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**ABSTRACT**

In clan societies, people are categorised into several cultural groups, so-called clans, within which they believe to share common ancestors. Clan attributions provide certain rules for marriage and descent. Anthropologists have revealed several kinship structures and their corresponding cultural characteristics, following such rules. We previously introduced an agent-based model of kinship structures. Here, we propose a simplified model in which competing societies evolve. The societies themselves comprise multiple evolving families with parameters for cultural traits and mate preferences. These values determine with whom each family cooperates and competes, and they mutate when transmitted to a new generation. The growth rate of each family is determined by the number of cooperators and competitors. Through this multi-level evolution, family traits and preferences diversify to form clusters that possess the properties of clans. Subsequently, kinship structures emerge, including dual organisation and generalised or restricted exchange, as well as patrilineal, matrilineal, and double descent systems. These structures depend on the necessity of cooperation and the strength of mating competition, which are also estimated analytically. Finally, statistical analysis based on the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample, a global ethnographic database, empirically verify theoretical results. Such collaboration between theoretical and empirical approaches will unveil universal features in anthropology.
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**Introduction**

Marriage and descent relationships form families and provide kin relationships among them. In many indigenous societies, families constitute a cultural group, the so-called clan, in which people are not necessarily biologically related, but are culturally related\(^1,2\). The marriage and descent relationships of families are determined by clan attributions. In particular, marriage within a clan is often prohibited by the so-called symbolic incest taboo\(^2,4–10\). The rule can further decide the clan (different from one’s own) from which one must choose a mate\(^2\). The elucidation of such rules and their corresponding kinship structures has been a core theme in cultural anthropological studies\(^1,11\).

Lévi-Strauss classified kinship structures according to their marriage and descent relationships\(^2\). The structures are characterised by the “flow” of women and children. When women in clan X marry men in clan Y and give birth in clan Y, we can see the flow of women from clan X to Y. (In a matrilineal society where men change their clan attributions after marriage, a flow of men is observed instead.) Similarly, when the children of a couple in clan X belong to clan Y, we can see the flow of children from clan X to Y. Here, the flow of children means that of children’s attributions but neither of their location nor parental authority\(^12\). For example, when children inherit their father’s surname but live in their mother’s village, the children’s attribution, which is determined by both surname and location, differs from those of both their father and mother.

Kinship structures are characterised by defining the marriage cycle \(C_m\) and descent cycle \(C_d\) as the lengths of the cycles in the flow of women and children across clans, respectively. The classes include the incest structure, without the symbolic incest taboo \(C_m = C_d = 1\), i.e. without division of clans; dual organisation, a direct exchange of brides between two clans \(C_m = 2, C_d = 1\); generalised exchange, an indirect exchange of brides among more than two clans \(C_m \geq 3, C_d = 1\); and restricted exchange, a direct exchange of brides with the flow of children to different clans \(C_m = C_d = 2\). Structures with \(C_m \geq 3\) and \(C_d = 2\) are rarely observed. (The so-called Murungin structure was expected to fulfil these conditions; however, this was later demonstrated to be false\(^3,13,14\).) When \(C_d = 1\), children inherit cultural traits from either their father or mother and belong to the same clan as them. Each descent system is classified as either patrilineal or matrilineal descent. In contrast, when \(C_d = 2\), children inherit cultural traits from both parents independently, and belong to a different clan from either parent. This is known as double descent.
Ethnographic reports provide examples in which paternally (or maternally) inherited traits are solely significant, or both paternally and maternally inherited traits are referred to\textsuperscript{3,15,16}. From global data, it is known that patrilineal descent is dominant over matrilineal or double descent\textsuperscript{17}. Evolutionary anthropologists have explained this imbalance by the higher investment efficiency of wealth as a reproductive source for sons than for daughters\textsuperscript{11,18,19}. However, this perspective ignores the distinctions between societies regarding symbolic traits. Indeed, it has been reported that the identity of the categorical descent group is more emphasized than genetic relatedness in some cooperative actions\textsuperscript{20,21}. In this study, we demonstrate the evolution of descent systems accompanied by the emergence of distinctive traits.

Previously, we built an agent-based model representing the multi-level evolution of lineages (i.e. extended families) and societies, and discussed the emergence of the symbolic incest taboo and kinship structures\textsuperscript{22}. We modelled the social relationships of lineages derived from marriage and revealed that various kinship structures spontaneously emerged. However, the model was too complicated to perform adequate analyses of the evolution of descent systems or to compare theoretical parameters with empirical data. Here, we introduce a simplified model suitable for studying the evolution of kinship structures and descent systems, making analytical estimates, and performing empirical tests using a suitable database.

For data analysis, we use the global ethnographic database of premodern societies, the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS)\textsuperscript{17,23}. The SCCS contains 186 societies, which are thought to be culturally and linguistically independent of each other. The data allow us to quantitatively analyse cultural adaptations to environments rather than cultural transmission\textsuperscript{24,25}. Previous studies have investigated conditions that favour cousin marriage\textsuperscript{26} and polygamy\textsuperscript{27}. However, it is difficult to determine which types of cousin marriage or kinship structures are preferred from correlation analyses alone\textsuperscript{28}. Here, we demonstrate that collaboration between theoretical simulation of the constructive model and statistical analyses of ethnographic data enable us to unveil the origins of, and conditions for, each kinship structure.

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In the next section, we introduce a simplified model. Then, using evolutionary simulations, we demonstrate the emergence of kinship structures and descent systems, and uncover their specific conditions. We also estimate these conditions analytically. Next, by analysing the SCCS, the theoretical results are verified. Finally, we discuss how the present method, which combines theoretical models and empirical data analysis, is relevant in exploring anthropological phenomena.

Model

The model is described below in general terms (see the Methods section for further details). Fig. 1 shows a schematic of our model. Families grow by interacting with other families in the society (Fig. 1(A)). At the time of marriage, family members independently build new families of their own. The society splits in half when the number of families reaches double its initial value \(N_f\). At this time, another society is removed at random so that the number of societies in the entire system remains fixed at \(N_s\). Thus, the number of societies is always fixed as \(N_s\), but the number of families fluctuates between 0 and \(2N_f\). This process introduces society-level selection so that societies that grow faster replace others. This can be interpreted as invasion, imitation, or the coarse-grained description of a growing system. This framework, known as multi-level selection, has been widely adopted in biological and social evolution studies to explain group-level structures\textsuperscript{22,29-35}. In a previous study, we used a three-level model, but here we simplified the model by eliminating the “lineages”, the intermediate layer between families and societies\textsuperscript{22}.

