



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

What is the expected human childhood? Insights from evolutionary anthropology

Journal:	<i>Development and Psychopathology</i>
Manuscript ID	DPP-2021-00245.R1
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue Article
Keyword:	Human evolution, Expected childhood, Dimensions of adversity, Threat, Deprivation
Abstract:	<p>In psychological research, there are often assumptions about the conditions that children expect to encounter during development. These assumptions shape prevailing ideas about the experiences that children are capable of adjusting to, and whether their responses are viewed as impairments or adaptations. Specifically, the expected childhood is often depicted as nurturing and safe, and characterized by high levels of caregiver investment. Here, we synthesize evidence from history, anthropology, and primatology to challenge this view. We review evidence of forms of threat — infanticide, violent conflict, and predation — and forms of deprivation — social, cognitive, and nutritional — that children have faced throughout human evolution. We argue that mean levels of threat and deprivation were higher than is typical in industrialized societies, and that our species has experienced much variation in the levels of these adversities across space and time. These conditions likely favored a high degree of phenotypic plasticity, or the ability to tailor development to different conditions. This body of evidence has implications for recognizing developmental adaptations to adversity, for cultural variation in responses to adverse experiences, and for definitions of adversity and deprivation based on the expected human childhood.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

What is the expected human childhood? Insights from evolutionary anthropology

Abstract:

In psychological research, there are often assumptions about the conditions that children expect to encounter during development. These assumptions shape prevailing ideas about the experiences that children are capable of adjusting to, and whether their responses are viewed as impairments or adaptations. Specifically, the expected childhood is often depicted as nurturing and safe, and characterized by high levels of caregiver investment. Here, we synthesize evidence from history, anthropology, and primatology to challenge this view. We review evidence of forms of threat — infanticide, violent conflict, and predation — and forms of deprivation — social, cognitive, and nutritional — that children have faced throughout human evolution. We argue that mean levels of threat and deprivation were higher than is typical in industrialized societies, and that our species has experienced much variation in the levels of these adversities across space and time. These conditions likely favored a high degree of phenotypic plasticity, or the ability to tailor development to different conditions. This body of evidence has implications for recognizing developmental adaptations to adversity, for cultural variation in responses to adverse experiences, and for definitions of adversity and deprivation based on the expected human childhood.

1. Introduction:

A common view in developmental and clinical psychology is that children have evolved in environments that were mainly safe and characterized by high levels of social, cognitive, and nutritional investment. For instance, models of toxic stress (Shonkoff et al., 2012) and allostatic load (Lupien et al., 2006; McEwen & Stellar, 1993) assume that the physiological mechanisms supporting responses to stress in humans become ‘dysregulated’ by chronic adversity, because these systems have evolved to deal with fleeting dangers, not with chronic threat (Ellis & Del Giudice, 2014, 2019). In contrast, the threat-deprivation model of adversity does acknowledge that chronic threat was a recurrent feature in some societies across human evolution (Humphreys & Zeanah, 2015; McLaughlin & Sheridan, 2016; Sheridan & McLaughlin, 2014). However, this model assumes that chronic deprivation was rare, such that children do not have psychological mechanisms for effectively dealing with low levels of social, cognitive, and nutritional support.

Both models make assumptions about which experiences were, and were not, part of the *expected childhood environment*. The term ‘expected environment’ (or expectable environment) has been widely used but not explicitly defined in past research. Here, we define it as the range of conditions that shaped our species’ evolved developmental mechanisms. Although sometimes discussed in discrete terms in psychology – “Is this experience part of the expected environment or not?” – we instead characterize the expected environment as a distribution of environmental conditions that a species has experienced over evolutionary time, as typically done in biology (Frankenhuis et al., 2018; Frankenhuis & Walasek, 2020). The issue at stake is which types of fitness-relevant adversities have occurred with sufficient frequency across human evolution to have shaped the psychological mechanisms that influence development and behavior today.

