max), as well as the mean, standard deviation, and the sample size for each domain.

DIRECT TEACHING BY PARENTS

We asked participants about whether parents should "directly teach" *(e dodonu me vakavulica ga)* their children anything, and what would happen if parents did not teach these things to their children. The following plots show the results of these two questions. Both questions are based on responses by n = 44 participants who could name more than one domain each, so while the maximum score for any one domain is 44, the plots represent more than 44 total responses across the domains. We coded the responses about what parents ought to teach into a number of categories (see Table 3). We present participants' reports of what parents should teach their children directly in Fig. 1, and the consequences if parents fail to teach their children these things in Fig. 2.



FIGURE 1. Participants responses about what parents should teach children, from n = 44 participants. 2 Participants gave responses that were coded as "other" and which are not displayed here. Categories are arranged in an order that allows for easiest comparison with Fig. 3, so that the categories showing zero responses on this plot were never listed in response to this particular question.

Category	**Description**
Fijian tradition *itovo vakavanua*	This includes learning Fijian customs or traditions or any specific instances, such as kava presentations, Fijian meke dances, or ancient stories *(talanoa makawa)* about Fiji or the village.
Good attitude, conduct, or manners	This includes demonstrating the proper conduct, including appropriate attitudes of respect and good manners more generally. It includes references to good behavior (i tovo *vinaka*), healthy attitudes (*i vakarau bula*), good attitudes (*vakarau vina*) showing respect (*vakarokoroko*), demonstrating obedience (*i vakarorogo*), family life (*itovo matavuvale*), and ways of life generally (*i valavala*). The latter term sometimes confers a negative connotation (Gatty, 2009).
Manner of dress *isulusulu*	Style of dress. This is in fact an important area of learning, since there are strict village rules around dress that apply to adults and to older children, around age 15 and up. For instance, women are forbidden from wearing pants or shorts, and must wear clothing that covers their shoulders. Young girls in contrast may often wear shorts, and swim in the ocean wearing nothing at all.
Language *ivosavosa*	Ways of speech, sayings, or simply to speak the (Fijian) language.
Church, or Christianity *lotu*	Includes teaching children "to know Jesus" and to read the bible, as well as the importance of attending church generally.
Schooling, or Education *vuli*	This includes encouraging children to work hard at school, as well as simply forcing them to attend school. No participants suggested that parents should teach their children any of the class contents.
Hair Styles *ikotikoti*	Hair styles, literally hair "cuts."
Kinship or social knowledge	This includes knowing kin relationships and kin terms, as well as how to behave in social relationships. The *veitacini tabu* would fall into this category, but no participants mentioned it explicitly.
Gendered behavior	This includes references to "how to behave like a young lady *(vulau)*/young man *(sauravou)*."
Skills or Tasks	This includes all mentions of domains of village work, including all of the domains considered in this paper, and a few others. For example, house building *(tara sue)* or collecting coconuts *(vili niu),* as well as riding a horse *(vodo ose).*
Other	Only includes responses that were so vague as to be impossible to interpret, or which were not relevant to the question.
Sports or Games *na qito*	This includes the general response of sports/games *(qito),* and also specific sports such as rugby *(rakavi).* This response arose only in the question on peer-learning.
Bad behaviors	All of the responses to this question falling in this category listed specific behaviors. These behaviors included: smoking

Category	Description
	tobacco/marijuana *(kana tavako/marijuana),* sniffing glue or benzene *(panpan)*, habitual kava or beer drinking *(dau somu yaqona/bia).*
Nothing	Two participants said there is nothing that children learn from peers. One of these same participants also said there is nothing that children learn from non-parent adults.

TABLE 3. An explanation of the categories of things to be learned, as coded from the questions on what parents should teach directly, what children learn from peers, and what children learn from non-parent adults. Some of the categories were listed in response to all three questions, some were not. Fijian words listed are a mixture of Standard Fijian and the local Teci dialect, because they are taken from actual participant responses.



FIGURE 2. Participant responses about what would happen if parents did not teach these things, from n = 44 participants.

Category	Description
Bad attitude, conduct, or manners	This includes bad attitudes *(vakarau ca),* recklessness *(talabusese)*, bad conduct or manners *(itovo ca)*, a lack of manners *(sega ni vakaitovo)* a lack of respect (*sega na veidokai,* or *viavialevu*; lit. acting big), talking back *(sauma na vosa),* being immature *(sega ni yalomatua),* or being cunning with the connotation of disrespect *(kiva).*
Poor knowledge of Fijian traditions	Participants suggested that children would not know the Fijian or village traditions *(sega ni kila na itovo vakaviti/vakavanua).*
Problems (unspecified)	Some participants reported only that there would be problems *(na leqa).*
Doing bad deeds	This includes doing bad things *(itovo kaukauwa;* lit. "hard behaviors"*),* also specific problems such as smoking marijuana or tabacco *(kana marijuana/tavako),* sniffing glue or benzene *(panpan),* or excessive/habitual kava or beer drinking *(dau somu yaqona/bia).*
Ignorance in general	Some participants said that the children would know nothing (*e sega tu ni dua na ka era kila*), would not know how to work *(sega ni kila na cakacaka),* would not know proper family behavior *(sega ni kila na itovo ni matavuvale)*, or would be very stupid/foolish in their ways of life and their conduct *(sese sese vakalevu na nodra I valavala kei na i tovo).*
Cause shame	Some participants said child would bring shame *(madua)* to himself and his family, for example by failing in school.
Social conflict	Participants suggested there would be disputes *(na veileti),* and a lack of honor/respect *(sega na veirokorokovi).*
Social rejection	One participant said that children who are not taught these things will not be wanted or liked in other places *(sega ni taleitaki mai na veivanua tale).*

TABLE 4. Lists the categories of consequences if parents do not teach certain things to their children (n = 44). While some categories match up quite nicely with domains to be taught—for example the need to teach traditions, and the fear that children will be ignorant of tradition—others are not so clear-cut. No participants said children would learn these things in another way, or that there would be no consequences to a lack of teaching these things. Fijian words listed here are a mixture of Standard Fijian and the local Teci dialect, because they represent actual participant responses.

LEARNING FROM NON-PARENT ADULTS AND PEERS

In two additional questions we asked (1) whether there is anything boys and girls learn from peers, and (2) whether there is anything that boys and girls must learn from adults who are not their parents. We present these data in a single plot, to highlight the areas of overlap and of distinction between the responses to these two questions (see Fig. 3).

Our participants reported that children are expected to learn most of these categories from both non-parent adults and peers. However, children are expected to learn games, bad behaviors, and for the most part hairstyle *only* from peers. Peers also dominate other domains, such as style of dress and language use. It may be that in these categories, children are expected to learn one aspect of the domain from adults (e.g., clothing restrictions) and another aspect from their peers (e.g. women's choice in textile and pattern shape for tailor-made *sulu jaba*, which are worn at most public celebrations). In contrast, non-parent adults are much more likely than peers to be associated with learning Fijian traditions, most likely because peers are themselves still ignorant to many of the traditions.



FIGURE 3. Shows participant responses about what children learn from non-parent adults, and from peers, for n = 44 participants.