Each family has a pair of cultural traits and mate preferences that are culturally transmitted to the next generation. There are two pathways for cultural transmission: patrilineal and maternal. Hence, we need the two-dimensional trait \(t = (t_1, t_2)\) and preference \(p = (p_1, p_2)\). Thus, when a man in family \(i\) and a woman in family \(j\) are married, their children will have the trait \(T = (t_1', t_2')\) and preference \(P = (p_1', p_2')\). We revised this system since the previous model\textsuperscript{22} to improve clarity when discussing the evolution of descent systems.

The traits \(t_1\) and \(t_2\) could represent, for example, surnames, occupations, or totems\textsuperscript{36}. Here, the preference is for grooms.
Women in family $j$ are likely to accept marriage offers from men in family $i$ if $|t' - p'|/\tau$ is sufficiently small. Therefore, men preferentially offer marriage to those who prefer them. In our model, this point is the sole asymmetry between men and women. Here, we refer to the anthropological studies that state that, in most societies if not all, grooms offer marriage proposals to brides and, as a result, indigenous people symbolically “exchange women”\textsuperscript{2,36}. At the time of altering generations, we added noise $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2)$ to $t$ and $p$, independently sampled from a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance $\mu^2$. Cultural traits are modified when transmitted\textsuperscript{37}, corresponding to genetic mutations in evolutionary biology. Such cultural traits are used to categorise social groups, even without genetic relatedness\textsuperscript{38}.

Next, we introduced cooperative relationships with conditional kin and mates (blue and orange solid lines in Fig. 1(B)). Families cooperate with those who have traits similar to their own and those who prefer (or are preferred by) them. We calculated the density of cooperative families $friend_i$ for each family $i$. A smaller $friend value implies that the family gains less cooperation, resulting in a decline in the growth rate, where $d_r$ represents the death rate increment owing to non-cooperation. At larger $d_r$ values, a small proportion of non-cooperators is crucial for survival.

We also introduced competitive relationships with mating rivals (red dashed line in Fig. 1(B)). Families compete with those who have similar preferences. We calculated the density of competitive families $rival_i$ for each family $i$. A larger $rival value implies that the family suffers from many rivals, resulting in a decline in the growth rate, where $d_p$ represents the increase in the death rate owing to competition. Here, the strength of competition depends only on the number of families with close preferences and is independent of the number of preferred families, because competition occurs even when there are sufficient grooms and brides\textsuperscript{39}.

Using the above settings, we calculated the population growth determined by the interactions between families. Here, the possibility of marriage and the degrees of cooperation and competition were measured using a Gaussian function of traits and preferences. For example, the degree of cooperation between cultural kin is given by $\exp(-|t' - t'|^2/\tau^2)$, where $\tau$ is the tolerance for similar traits and preferences. Then, the suppression term of the population with $friend$ and $rival$ is introduced by $\exp(-d_r(1 - friend) - d_m(rival))$. Note that the presented results are qualitatively independent of these specific forms. For example, $-d_r(1 - friend) - d_m(rival)$ and $1/(1 + d_r(1 - friend) + d_m(rival))$ (adopted in the previous model\textsuperscript{22}) essentially produce the same results, as long as cooperation enhances and conflict suppresses the population. Here, we adopt the present form, as it is more suitable for analytical calculations.

The initial values of $t, p$ are $(0, 0)$ in this model. Thus, at first, no rules exist concerning marriage or descent. Thus, any couple can get married, even within a family. However, the evolved structures are not altered by changing the initial conditions, such as to those sampled from the Gaussian distribution. The notations and parameter values adopted in the simulations are summarised in Table 1.

### Table 1. Parameters used in the model. In the results described below, the values of $b, \mu, \tau, N_f$, and $N_i$ are fixed to those shown in the table, unless the value is described explicitly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Intrinsic growth rate</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>Mutation rate for $t, p$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau$</td>
<td>Tolerance for similarity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_f$</td>
<td>Initial number of families in society</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N_i$</td>
<td>Number of societies in a system</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_r$</td>
<td>Decline in mortality with cooperation</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_m$</td>
<td>Increase in mortality with competition</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>Cultural traits of family</td>
<td>Evolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Preferences for groom traits</td>
<td>Evolve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evolution of Kinship Structures

The model was simulated by changing the parameters listed in Table 1. In 500 steps of simulation, the $(t, p)$ values of families within a society diverge, and finally, clusters are formed in $(t, p)$ space, as shown in Fig. 2. Siblings belonged to the same clusters. Families within the same clusters, including those who were genetically unrelated, recognise each other as cultural kin. They avoided marriage within a cluster and preferred mates from other clusters. Hence, the emergent clusters are culturally united groups with the symbolic incest taboo, preferring exogamy. They can therefore be interpreted as clans. The attribution of clans was determined by referring to the parental traits. Here, the discretised traits were solely significant, leading to the evolution of various descent systems. In this model, the descent relationships of clans emerge, as well as their marriage relationships. Here, we used the $X$-means method to optimise the number of clusters by adopting the Bayesian information criterion\textsuperscript{40}. The relationships between clans were determined by tracing the marriage and descent relationships of the cluster centres. The emergent structures were classified according to the cycles of marriage and descent relationships, that is, $C_m$ and $C_d$, respectively.