1
2
3 Here, we challenge the assumption that the expected childhood was typically safe and
4 supportive and argue that the prevailing views are skewed by an outsized focus on a thin slice of
5 societies. Much of the research that informs developmental and clinical psychology is drawn
6 from ‘WEIRD’ populations — or those that are Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and
7 Democratic (Henrich et al., 2010) — which benefit from high levels of safety and material
8 resources on average (Amir & McAuliffe, 2020; Arnett, 2008; Barrett, 2020; Henrich et al.,
9 2010; Humphreys & Salo, 2020; Nielsen et al., 2017; Nisbett, 2003; Qu et al., 2021; Thalmayer
10 et al., 2020). These populations also tend to be culturally similar (Muthukrishna et al., 2020),
11 though clearly there are vast differences in the resources and lived experiences of different
12 groups *within* WEIRD populations as well (e.g., marginalized vs. privileged groups) (Clancy &
13 Davis, 2019). In addition to WEIRD populations being a poor representation of the global
14 population, accounting for only 12% of contemporary humans (Henrich et al., 2010), they are
15 also a poor representation of *Homo sapiens* generally, as WEIRD populations are biased toward
16 subsistence modes and social structures that did not exist for the majority of human history. This
17 biased sampling can lead to an inaccurate and narrow view of the expected human childhood
18 with culturally-tethered assumptions, such as parents’ unconditional willingness and ability to
19 provision heavily for their children.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Perspectives on the expected human childhood shape research agendas by informing
43 hypotheses. Consider a scientist who assumes that a given negative experience (e.g., insensitive
44 caregiving, exposure to violence) falls outside the *species-typical range*, the range of inputs that
45 humans have evolved adaptations to deal with. This scientist might expect to see responses that
46 follow from *experience-dependent plasticity* – that is, specific experiences resulting in gradual
47 neurobiological changes that tend to be reversible based on later experience. Conversely, they
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may anticipate *dysregulation*, or an inability to mount a biologically adaptive response.
4
5 However, they may be less likely to expect responses that follow from *experience-expectant*
6
7 *plasticity* – that is, experiences at a specific developmental stage triggering major and rapid
8
9 neurobiological changes that are difficult to reverse – as those responses are thought to occur
10
11 only when dealing with species-typical conditions (Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020a; Gabard-
12
13 Durnam & McLaughlin, 2019; Greenough et al., 1987; Nelson & Gabard-Durnam, 2020). In
14
15 other words, if a scientist assumes an adverse experience falls *outside* the species-typical range,
16
17 they may anticipate either reversible change or dysregulation. If, however, they assume it falls
18
19 *within* this range, they may expect either experience-expectant or experience-dependent
20
21 plasticity¹ (McLaughlin & Gabard-Durnam, in press). In short, judgments about whether or not
22
23 an adverse experience falls within the species-typical range or not has consequences for our
24
25 scientific understanding of adaptation and impairment as well as for specific research agendas.
26
27 Therefore, the field needs an accurate portrait of the species-typical range to better inform our
28
29 view of the expected human childhood.
30
31
32
33
34

35 In the sections that follow, we bring together evidence from history, anthropology, and
36
37 primatology to argue that over evolutionary time, human infants and children have on average
38
39 been exposed to higher levels of threat and (some forms of) deprivation than is typical in
40
41 industrialized societies; and that because these levels were highly variable across time and space
42
43 (Roser et al., 2019a; Stearns, 2006; Volk & Atkinson, 2008, 2013), natural selection has likely
44
45 favored phenotypic plasticity, the ability to tailor development to different conditions.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 ¹ The term ‘expected’ plasticity is arguably a misnomer, because this form of plasticity does not necessarily
55 evolve in response to the ‘expected’ environment. This has led to some confusion in previous work by one of us
56 (Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020a).
57
58
59
60

Child-centeredness across societies

Societies vary in their degree of *child-centeredness* — or, the extent to which adults curate their environment to conform to the preferences of children. While hunter-gatherer societies tend to be high on *indulgence* — meaning parents are quick to respond to children’s desires, like nursing (Konner, 2016) — they tend to be lower on child-centeredness, expecting children to accommodate and adapt to a more adult-centered lifeway (Rogoff, 2011). While the degree of child-centeredness is generally high in many contemporary WEIRD societies, this feature is likely to be an outlier in the distribution of societies in human history (Lancy, 2014, 2015), and may be a violation of the expected human childhood. This is not to say that parents don’t care for their children in non-WEIRD societies; that is patently false. In all societies, children are cared for. Also, as small-scale societies are more susceptible to harsh and unpredictable environments, and as risks particularly affect children because of their immature immune systems, caregiving must be attuned to children’s *needs* for them to have a decent chance at survival (Martin et al., 2020; Tronick et al., 1987). However, in small-scale societies, children’s *preferences* may play a smaller role in shaping adult behavior than they do in WEIRD societies. For instance, children may be expected to adapt to the daily schedules of adult caregivers, as opposed to the other way around, and older children may be expected to take on more responsibilities, such as contributing to the household economy by participating in food production, household chores, and childcare (Blurton Jones et al., 1989; Crittenden et al., 2013; Lee & Kramer, 2002).

We are not arguing that behaviors such as extra attention to children’s needs and preferences are unnatural and therefore undesirable. That would be committing the naturalistic fallacy, or inferring ‘ought’ from ‘is’. Rather, we argue that discourse in developmental and

1
2
3 clinical psychology can benefit from a greater incorporation of evidence from diverse fields
4
5 when considering which types of experiences fall within the species-typical range.
6

7
8 We are not the first to recognize that many well-established psychological theories do not
9
10 generalize as widely as commonly assumed. This point has been repeatedly made in psychology
11
12 journals (e.g., Keller et al., 2018; Rogoff et al., 2017; Sternberg, 2014), and has been the focus of
13
14 work by evolutionary developmental psychologists (e.g., Barrett, 2020; Bjorklund & Ellis, 2014;
15
16 Geary & Berch, 2016; House et al., 2013; Legare, 2019). Reaching out from the other side of the
17
18 bridge, clinical psychologists have connected their work with that of biological anthropologists
19
20 and evolutionary psychologists (e.g., Callaghan & Tottenham, 2016; Ganz, 2018; Richardson et
21
22 al., 2020; Rifkin-Graboi et al., 2021; Tooley et al., 2021). Particularly relevant is a recent paper
23
24 by Humphreys and Salo (2020), which argues that developmental and clinical psychologists need
25
26 to empirically update their notions of the expected human childhood in a way that better aligns
27
28 with the high and variable levels of adversity documented in the historical and cross-cultural
29
30 record.
31
32
33