Various kinship structures and descent systems have evolved, as shown in Fig. 2. In Fig. 2(A) only one clan—namely A (yellow)—exists and marriage occurs within it, representing an incest structure. Here, traits and preferences do not diverge. In Fig. 2(B) two clans—namely A (yellow) and B (green)—prefer each other (A $\Rightarrow$ B, representing dual organisation. Here, traits and preferences diverge in only two dimensions. One can interpret this as a system in which maternally inherited traits $t_2$ are solely referred to for marriage and descent. Hence, a matrilineal descent system evolves. In Fig. 2(C) three clans—namely A (green), B (yellow), and C (orange)—prefer other clans cyclically (A $\Rightarrow$ B $\Rightarrow$ C $\Rightarrow$ A), representing generalised exchange. Here, traits and preferences diverge in only one dimension. One can interpret this as a sys-
Figure 2. Examples of the evolution of kinship structures. \((t, p)\) values of families in society after 500 simulation steps. The figures show the temporal evolution of \((t, p)\) values (upper-left), a schematic representation of the emergent structure (upper-right), and the final state (bottom). The temporal evolution of the trait and preference values of families in a society are represented in blue and red, respectively. The final states are shown as a \(t_1 - p_1\) map, a \(t_2 - p_2\) map, and a \(t_1 - t_2\) map from left to right. The structures are categorised by calculating the marriage cycle \((C_m)\) and descent cycle \((C_d)\) as the lengths of the cycles of the flow of women and children, respectively. (A) Incest structure without division of clans. Marriage occurred within clan A (yellow). \(d_c = 5.0, d_m = 0.1\). (B) Dual organisation with a matrilineal descent system. Clans A (yellow) and B (green) diverged concerning the maternally inherited trait \(t_2\) and preferred each other. \(d_c = 0.3, d_m = 0.2\). (C) Generalised exchange with a patrilineal descent system. Clans A (green), B (yellow), and C (orange) diverged concerning the paternally inherited trait \(t_1\) and preferred others cyclically. \(d_c = 0.5, d_m = 1.0\). (D) Restricted exchange with a double descent system. Clans \(A_1\) (orange), \(A_2\) (pink), \(B_1\) (green), and \(B_2\) (yellow) exhibit pairwise marriage and descent relationships. Here, clans diverged in terms of both maternally and paternally inherited traits. \(d_c = 0.2, d_m = 1.0\).

Fig. 3 shows the phase diagrams of kinship structures. Double descent is dominant in restricted exchange by definition. Patrilineal descent is dominant over matrilineal descent in both dual organisation and generalised exchange, whereas the fraction of matrilineal descent is larger in dual organisation.

Fig. 4 shows the dependence of phase diagrams of kinship structures on \(N_s, N_l,\) and \(\mu\). Fig. 5 (A) suggests that, as the...
number of societies in the system $N_f$ increases, restricted exchange evolves across broader parameter regions, whereas the region of dual organisation narrows. Considering multi-level evolution, group-level selection generally strengthens as the number of groups increases. As restricted exchange requires divergence in both traits, its formation is harder, even for large $d_m/d_c$. Hence, group-level pressure is necessary for the evolution of such sophisticated structures.

Next, Fig. 5 (B) suggests that, as the number of families within a society $N_f$ increases, generalised and restricted exchange evolve across broader parameter regions, whereas the incest structure and dual organisation are restricted to narrower regions. This can be explained by the robustness of the various structures against fluctuations in the population of each clan, as well as fluctuations in traits and preferences. In reality, however, as the population increases, interactions among families will diversify, and kinship structures may be destroyed (in other words, a return to incest structures may occur), which is outside the scope of our model.

Finally, Fig. 5 (C) suggests that sophisticated structures, such as restricted or generalised exchange, disappear as the mutation rate $\mu$ increases. A larger $\mu$ results in larger fluctuations in traits and preferences, which can destroy the more sophisticated structures.

Analytical Estimation of the Phase Diagrams of Structures

To estimate the phase diagrams of the evolved structures shown in Figs. 3 and 5, we calculated the fitness of each society. We assumed that the distribution of traits and preferences in the clans followed a multivariate normal distribution (see supplementary text for details). Here, we adopt a simplified expression of the evolved structures by setting the variance of the distribution to 0, because the inclusion of the variance $\sigma^2$ for each clan gives the multiplication factor $\frac{1}{\sigma^2+\tau^2}$ for friend and rival, as shown in the supplementary text. Thus, it only slightly influences the estimation of the phase boundaries.

Recall that clusters emerge and are sustained depending on the fluctuation of traits and preferences. The centres of the groom and bride clans deviate with the order of the mutation rate $\mu$. Thus, for example, the centres of clans in dual organisation would be $(f, p) = ((a, b), (c, d))$ and $((b + \delta \mu, a + \delta \mu), (d + \delta \mu, c + \delta \mu))$ (where $\delta \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$). Because of this deviation, the degree of cooperation of the mate is reduced by the factor $\exp(-\alpha \mu^2)$ from that of the kin (where $\alpha \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$). Finally, friend and rival are calculated for each structure, as shown in Table 2.

Furthermore, as the population is finite, there is fluctuation in the population of each clan, as well as in their traits and preferences. This introduces the probability of emergence and sustenance, which depends on the differences in the complexity of each structure. As the structural complexity increases, the probability decreases. Thus, we can assume that the probabilities of the incest structure $p_I$, dual organisation $p_D$, generalised exchange $p_G$, and restricted exchange $p_R$ decline in this order. When $N_f$ or $N_s$ is larger, or $\mu$ is smaller, $p_I, p_D, p_G$, and $p_R$ increase to 1 owing to smaller fluctuations.
or stronger society-level selection. See the supplementary text for the evaluation of probabilities.

The conditions in which the cooperation structures are more adaptive than the incest structure will be given by

\[ p_I \exp(-d_c \cdot 1) < p_D \exp\left(-d_c \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\alpha \mu^2)\right) - \frac{1}{2} \right), \]  

\[ d_m / d_c > 1 - \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) + \frac{6}{d_c} \log p_D / p_G. \]

Similarly, generalised exchange is more adaptive than dual organisation if

\[ d_m / d_c > 1 - \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) + \frac{6}{d_c} \log p_D / p_G, \]  

and restricted exchange is more adaptive than generalised exchange if

\[ d_m / d_c > 1 + 5 \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) + \frac{12}{d_c} \log p_G / p_R. \]

To be precise, we would need to calculate the average fitness of the families, rather than the average friend and rival. However, the results can be regarded as approximately equal for the rough estimations used in the current parameter regions.

Thus, the above simple calculation explains the transition of emergent structures in response to increase in \( d_m / d_c \). In particular, if \( d_c \), \( N_f \), or \( N_s \) is large, the last terms in Eqs. (3)–(5) are negligible and the boundaries are determined by \( d_m / d_c \).

Figure 5. Dependence of phase diagrams of kinship structures on other parameters (A) the number of societies \( N_s \), (B) the number of families within a society \( N_f \), and (C) the mutation rate \( \mu \). The incest structure is plotted in yellow, dual organisation in green, generalised exchange in orange, and restricted exchange in pink, whereas conditions leading to the extinction are plotted in blue. Each diagram is obtained in the same way as Fig. 3 (A). Unless the value is shown on the axis, the parameter values are fixed to those in Table 1.

Table 2. The density of cooperators (friend), competitors (rival), and the probability of emergence and sustenance for each structure. Here, we ignore deviations within the cluster. The traits and preferences of grooms and brides are assumed to deviate in the order of the mutation rate \( \mu \). For generalised and restricted exchanges, we focused on the simplest forms, as shown in Fig. 3(C, D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>friend</th>
<th>rival</th>
<th>prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>( p_I )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td>( p_D )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalised</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td>( p_G )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\alpha \mu^2) )</td>
<td>( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td>( p_R )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The density of cooperators (friend), competitors (rival), and the probability of emergence and sustenance for each structure. Here, we ignore deviations within the cluster. The traits and preferences of grooms and brides are assumed to deviate in the order of the mutation rate \( \mu \). For generalised and restricted exchanges, we focused on the simplest forms, as shown in Fig. 3(C, D).

**Empirical Data Analyses**

We then verified our results on the phase diagrams of kinship structures and descent systems. We used the SCCS database, which contains ethnographic data of 186 pre-modern societies around the world. We identified the kinship structures of each society by referring to their descent systems, exogamous units, and cousin preferences for mates. See the Methods section and Table S1 for further details. Our results identified 22 societies as incest structures, 14 as dual organisation, 15 as generalised exchange, and 9 as restricted exchange. Fig. S1 shows their geographic distributions. Each structure is spread out globally, without a clear spatial pattern. This suggests that the kinship structures in each region are achieved by cultural adaptation rather than cultural transmission.

To identify the significant explanatory variables for the kinship structures, we conducted Spearman’s rank correlations between the SCCS variables and the structures. Although it would be desirable to conduct more sophisticated analyses, such as classification learning to reveal features relevant to the family systems, it would be difficult to conduct any analyses other than correlations owing to data insufficiencies. The variables that were highly correlated with kinship structures are listed in Table S2. The most highly correlated variables are mainly those related to \( d_c \) and \( d_m \) in our model, or gender balance in the societies.

Among them, we show the variables that can be related to \( d_c \) and \( d_m \) in Table 3. We estimated \( d_c \) using the values for hostility toward other ethnic groups, tributary payments or taxation, violence against other ethnic groups, ties across
Table 3. Correlations between SCCS variables and kinship structures.
For pairs of kinship structures, the Spearman’s rank correlation between the SCCS variables and the structures was calculated. Then, the absolute values of the correlation were averaged for each pair. This table shows the variables that exhibited high correlations and are relevant to \( d_c \) and \( d_m \). We list the variables, the average value of the correlation, and the corresponding parameters in the model. See Table S2 for further information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hostility towards Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>( d_c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tributary Payments or Taxation</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>( d_c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence against Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>( d_c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ties across Communities</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>( d_c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Rewards</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>( d_c )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval of Rape</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>( d_m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence within the Society</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>( d_m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict within the Society</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>( d_m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval of Incest</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>( d_m )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapproval of Premarital Sex</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>( d_m )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... (The empirical results are similar to the theoretical results for smaller \( N_f \), as shown in Fig. S4.)

Discussion

By considering cooperation among kin and mates as well as competition among rivals in our model, we demonstrated that families form clusters in \((t, p)\) space, where \( t \) and \( p \) denote traits and preferences, respectively. Families within a cluster are recognised as cultural kin. Marriage occurs only among families from different clusters. Hence, the clusters of families that emerged in our model can be interpreted as clans. The results show the emergence of symbolic incest taboos and kinship structures. Furthermore, the traits and preferences were differentiated involving either paternally or maternally inherited ones only, or both. This demonstrates the evolution of descent systems such as patrilineal, matrilineal, and double descent systems. In addition, we showed that the parameters related to \( d_c \) and \( d_m \) in our model can be considered significant explanatory variables, by analysing a global ethnographic database of 186 societies, the SCCS. By estimating \( d_c \) and \( d_m \) from the data, we showed consistency between the theoretical and empirical results of the parameter dependencies of the kinship structures and descent systems.

In cultural anthropology, Levi-Strauss emphasised cooperation brought about by marriage and proposed the “alliance theory” to explain kinship structures. Here, we added competition among marital rivals and studied the evolutionary pressure to increase cooperation and decrease competition. The consistency between the theoretical and empirical results supports the plausibility of our scenario.

Kinship structures evolve depending on \( d_m/d_c \): that is, the relative importance of avoiding marital competition compared to that of cooperating among kin and mates. These factors can be determined by environmental conditions, such as the scarcity of mates, and the frequency of group acts, such as public works or massive violence, respectively. When the pressure for cooperation is dominant over the avoidance of competition, societies are divided into a few clans united by affinal relationships. As the importance of avoiding competition increases, dividing societies into more clans is more adaptive. Hence, as \( d_m/d_c \) increases, the emergent structures change from incest structures to dual organisation, generalised exchange, and finally to restricted exchange. In cultural anthropology, dual organisation is categorised as the simplest form of restricted exchange, by focusing on \( C_m = 2 \). Our results, however, suggest that it is more similar to generalised exchange, by focusing on \( C_d = 1 \) with regard to environmental dependencies.

Furthermore, in our model, patrilineal descent evolved more frequently than matrilineal descent. Since the sole asymmetry of sex lies in the process of mate choice, that is, women preferring certain men’s traits, the selection pressure to favour those men with preferable traits leads to the divergence of paternally inherited traits. In the real-world data, patrilineal descent was also more frequent than matrilineal descent. However, in our
model, the dominance of patrilineal descent was excessive. In real societies, mates are sometimes be chosen inversely, and other aspects, such as the effect of paternal uncertainty, cannot be neglected. Nonetheless, our study explains the fact that significant traits are frequently inherited paternally.