34 35 **Outline**

36
37 Here, we synthesize the main findings of systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and cross-
38
39 cultural investigations, each of which have analyzed dimensions of adversity (e.g., infant
40
41 mortality due to exposures to pathogens or violence), in humans or non-human primates, during
42
43 a particular historical or contemporary time period. We focus on two broad dimensions of the
44
45 early environment known to impact key developmental outcomes, *threat* and *deprivation*, as
46
47 these dimensions are the central focus of the threat-deprivation model of adversity (Humphreys
48
49 & Zeanah, 2015; McLaughlin & Sheridan, 2016; Sheridan & McLaughlin, 2014). We define
50
51 *threat* as experiences involving the potential for harm imposed by other agents, and *deprivation*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 as low levels of social, cognitive, and nutritional inputs, all of which should be contextualized
4
5 within the larger cultural expectations and norms they take place in (see section 6). In the
6
7 harshness-unpredictability framework (Ellis et al., 2009; Ellis et al., under review), threat and
8
9 deprivation are the primary causes of *harshness*, defined as age-specific rates of morbidity and
10
11 mortality. This framework defines *unpredictability* as stochastic variation in harshness over
12
13 space and time (Ellis et al., 2009). Our analysis covers unpredictability in three main ways. First,
14
15 we discuss the idea that high levels of climate variability in human evolution lowered the
16
17 correlation between nutritional conditions early and later in life, reducing the adaptive value of
18
19 using the former to developmentally adapt to the latter (Nettle et al., 2013; Wells, 2007). Second,
20
21 we discuss the fact that higher infant and child survival in recent history has reduced variance in
22
23 the age at death, thus increasing predictability, though not necessarily the correlation between
24
25 conditions early and later in life (Young et al., 2020). Third, we discuss evidence suggesting that
26
27 parent-child interactions may be less predictable, for instance due to less consistent parenting
28
29 (Eltanamy et al., 2021; Mesman et al., 2016), when families live in extremely harsh conditions
30
31 (e.g., high pathogen loads, famine, warfare) (Quinlan, 2007).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 In section 2, we begin with a broad discussion of infant and child mortality across human
39
40 history. In section 3, we examine the dimension of *threat* — acts of commission that inflict direct
41
42 harm or violence — followed by a discussion of *deprivation* — acts of omission, such as
43
44 restricting investment — in section 4². In section 5, we briefly address the ways in which threat
45
46
47

48 ² Threat (section 3) and deprivation (section 4) can be distinguished based on whether the actions involved
49 are acts of commission (e.g., inflicting direct harm or violence) and acts of omission (e.g., insufficient nursing, early
50 weaning, limiting protection against pathogens or predators) (Humphreys & Zeanah, 2015). Acts of commission are
51 a form of *threat*; that is, experiences involving the potential for harm imposed by other agents. Acts of omission are
52 a form of *deprivation*; that is, low levels of social, cognitive, and nutritional inputs. Empirical research shows that
53 threat and deprivation (e.g., abuse vs. neglect) may shape mental abilities in different ways (Colich et al., 2020;
54 Humphreys & Zeanah, 2015; McLaughlin et al., 2019; Sheridan & McLaughlin, 2014; Sumner et al., 2019), across a
55 range of countries (Salhi et al., 2021). However, although the line between threat and deprivation is clear-cut in
56 some cases, it is murky in others. For instance, in some cultures infanticide may occur by leaving an infant behind in
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and deprivation have been associated with each other during human evolution; that is, were
4
5 children who were exposed to threat also more likely to be deprived and vice versa? Finally, in
6
7 section 6, we discuss major developmental and clinical implications of our two main claims; (1)
8
9 that the mean level of adversity for our species was higher than developmental and clinical
10
11 psychologists often assume; and (2) that variation in adversity across societies and individuals,
12
13 not uniformity, was common across human history (**Figure 1**). We argue that in response to such
14
15 variation, natural selection has likely favored *phenotypic plasticity*, the ability to tailor
16
17 development to different conditions, including harsh and unpredictable environments. This
18
19 means that a given person can be highly plastic in response to the environment.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 [INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE; please find the associated caption below]
27
28
29
30