In the empirical data analysis, we found the correlation between kinship structures and gender balance, as well as $d_c$ and $d_m$ (see Table S2). They showed that gender inequality increased in the following order: restricted exchange, dual organisation, and generalised exchange. As the empirical data and our model show, the descent system is more biased towards patrilineal descent in generalised exchange and less so in dual organisation, whereas double descent is adopted in restricted exchange. By expecting male dominance in societies where paternally inherited traits are solely significant, we can explain this trend. Thus, in terms of gender balance, it may be reasonable to assume that dual organisation is more similar to restricted exchange than to generalised exchange.

Apart from the parameters $d_c$ and $d_m$, the mutation rate $\mu$, the number of competing societies $N_c$, and the initial number of families within a society $N_f$ are also relevant in determining kinship structures (see Fig. 5 and Table S2). Fig. 5 as well as our analytical calculations suggest that sophisticated structures such as generalised and restricted exchange are more fragile owing to their fluctuation under smaller $N_c$ or $N_f$, or larger $\mu$. This trend was empirically verified for $N_f$, but not for $N_c$. The inconsistent $N_f$-related trend may be caused by the development of diverse interactions between families other than kinship in larger populations. We were unable to estimate $\mu$ from the data, and this remains a future task.

Furthermore, the dependence of the incest structure on $\overline{d_c}$ and $\overline{d_m}$ was not clearly observed in the empirical data. Societies with an incest structure can be structured by aspects other than kinship, for example, by the government. Such structuralisation can be interpreted as another adaptation, which is beyond the scope of our model.

This study has some limitations. In the model, we only focused on societies in which marriage and descent rules are strictly determined by customs. In other words, our model concerns the elementary structures of kinship, where paternal and maternal traits are referred to independently. As population size grows, the unity of kin groups is weakened, and marriage rules are relaxed so that only marriage within the clan is prohibited (i.e. it does not specify the clan from which the mate must be chosen) or only that within the nuclear family. The descent rules also change so that they can refer to either the father or mother in each generation by choice, or both parents’ traits are multiply referred to. This is the case in complex structures of kinship. In pre-industrialised complex societies, family systems could become divergent concerning parent–child and inter-sibling relationships. (See also for a theoretical study on the evolution of family systems.)

In our data analysis, we could only analyse the correlations between ethnographic variables and kinship structures.

Although it would be desirable to conduct further analyses (such as classification learning), it is infeasible owing to data insufficiencies. Furthermore, because of the lack of chronological data, we could not analyse the causal relationships between social structures and cultural conditions related to $d_c$, $d_m$, and other parameters. In addition, our estimation of $\overline{d_c}$ and $\overline{d_m}$ may seem arbitrary. Despite the robustness of our results against the estimation procedures used for $\overline{d_c}$ and $\overline{d_m}$, we recognise the necessity of field studies to measure such variables directly.

Social structures, such as kinship structures, are generated through interactions among people over many generations. It is considered difficult to explain such complex systems from basic conditions using simple correlation analyses alone. Here, by integrating theoretical simulations of a simple constructive model and empirical data analyses, we have demonstrated that various kinship structures emerge depending on the degrees of cooperation and avoidance of competition. Theoretical studies, as shown here, produce explanatory scenarios by referring to the accumulated hypotheses and data from empirical studies and propose relevant variables to be measured in the field. Empirical studies in the field describe novel aspects of anthropological phenomena and allow the measurement of variables to test theories. Such collaboration between theoretical and empirical studies will contribute to discussing the emergence of complex social structures and unveiling universal features in anthropology.

**Method**

**Algorithm**

To simulate population dynamics taking social interactions among families into consideration, the degrees of cooperation and competition were calculated by comparing trait and preference values with a tolerance parameter $\tau$. Hence, families $i$ and $j$ cooperate if $|t^i - t^j|/\tau$, $|t^i - p^i|/\tau$, or $|p^i - t^j|/\tau$ is sufficiently small. These conditions correspond to $i$ and $j$ being cultural kin, the women in $j$ preferring men in $i$, and the women in $i$ preferring men in $j$, respectively. Families $i$ and $j$ compete if they prefer similar families, that is, if $|p^i - p^j|/\tau$ is sufficiently small.

We adopted the following algorithm for population changes in families: For family $i$ and time step $n$, the numbers of unmarried men and unmarried women are denoted by $M^i(n)$ and $F^i(n)$, respectively. The intrinsic growth rate is denoted by $b$. We represent the set of families in society as $\Phi$ and the families that accept men in family $i$ as grooms as $\hat{i}$. Then, the population change in family $i$ is given by

$$t^i(n) = t^i(n-1) + \eta, \quad p^i(n) = p^i(n-1) + \eta, \quad (6)$$

$$d_{i,j} = \min(|t^i(n) - t^j(n)|, |p^i(n) - t^j(n)|), \quad (7)$$

$$\text{friend}^i(n) = \sum_{j \in \Phi} \frac{\exp(-d_{i,j}^2/\tau^2)}{|\Phi|}, \quad (9)$$
rivali(n) = \sum_{j \in \Phi} \exp(-|pppi(n) - pppj(n)|^2/\tau^2), \quad (10)

r = b \exp(-d_c(1 - friendi(n)) - d_m \text{rivali}(n)), \quad (11)

M'(n) = \text{Poisson}(r), \quad F'(n) = \text{Poisson}(r), \quad (12)

Here, the probability for family i to offer family 'i' for marriage P('i) is

P('i) = \frac{\exp(-|'i(n) - p'_i(n)|^2/\tau^2)}{\sum_{i \neq 'i} \exp(-|'i(n) - p'_i(n)|^2/\tau^2)}, \quad (13)

r' = (r'_1(n), r'_2(n)), \quad p''(n) = (p'1(n), p'2(n)). \quad (14)

The noise component \eta is added to \eta and p, comprising two independent normal variates with mean 0 and variance \mu^2, as shown in Eq. (6). The population growth of each family is suppressed depending on friend and rival, as given by Eqs. (9) and (10), respectively. The number of unmarried children in each family follows a Poisson distribution, as given by Eqs. (11) and (12), respectively. People are married according to the traits and preferences of their families, as shown in Eq. (13). After marriage, couples build their own families, and the children inherit traits and preferences, as shown in Eq. (14). Couples and those who cannot find mates within two generations die at the time of altering generations. Here, we assumed monogamy, but the result was qualitatively independent of such a marriage system.

Classification of Kinship Structures

Here, we describe the basic concept behind our classifications. See Table S1 for the criteria of identification and a detailed explanation of SCCS variables. Kinship structures are characterised by the descent system, exogamous units, and cousin preferences for mates. The descent system refers to trait inheritance, either paternal, maternal, or both. Exogamous units refer to the groups in which marriage is prohibited by the symbolic incest taboo. For cousin preference, one considers the woman with the largest genetic relatedness in the preferred clan: in patrilineal dual organisation, for example, a man in clan A is married to a woman in clan B. His father from A and his mother from B form a couple in A. In contrast, his mother’s brother from B and his father’s sister from A give birth to children in B. Hence, the woman with the largest genetic relatedness would be the daughter of the father’s sister and mother’s brother, which is a symmetrical cross-cousin.

The incest structure has no exogamous units (specifically, none larger than cohabitant groups). Dual organisation is characterised by a patrilineal (or matrilineal) descent system, marriage prohibition within patrilineal (or matrilineal) moieties, and mating preference for symmetrical cross-cousins. Generalised exchange is characterised by a patrilineal (or matrilineal) descent system, marriage prohibition within patrilineal (or matrilineal) clans, and mating preference for the mother’s brother’s daughter (or father’s sister’s daughter). Restricted exchange is characterised by a double descent system, marriage prohibition within both patrilineal and matrilineal kin, and mating preference for symmetrical cross-cousins. Indeed, in the structure shown in Fig. 2(D), the patrilineal kin of clan A1 belong to A1 or A2, whereas the matrilineal kin belong to A0 or B1. This is because the character A is inherited paternally, and the number 1 is inherited maternally. Furthermore, a man in clan A1 would prefer a woman in clan B2, who is a symmetrical cross-cousin. Our criteria ignore the mating preference for “cousins as a category” who belong to the same clan as a certain cousin. One may be able to incorporate many societies for analysis if these criteria are extended, but we prioritised clarity.
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SUPPLEMENTARY TEXT

Detailed Estimation of the Phase Diagrams of Kinship Structures

To estimate the environmental dependence of the evolved structures in Figs. 3 and 5, we calculated the fitness of each structure. We assume that the traits and preferences in the clans follow a multivariate normal distribution. We also assume that the variables \(t_1, t_2, p_1\), and \(p_2\) are independent and have the same variance \(\sigma^2\). Thus, the probability function of the traits and preferences of the families in the incest structure, with its cluster centre at \((t, p) = ((t_1^1, t_2^1), (p_1^1, p_2^1))\), is given by

\[
f(t_1, t_2, p_1, p_2) = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\right)^4 \exp\left(-\frac{(t_1 - t_1^1)^2 + (t_2 - t_2^1)^2 + (p_1 - p_1^1)^2 + (p_2 - p_2^1)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).
\]  

(S1)

The average values of friend in the same clan (kin) and, similarly, those of rival would be

\[
<\text{friend}> = \frac{1}{4\sigma^2/\tau^2 + 1} \int \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\right)^4 \exp\left(-\frac{|t^a - t^b|^2}{\tau^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(t^a_1 - t_1^1)^2 + (t^a_2 - t_2^1)^2 + (p^a_1 - p_1^1)^2 + (p^a_2 - p_2^1)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dt^a_1 dt^a_2 dp^a_1 dp^a_2
\]  

(S2)

\[
= \frac{1}{4\sigma^2/\tau^2 + 1} \int \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\right)^4 \exp\left(-\frac{|t^a - p^b|^2}{\tau^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(t^a_1 - t_1^1)^2 + (t^a_2 - t_2^1)^2 + (p^a_1 - t_1^1 - \delta\mu)^2 + (p^a_2 - t_2^1 - \delta\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dt^a_1 dt^a_2 dp^a_1 dp^a_2
\]  

(S3)

(S4)

Next, we recall that clusters emerge and are sustained depending on the fluctuation of traits and preferences. The centres of the groom and bride clans deviate with the order of the mutation rate \(\mu\). Thus, for example, the centres of clans in dual organisations would be \((t, p) = ((a, b), (c, d))\) and \(((b + \alpha\mu, a + \alpha\mu), (d + \beta\mu, c + \beta\mu))\), where \(\alpha \sim O(1)\). The average values of friend in the mate’s clan would be

\[
<\text{friend}> = \frac{1}{4\sigma^2/\tau^2 + 1} \int \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}}\right)^4 \exp\left(-\frac{|t^a - p^b|^2}{\tau^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{(t^a_1 - t_1^1)^2 + (t^a_2 - t_2^1)^2 + (p^a_1 - t_1^1 - \delta\mu)^2 + (p^a_2 - t_2^1 - \delta\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dt^a_1 dt^a_2 dp^a_1 dp^a_2
\]  

(S5)

\[
= \frac{1}{4\sigma^2/\tau^2 + 1} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2\mu^2}{4\sigma^2 + \tau^2}\right)
\]  

(S6)

(S7)

Hence, considering the variance in the \((t, p)\) distribution leads to multiplying \(\frac{1}{4\sigma^2/\tau^2 + 1}\) by each value of \(<\text{friend}>\) and \(<\text{rival}>\) in Table 2; the \(\alpha\) values therein are given by \(\frac{\delta^2}{4\sigma^2 + \tau^2}\). Because these multiplication factors are common to every value, the conditions of the phase boundaries are qualitatively consistent with those in the main text.