31 **Figure 1.** The expected human childhood. A common view in developmental and clinical
32
33 psychology is that the expected human childhood was low in threat and deprivation (dotted
34
35 circles). The proposed view is that the expected human childhood was characterized by higher
36
37 mean levels of threat and nutritional and higher levels of variance in these adversities across
38
39 individuals (solid circles). This view focuses less on ‘normative development’ and more on
40
41 phenotypic plasticity, the ability to tailor development to different conditions, including harsh
42
43 and unpredictable environments. This figure was inspired by figure 1 in Sheridan and
44
45 McLaughlin (2014), and by figure 1 in McLaughlin and Sheridan (2016).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 the wilderness (e.g., bush, jungle, or forest), where it will not survive by itself. Is this an act of commission or
54
55 omission? Nonetheless, neglect appears to be more common in the cross-cultural record than deliberate killing, even
56
57 if the end result is frequently the same (Korbin, 1987).
58
59
60

2. Infant and child mortality across human evolution

People often think of art or music as the greatest of human achievements, but this honor really belongs to the global reduction of infant and child mortality, and associated psychosocial adversities (e.g., bereavement), in recent history (Roser et al., 2019a; Stearns, 2006; Volk & Atkinson, 2008, 2013). In this section, we strive to make two primary points: (1) that mean infant and child mortality was relatively higher in the past, and that (2) infant and child mortality were, and continue to be, variable across societies. Though there is substantial variation between geographical regions, and in some places infant and child mortality continue to be high, children's welfare, on average, has improved greatly in recent history.

A survey of small-scale and mainly recent historical societies suggests that prior to the advent of agriculture, more than a quarter of infants did not survive their first year of life, and nearly half did not survive to puberty (Volk & Atkinson, 2008, 2013; for surveys focusing on small-scale societies, see Gurven & Kaplan, 2007; Hewlett, 1991; Walker et al., 2006). Many others suffered morbidity, that is disability and damage, caused by environmental hazards. To compare: infant and child mortality rates are less than 1% in WEIRD societies (Human Mortality Database, 2008; Roser et al., 2019a). In 2017, global infant and child mortality rates were 2.9% and 4.6%, respectively, with the highest contemporary child mortality rates in Sub-Saharan Africa — where in some countries 10% of children never reach their 5th birthday — and the lowest in Iceland, below 0.3% (Roser et al., 2019a). In societies where gains have been made in recent history, these have often been attributed to agriculture and economic growth that resulted in improved nutrition, housing, infrastructure, hygiene, the advent of public health, and technological and medical advances. However, while global mean rates of infant and child mortality have declined over time, there is and long has been substantial variation in mortality

1
2
3 rates across societies (Human Mortality Database, 2008; Roser et al., 2019a). Thus, it is not only
4 the case that our conception of mortality rates is skewed by the affluent West, but also that these
5 patterns are different from the majority of human experience until very recently.
6
7

8
9
10 It would be one-sided to sketch a portrait of human history that only emphasizes
11 adversity. Human societies are better characterized as diverse (Singh & Glowacki, 2021), and
12 throughout history, many societies were highly cooperative, egalitarian, and practiced extensive
13 alloparenting, with children learning valuable skills and knowledge in mixed-age peer groups
14 (Kelly, 2013; Meehan & Crittenden, 2016; Lew-Levy et al., 2017). Our goal is therefore to
15 synthesize a nuanced portrait of childhood throughout human history, particularly one that can
16 accommodate variation across cultures and ecologies (Barnard, 2004; Humphreys & Salo, 2020;
17 Page & French, 2020).
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 We begin this section by describing how infant and child mortality rates have historically
29 varied, and continue to vary, by subsistence mode. Then, we discuss two facts that have
30 promoted the evolution of childhood adaptations to stress. First, the force of natural selection
31 declines with age; that is, the extent to which traits affect lifetime reproductive success is
32 stronger earlier relative to later in life. Second, infants and children have been able to exert some
33 degree of influence over their own survival via their own behavior and by influencing their
34 caregivers (e.g., evocative effects of temperament). This background sets the stage for discussing
35 threat, deprivation, and their associations, in sections 3-5.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **The demographic transition**

47
48
49 Prior to the advent of crop and animal domestication in some regions of the world during
50 the Neolithic Revolution — as early as 13,000 years ago — the predominant mode of subsistence
51 for *Homo sapiens* was centered on hunting and gathering (Weisdorf, 2005). As *Homo sapiens*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 has existed for about 200,000 years, this means that for roughly 95% of our species' history,
4
5 children were born into hunter-gatherer societies (van Schaik, 2016). More generally, the genus
6
7 *Homo*, which stretches back 2 million years to *Homo habilis*, also relied on foraging as the
8
9 primary subsistence strategy, suggesting that this lifeway has deep evolutionary roots.
10
11

12 In hunter-gatherer societies, life expectancy tends to be lower than in contemporary,
13
14 industrialized societies. This difference in life expectancy, however, is not driven much by adult
15
16 mortality. For instance, in contemporary hunter-gatherer and forager-horticulturalist populations,
17
18 the human mortality hazard curve is typically U-shaped, with high mortality hazards early and
19
20 late in life (Gurven & Kaplan, 2007; Hill et al., 2007; Walker et al., 2006). The per-year survival
21
22 odds for adults are high: once an individual has reached the age of 15, the mode in adulthood is
23
24 approximately 72 years, with a range of 68-78 years of age (Gurven & Kaplan, 2007). Note that
25
26 life expectancy at age 15 will be lower than the mode, because the distribution around the mode
27
28 is not symmetrical; there are more deaths to the left of the mode than to the right (Walker et al.,
29
30 2006). Though estimates of prehistoric humans are more uncertain, the predicted longevity of *H.*
31
32 *habilis* is 52-56 years and that of *H. erectus* 60-63 years (Charnov & Berrigan, 1993; Hammer &
33
34 Foley, 1996; see also Page & French, 2020). Thus, the difference in life expectancy between past
35
36 and present societies seems to be mainly driven by mortality in early life.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 [INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE; please find the associated caption below]
46
47
48

49 **Figure 2.** The demographic transition. An illustration of general trends in birth rates,
50
51 death rates, and total population size across (top) the evolutionary history of *Homo sapiens*, and
52
53 a zoom-in (bottom) across more recent demographic transitions. Lines depict qualitative patterns,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 not empirical data. A significant degree of variation and noise is also expected in all of these
4 rates, but is not illustrated here. This figure was inspired by Roser et al. (2019b).
5
6
7
8
9

10 Contemporary hunter-gatherer societies are characterized by high birth and high death
11 rates. These features overlap with the central features of what is sometimes described as Stage 1
12 of the Demographic Transition, typically observed among hunter-gatherer or non-industrial
13 societies (**Figure 2**). The Demographic Transition Model (Thompson, 1929) is a descriptive
14 model of the demographic shift from high birth and mortality rates to low birth and mortality
15 rates in response to industrialization and accompanying changes, such as advances in technology,
16 education, and economic development. In Stage 1, populations exhibit both high birth and death
17 rates, leading to roughly stable or slowly increasing population sizes. In Stage 2, death rates
18 begin to fall rapidly but birth rates remain high, leading to rapid increases in population size. In
19 Stage 3, birth rates also begin to fall, leading to a slower increase in population size which
20 culminates in a falling, then more stable population size in Stage 4, where both birth and death
21 rates remain low. In Stage 5, there may be a slight increase in birth rates, leading to small
22 increases in population size. The main point illustrated in **Figure 2** is that the demographic shifts
23 in Stages 2-5 have occurred in the last 5% of our species' history. Thus, we can assume that the
24 other 95% of that time was spent in environments that more closely resembled the features of
25 Stage 1; environments which, as noted earlier, were highly variable.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 We can gain additional insight by viewing demographic data through an evolutionary
47 lens (Kaplan & Lancaster, 2000; Mace, 2000; Sear, 2015, 2021). A primary engine of evolution
48 — or, change in the genetic composition of a population over time, is natural selection, defined
49 as the differential reproductive success of inherited variations (Buss, 1999). The currency of
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 natural selection is *inclusive fitness*, or the number of offspring an individual produces
4
5 throughout their life (lifetime reproductive success), plus the effect they have on the reproduction
6
7 of relatives (indirect fitness), who are more likely to share their genes. Under pressure from
8
9 selection, traits or adaptations that help an organism improve their reproductive success are
10
11 favored and thus propagate in a population. If an organism dies before reproducing, their genes
12
13 are less represented in the next generation and are at a disadvantage. Over time, this process
14
15 results in physiological and behavioral adaptations with the capacity to effectively respond to the
16
17 species-typical range of environmental inputs.
18
19

20 21 22 **The force of selection declines with age**

23
24 In line with demographic research, we distinguish between *infant mortality rate*, the
25
26 likelihood of dying prior to age 1, and *child mortality rate*, the cumulative probability of dying
27
28 prior to approximate sexual maturity at age 15 (Volk & Atkinson, 2013). As the latter mortality
29
30 rate subsumes the former, these two rates are not exclusive. Nonetheless, this distinction is useful
31
32 because the causes of mortality might differ for infants and children. In the contemporary United
33
34 States, infants are more likely to die from abuse and neglect than older children are. For instance,
35
36 in 2019, infants younger than 1 year old died from abuse and neglect at more than three times the
37
38 rate (22.94 per 100,000 children) of children who were 1 year old (6.87 per 100,000 children),
39
40 and this difference only increases for older age groups (U.S. Department of Health & Human
41
42 Services, 2021, see p. 55).
43
44
45