Furthermore, we estimated the probability of sustaining each structure. In each simulation step, the population of each clan fluctuates owing to the number of births, which follow a Poisson distribution. In
addition, there is a random walk in the \((t, p)\) space. Hence, if all families in the clan have no children, or all their children leave the cluster, the clan will disappear. This can occur if the population is finite. We set the probability of a family not having children in their cluster to \(q\). When there are \(N\) families, composing the \(n\) clans in the society, the probability of sustaining the structure is \(p = 1 - qN/n\). This increases as the number of clans increases. As \(n\) is 1, 2, 3, and 4 for the incest structure, dual organisation, generalised exchange, and restricted exchange, respectively, the above sustenance probabilities (\(p_I\) for the incest structure, \(p_D\) for dual organisation, \(p_G\) for generalised exchange, and \(p_R\) for restricted exchange) decline in this order. In addition, as \(\mu\) increases, \(p\) decreases; as \(N_f\) increases, \(p\) decreases; and as \(N_s\) increases, the probability of sampling corrupted societies decreases. Hence, \(p_I, p_D, p_G,\) and \(p_R\) will increase to 1 when \(N_f\) or \(N_s\) is large or \(\mu\) is small.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES

Figure S1. Geographic distribution of kinship structures. Incest, dual organisation, generalised exchange, and restricted exchange are plotted in yellow, green, orange, and pink, respectively. This information is based on [1, 2]. Owing to data shortages, kinship structures were identified in 60 of the 186 societies in the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample (SCCS). There were 22 societies identified as incest structures, 14 as dual organisation structures, 15 as generalised exchange structures, and 9 as restricted exchange structures. We only used the data of 24 societies in which sufficient data were available to estimate \(\tilde{d}_c\) and \(\tilde{d}_m\) in Fig. 4(B).

Figure S2. Geographic distribution of descent systems. Patrilineal, matrilineal, and double descent systems are plotted in orange, blue, and yellow, respectively. Information is based on [1, 2]. Descent systems were identified in all 186 societies in the SCCS. There were 75 societies identified as patrilineal, 26 as matrilineal, and 10 as double descent systems. Furthermore, descent lines were traced either paternally or maternally in each generation (so-called ambilineal descent) in six societies, and kin groups were not observed in 69 societies, which are omitted from the figure. We only used the data of 34 societies in which sufficient data were available to identify kinship structures, as shown in Fig. 5(B).
Figure S3. Phase diagram of the kinship structures against the parameters $d_c$ and $d_m$. By analysing the SCCS, we estimated $d_c$ and $d_m$ for each society and plotted the dependencies of their kinship structures. The incest structure is plotted in yellow, dual organisation in green, generalised exchange in orange, and restricted exchange in pink. Incest structures are spread widely in the diagram. This may be because societies with such structures can have social systems other than kinship influencing their adoption of these conditions.

Figure S4. Dependency of descent systems on kinship structures. Figures show the frequency of each descent system, both theoretically and empirically. The frequencies of matrilineal (yellow), patrilineal (orange), and double descent (green) systems are shown. (A) Theoretical phase diagram. The model was simulated by changing the $d_c$ and $d_m$ values. We calculated the frequencies of each descent system for each kinship structure. In Fig. 5(A), $N_f = 50$. Here, $N_f = 30$. (B) Empirical phase diagram. By analysing the SCCS, we identified descent systems and kinship structures for each society. We counted the frequencies of each descent system for each kinship structure.
Table S1. Identification of kinship structures. Structures are categorised by referring to the descent system, exogamous units, and cousin preferences for mates. Exclusive conditions for identifying the same class are described in different rows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incest structure</td>
<td>No exogamy</td>
<td>“219” &lt; 3 and “222” = “224” = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual organisation</td>
<td>Patrilineal moiety exogamy</td>
<td>“222” = 6 and “224” = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrilineal moiety exogamy</td>
<td>“222” = 1 and “224” = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrilineal descent with symmetrical cross-cousin preference</td>
<td>“70” = 3 and “224” = “230” = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrilineal descent with symmetrical cross-cousin preference</td>
<td>“70” = 1 and “222” = “230” = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalised exchange</td>
<td>Patrilineal descent with MoBrDa preference</td>
<td>“70” = 3 and “230” = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrilineal exogamy with MoBrDa preference</td>
<td>“222” &gt; 1 and “230” = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrilineal descent with FaSiDa preference</td>
<td>“70” = 3 and “230” = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matrilineal exogamy with FaSiDa preference</td>
<td>“224” &gt; 1 and “230” = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted exchange</td>
<td>Exogamy concerning both patrilineal and matrilineal kins</td>
<td>“222” &gt; 1 and “224” &gt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double descent with symmetrical cross-cousin preference</td>
<td>“70” = 2 and “230” = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S2. Correlation between variables in the SCCS and kinship structures. For pairs of kinship structures (dual organisation, generalised exchange, and restricted exchange), Spearman’s rank correlations between the SCCS variables and the structures were calculated. Then, the absolute values of the correlations were averaged for each pair. This table shows the variables that exhibited high correlation, together with the average of the absolute values of its correlation, and the average value of the variables for each structure. The last two columns show the fraction of available data for each variable and the corresponding parameters in the model. The top 12 variables in the correlation are shown above the dashed line; the five variables under the dashed line are included because they could also be relevant to the model parameters. Generally, a larger value for each item shows that the item is observed to a greater degree in societies (e.g. a large value for SCCS1772 shows that hostility toward other ethnic groups is strong). Most variables with high correlation are related to $d_e$, $d_m$, gender balance, or the other parameters of our model. SCCS973, SCCS983, and SCCS1767 suggest that gender inequality is most frequently observed in generalised exchange, followed (in order) by dual organisation and restricted exchange. As discussed in the main text, patrilineal descent is more dominant in generalised exchange and less dominant in dual organisation, whereas double descent is adopted in restricted exchange. Because paternal kin are highly recognised in patrilineal descent and both paternal and maternal kin are recognised equally in double descent, the above trend of gender inequality is reasonable. As for the other parameters, SCCS1756 influences $N_f$, and SCCS1865 influences $N_s$. The trend of SCCS1865 shows that a large (or small) $N_s$ leads to the evolution of restricted (or generalised) exchange across larger parameter regions, which is consistent with Fig. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Corr.</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Generalised</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1689</td>
<td>Sex Ratio (Males/Females*10)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1772</td>
<td>Hostility towards Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>$d_e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS939</td>
<td>Personal Restrictions on Regular Menstruation</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS973</td>
<td>Degree of Marriage Celebration</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1737</td>
<td>Extent of Burden Caused by Tribute Payments or Taxation</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>$d_e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS173</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>$d_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS983</td>
<td>Property Exchanges after Divorce</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS782</td>
<td>(Un) Acceptability of Violence within the Society</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>$d_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS58</td>
<td>General Indulgence, Infancy</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS768</td>
<td>(No) Conflict between Communities of the Same Society</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>$d_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1770</td>
<td>Attitude towards Violence against Other Ethnic Groups</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>$d_e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS960</td>
<td>Violation of the Incest Taboo</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>$d_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS791</td>
<td>Cross-cutting Ties across Communities</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>$d_e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS962</td>
<td>Violation of Restrictions on Premarital Sex</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>$d_m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS905</td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>$d_e$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1756</td>
<td>Size of Local Community</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>186.67</td>
<td>88.71</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>$N_f$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1767</td>
<td>Ideology of Male Superiority</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCCS1865</td>
<td>Number of Societies within 150 Mile Radius</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$N_s$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Values of SCCS Variables Used for Data Analyses