46
47 Knowledge about causes of death informs our expectations about which adaptations may
48
49 have been favored by natural selection at different developmental stages. The age at maturity
50
51 provides a logical cutoff, because natural selection acts differently before and after this age.
52
53 More specifically, the force of selection is uniform before the age at maturity and declines
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exponentially after this age: steeply in early adulthood, and less steeply in old age (Caswell,
4 2007; Charlesworth, 2000; Hamilton, 1966; Jones, 2009), even if it rarely reaches zero (Pavard
5 & Coste, 2021). In other words, traits affect lifetime reproductive success substantially more
6 before the age at maturity, and less so at later ages, when organisms have used some of their
7 reproductive potential and have less of it to spare. The significance of this fact for human
8 evolution, which is characterized by high infant and child mortality, cannot be overstated: we
9 should expect strong selection for childhood adaptations to potentially stressful conditions, that
10 is, mechanisms that enable infants and children to deal with harsh and unpredictable
11 environments as well as possible, under the constraints posed by such environments.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 At this point, we wish to prevent four potential misunderstandings. First, the fact that
25 responses to chronic stress may entail costs to survival and reproduction later in life (e.g.,
26 allostatic load), does not mean they are not adaptive. What matters for natural selection is
27 whether these responses increase (or decrease) lifetime reproductive success. In many cases they
28 will, because the force of selection is much stronger earlier than later in life. Second, the fact that
29 adaptations for dealing with adversity exist does not mean that people living in harsh and
30 unpredictable conditions attain the same levels of survival and reproductive success as people
31 living in safe and supportive conditions; people are merely making the best of a difficult
32 situation. Third, if people have evolved adaptations for dealing with adversity, this by no means
33 implies that infants' and children's survival and well-being does not increase with higher levels
34 of caregiver investment; in fact, it often does (see section 4). Children in all but the most dire
35 circumstances depend on receiving high levels of care, even if caregiving looks very different
36 across different societies. Fourth, as already noted, if people have evolved to 'expect' certain
37 forms and variation in levels of adversity and are able to developmentally adjust to them (within
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the species-typical range), this by no means implies that we should reduce efforts to eradicate
4
5 adversity. Our bodies have adaptations for responding to cancer (e.g., the immune system
6
7 eliminates cancer cells on a regular basis), but cancer is harmful to survival and well-being, and
8
9 therefore, we should reduce carcinogens. In the same way that biologists and medical doctors
10
11 acknowledge the existence of adaptations for responding to cancer, psychologists should
12
13 acknowledge the existence of adaptations for responding to adversity. Such adversity has always
14
15 been with us; it is no stranger.
16
17

18 19 **Children's influence on their own survival**

20
21 Natural selection could only favor childhood adaptations to stress if responses to early
22
23 adversity affected survival or reproduction. In this subsection, therefore, we describe some (but
24
25 not all) of adaptive responses to early adversity, including ways in which infants and children
26
27 have been able to influence their own chances of survival.
28
29

30
31 The main cause of infant and child mortality during human evolution is thought to be
32
33 gastrointestinal or respiratory disease (70-80% of deaths) (Volk, 2011; see also Lancy, 2015;
34
35 Volk & Atkinson, 2013). Disease remains the primary modern cause of infant death, especially
36
37 in countries with high mortality rates (Bryce et al., 2005; Volk & Atkinson, 2013), and is more
38
39 likely to co-occur with low protein and/or caloric intake (McDade, 2003; Urlacher et al., 2018).
40
41 Before the demographic transition, there was much more variability in mortality rates due to the
42
43 periodic effects of infectious disease (e.g., cholera, smallpox, measles), potentially favoring the
44
45 evolution of phenotypic plasticity. Improved nutrition, better living conditions, and public health
46
47 interventions smoothed mortality variability (Gonzaga et al., 2018; Omran, 1983; Wilmoth &
48
49 Horiuchi, 1999). In human history, the probability of death has decreased at younger ages and
50
51 become concentrated (or compressed) at old ages. This 'mortality compression' (Stallard, 2016)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 implies that a narrower range of outcomes (reaching old age) has become more likely, thus
4
5 increasing predictability. However, mortality compression does not imply that the correlation
6
7 between conditions early and later in life has also changed. At least in principle, early adversity
8
9 might predict lower life expectancy as much, more, or less in populations before compared with
10
11 after the demographic transition. So, mortality compression implies that the age at death has
12
13 become more predictable in one component (variability) but not necessarily in another (cue
14
15 reliability) (for a discussion of components of unpredictability, see Young et al., 2020).
16
17
18

19
20 Infants and children are not helpless in the face of disease threat; they have some ability
21
22 to influence their exposures and responses to pathogens. They might influence their *exposures*,
23
24 for instance, by modifying their behavior in ways that reduce risk of ingesting pathogens (e.g.,
25
26 reducing exploration when near likely sources of pathogens, such as rotten meat, as adults do;
27
28 Curtis et al., 2011; Tybur & Lieberman, 2016; Tybur et al., 2013; though see Rottman, 2014).
29
30 Infants and children might also influence their *responses* to pathogens by changing their
31
32 allocation of internal energetic resources. For instance, they can allocate more energy to immune
33
34 function, if exposed to high levels of pathogens, thus increasing their chances of survival in
35
36 pathogen-rich environments (Blackwell et al., 2010; Garcia et al., 2020; McDade, 2003; McDade
37
38 et al., 2016; McDade et al., 2008; Urlacher et al., 2018).
39
40
41

42
43 The amount and quality of caregiving infants and children receive has a major impact on
44
45 their survival (Lancy, 2015; Quinlan, 2007; Volk & Atkinson, 2013). Caregivers influence
46
47 children's risk of morbidity (i.e., age-specific rates of damage) and mortality (i.e., age-specific
48
49 rates of death) in many ways. Two primary ways of influencing children's wellbeing is by
50
51 providing nutrition and protection. Nutrition is a basic resource for life (which young children
52
53 cannot produce) and which affects physical growth, in addition to children's capacity to mount
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 successful immune responses to pathogens. Protection takes a variety of forms, including
4 carrying, which is widespread in contemporary human societies and likely has been throughout
5 our evolutionary history, and which in some ecologies serves to reduce exposures to pathogens
6 and predation (Lozoff & Brittenham, 1979; Tracer, 2002a, 2002b). For instance, among the Au
7 and Gnau forager-horticulturalists in Papua New Guinea, mothers carry young infants a large
8 portion of the time, in part to protect them from the pathogenic environment. As they get older,
9 mothers carry their children less and less, gradually exposing them to antigens and pathogens in
10 the environment, and enabling the incremental development of immunocompetence (Tracer &
11 Wyckoff, 2020).

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Caregiver investment tends to be lower in harsh environments with high *extrinsic* risk,
25 meaning morbidity and mortality caused by factors that individuals, be they infants, children, or
26 caregivers, cannot control (Ellis et al., 2009; Quinlan, 2007). From an evolutionary perspective,
27 extrinsic risk creates diminishing returns to parental effort (Quinlan, 2007). A landmark cross-
28 cultural study of several dozen mostly non-industrial societies with various subsistence modes
29 suggests that when infant and child mortality results from famine or warfare, mothers tend to
30 invest less in their offspring (Quinlan, 2007). However, the relation between pathogen risk and
31 maternal investment is shaped like an inverted-U: maternal investment increases in environments
32 with low to moderate levels of pathogens, and then decreases from moderate to high levels
33 (Quinlan, 2007). Quinlan (2007) speculates this might be because in environments where
34 pathogen stress is low, infants and children need little protection; where it is high, they cannot be
35 protected; and where it is moderate, caregiver investment pays off the most. Consistent with this
36 pattern of higher parental investment at moderate levels of adversity, a recent meta-synthesis of
37 qualitative studies found that during times of war, parenting practices were harsher, more hostile,
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 less inconsistent, and less warm in extremely dangerous settings and warmer and more protective
4 when only living under threat (Eltanamy et al., 2021). A meta-analysis of quantitative studies,
5
6 however, found a linear pattern with small effect sizes: parents who had more exposure to war
7
8 were harsher ($r = .12$) and less warm ($r = -.02$) toward their children (note: this meta-analysis
9
10 coded hostility under harshness and did not measure inconsistency; Eltanamy et al., 2021).
11
12
13

14
15 Infants' and children's ability to influence their mortality risk depends largely (if not
16
17 primarily) on their ability to influence investment by caregivers. Empirical research shows that
18
19 parental investment generally improves infant and child survival (Volk & Atkinson, 2013). There
20
21 are many specific ways, through appearance and behavior, in which infants and children might
22
23 influence the quality and amount of investment they receive (e.g., by having neotenus (cute)
24
25 features, following gaze, attending to facial expressions, and responding contingently; Hrdy,
26
27 2016). Functionally, such behaviors may convey information about the child's health status.³
28
29
30 Additionally, children can influence their own survival through independent foraging and caloric
31
32 provisioning. Indeed, research suggests that hunter-gatherer children participate in foraging and
33
34 hunting from an early age, and are able to furnish a significant number of calories by middle
35
36 childhood (Blurton Jones et al., 1989; Crittenden et al., 2013).
37
38
39

40 Throughout human history and in a variety of cultures, caregivers applied a triage,
41
42 investing more in offspring judged to be more likely to survive and become productive members
43
44 of the family, who will be able to pay back the investment made in them (Lancy, 2014, 2015;
45
46 Volk & Atkinson, 2013). This is called the Banker's Paradox: only loan money to people who
47
48
49

50
51 ³ Biologists distinguish between signals and cues (Maynard-Smith & Harper, 2003). A 'cue' provides
52 information about some feature of the world (e.g., health status) and can be used to guide future action, but has not
53 evolved for this purpose. For instance, spider web vibrations convey information about prey body size, and so
54 spiders can use it to tailor their attacks, but prey body size has not evolved to this purpose. A 'signal' is a cue that
55 evolved for communication. For instance, prey body size may have evolved to convey information about the ability
56 to compete (e.g., for food or mates) to its conspecifics. Whether infant behavior indicative of health status is a cue or
57 signal is currently not known (Hrdy, 2016).
58
59
60

1
2
3 need it the least, as they are most likely to repay (Tooby & Cosmides, 1996). However, whether
4 a given caregiver follows the Banker's Paradox may depend on parental condition. For instance,
5 studies in the United States suggest that whereas parents with low resources invest more in low-
6 risk than high-risk children, parents with higher resources invest more in high-risk than low-risk
7 children (Beaulieu & Bugental, 2008; Bugental et al., 2010). In general, across human history
8 caregivers had multiple social roles and faced competing demands, with demands increasing in
9 times of resource stress (e.g., famine) and chronic danger (e.g., war); parents could not always
10 prioritize each child equally. In some cases, children were able to extract more resources from
11 their caregivers via behaviors deemed 'undesirable' in developmental and clinical psychology
12 (e.g., 'acting out'). For instance, de Vries (1984, 1987b) found in the Masai that calmer babies
13 received fewer resources than more temperamental babies, resulting in higher survival rates for
14 more temperamental babies during a famine. In this case, it seems the squeaky wheel gets the
15 grease.