The values of SCCS variables are explained as below, according to [1–14]

SCCS70 Descent - Membership in Corporate Kinship Groups
1 Matrilineal—through female line, 2 Double descent—separate groups through male and female lines, 3 Patrilineal—through male line, 4 Ambilineal—through one parent in each generation, and 5 Bilateral—not a corporate kin group

SCCS219 Community marriage organisation [Note, identical to EA015]
1 Demes, 2 Segmented (no exogamy), 3 Agamous, 4 Exogamous, 5 Segmental (exogamy), and 6 Clans

SCCS222 Largest patrilineal exogamous group [Note, identical to EA018]
1 No exogamy, 2 Extended taboo, 3 Lineages, 4 Sibs, 5 Phratries, and 6 Moieties

SCCS224 Largest matrilineal exogamous group [Note, identical to EA020]
1 No exogamy, 2 Extended taboo, 3 Lineages, 4 Sibs, 5 Phratries, and 6 Moieties

SCCS230 Cousin marriages preferred: subtypes [Note, identical to EA026]
1 Symmetrical cross-cousin, 2 MoBrDa, 3 FaSiDa, 4 FaBrDa, 5 Second cousin, and 9 None preferred

SCCS1689 Sex Ratio (Males/Females*10)
Number of males / number of females × 10

SCCS1772 Hostility towards Other Ethnic Groups
10 no or negligible hostility, 20 weak degree of hostility, 30 moderate degree of hostility, 31 moderate degree of hostility only directed against certain other ethnic groups, 32 moderate degree of hostility directed against almost all other ethnic groups, 40 high degree of hostility, 41 high degree of hostility only directed against certain other ethnic groups, and 42 high degree of hostility directed against almost all other ethnic groups

SCCS939 Personal Restrictions or Regular Menstruation
1 No restriction during this period, 2 Restrictions on personal activities but not social activities, 3 Restrictions on personal and social activities, 4 Few restrictions placed on personal and social activities, 5 Moderate restrictions (may not cook), and 6 Severe restrictions secluded in a menstrual hut

SCCS1737 Extent of Burden Caused by Tribute Payments or Taxation
20 sporadic taxation or request for tribute, 21 sporadic exactions are reported not to be burdensome, 22 sporadic exactions are reported to be burdensome, 30 regular taxation or request for tribute, 31 regular exactions are reported not to be burdensome, and 32 regular exactions are reported to be burdensome

SCCS173 Rape
1 Accepted/ignored, 2 Ridiculed, 3 Mildly disapproved, and 4 Strongly disapproved

SCCS983 Property Exchanges after Divorce. Ranked in order of the amount of financial loss incurred by the wife when a divorce occurs
1 There is no divorce, 2 No financial transaction occurs after a divorce (equal share), 3 The husband or his kin pay compensation, 4 The transaction that occurs depends on the circumstances, and 6 The wife and/or her kin group pay compensation

SCCS782 (Un) Acceptability of Violence toward Members of the Same Society, but outside the Local Community
1 Valued, 2 Acceptable, 3 Tolerated, and 4 Disapproved

SCCS58 General Indulgence, Infancy—Modifiers of General Scale Types
1 Low, 2 Medium, and 3 High

SCCS768 (No) Conflict between Communities of the Same Society
1 Endemic, 2 High, 3 Moderate, and 4 Mild or rare
SCCS1770 Attitude towards Physical Violence against Members of Other Ethnic Groups
10 Physical violence outside of ethnic group is rejected, 11 Physical violence outside of ethnic group is rejected because of military inferiority or cowardice, 20 Physical violence is tolerated or accepted—specification of the enemies is absent, 21 Physical violence is tolerated or accepted but not against the majority of other ethnic groups, 22 Physical violence is tolerated or accepted against the majority of other ethnic groups, 30 Physical violence is appreciated—no further specification against whom, 31 Physical violence is appreciated but not against the majority of other ethnic groups, and 32 physical violence is appreciated against the majority of other ethnic groups

SCCS960 Violation of the Incest Taboo
1 None or mild punishment, 2 Moderate punishment, 3 Severe punishment, 4 Punishment to those other than the offenders, 5 Punishment to the whole social group, and 6 Punishment that affects the offenders and their social group

SCCS791 Type of Cross-cutting Ties: Moieties Cutting across Communities
1 Absent, 2 Present but unimportant, and 3 Present and important

SCCS962 Violation of Restrictions on Premarital Sex. Each category specifies the consequences a woman faces if she violates premarital sex prohibition
1 Neither she nor her partner face punishment, 2 Her partner is punished, but she is not, 3 Mild punishment for the women, 4 Moderate punishment for the woman, 5 Severe punishment, banished from social group or killed, and 6 Severe or killed

SCCS905 Rewards (Special Gifts, Praises, or Ceremonies, Not including Ritual Purification) for a Man Who Has Killed an Enemy in Battle or Otherwise Shown Skill in War
1 Usually or Always, 2 Sometimes, and 3 Rarely or never

SCCS1756 Size of Local Community
Population of local community

SCCS1767 Ideology of Male Superiority
1 no ideology of male superiority, 2 weakly articulated ideology of male superiority, and 3 strongly articulated ideology of male superiority (it is the basic determinant of gender relations)

SCCS1865 Concordance: Number of Societies within 150 Mile Radius
The number of societies within a 150-mile radius
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