3. Threat

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 In this section, we explore how *threat* — experiences involving the potential for harm
36 imposed by other agents — may have shaped human development. We focus on three primary
37 threats to children throughout human evolution: infanticide, violent conflict with non-caregivers,
38 and predation. Infanticide is widely studied in primatology and anthropology, but receives less
39 attention in developmental and clinical psychology, which focus on living children. We discuss
40 infanticide for three reasons. First, infanticide appears to account for a non-trivial percentage of
41 infant deaths in human history, so it should be included in a characterization of the expected
42 human childhood. Second, the psychological mechanisms that infants and children use to survive
43 and thrive in contemporary societies – for instance, by soliciting investment from caregivers who
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 have little to spare – may have been shaped by past selection pressures created by infanticide.

4
5 Third, constraints may force caregivers to limit their investment (e.g., nutrition) for some period
6
7 to see whether a child is strong enough to survive. Some children who are alive today, especially
8
9 in harsh and unpredictable environments, have passed this triage, but may still be experiencing
10
11 the mental and physical consequences of this form of early adversity.
12
13

14 **Infanticide**

15
16
17 Following disease, another leading cause of infant and child mortality during human
18
19 evolution may have been infanticide, the killing of infants (Budnik & Liczbińska, 2006;
20
21 Cunningham, 2005; Rawson, 2003; Gurven & Kaplan, 2007; Lancy, 2014, 2015; Volk &
22
23 Atkinson, 2013). Infanticide appears to account for a non-trivial percentage of infant deaths
24
25 among societies in the past thousands of years (Volk, 2011; Volk & Atkinson, 2013) and among
26
27 contemporary hunter-gatherers (Gurven & Kaplan, 2007), but estimates are relatively uncertain
28
29 because infanticide is often a hidden behavior. Infanticide may have been carried out for a
30
31 variety of reasons, such as poor maternal or infant health, unsupportive social and ecological
32
33 conditions, or being born out of wedlock (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Hrdy, 1999, 2009; Lancy, 2014,
34
35 2015; Volk, 2011; Volk & Atkinson, 2008, 2013).
36
37
38
39

40
41 Infanticide is widespread among mammals. Phylogenetic analyses have shown that
42
43 infanticide occurs in 182 (63%) of the 289 species that have been studied (Lukas & Huchard,
44
45 2019). Breaking down by sex of the perpetrator, infanticide by females has been documented in
46
47 89 (31%) of 289 species (Lukas & Huchard, 2019), and infanticide by males in 119 (46%) of 260
48
49 species, including nearly all of the great apes (Lukas & Huchard, 2014). Infanticide rates are
50
51 highly variable across the mammals, mainly as a function of social organization and life history
52
53 (Lukas & Huchard, 2019). Both of these analyses have only focused on instances where
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individuals kill offspring that are most likely not their own, excluding instances where mothers
4
5 kill their own offspring. This appears to be different in humans where the main perpetrators of
6
7 infanticide may include parents or other family members, as discussed below.
8
9

10 The infanticide statistics provided in this section should not be misunderstood as
11
12 implying that ‘maltreatment was common’ in humans or other mammals. In fact, there is only
13
14 limited evidence for chronic physical abuse by caregivers in prehistoric human skeletal material
15
16 (Walker, 2001). We may speculate that if infants and children were killed by their caregivers,
17
18 this likely occurred in a punctuated violent event or prolonged deprivation, rather than through
19
20 the cumulative effects of repeated physical abuse over the course of months or years. That
21
22 infanticide may have accounted for a substantial percentage of infant deaths in human history,
23
24 and that rates of infanticide varied across societies, should inform estimates of the mean level of
25
26 harshness (age-specific rates of morbidity and mortality), and stochastic variation in the level of
27
28 harshness over space and time, of the expected human childhood.
29
30
31
32

33 The anthropological record suggests that if infanticide occurs, it is mainly carried out by
34
35 primary caregivers, not strangers or familiar non-relatives; though there are exceptions, such as
36
37 when infants and children whose father had died, or who had abandoned them, were killed by the
38
39 new partner of their mother (Hill & Hurtado, 1996; Hill & Kaplan, 1988). Infanticide is typically
40
41 described as an emotionally painful event for caregivers, who consider it either necessary or the
42
43 best choice among a set of terrible options (Chagnon, 2012; Hrdy, 1999; Lancy, 2015; Volk &
44
45 Atkinson, 2008, 2013). Other work claims that there has been a shift in attitudes toward infants
46
47 and children in the 19th century; that before then, people considered it less of a need to cherish
48
49 infants, to offer them safety and security, and to help them develop (Mitterauer & Sieder, 1997;
50
51 Zelizer, 1985). Regardless, culturally sensitive understandings recognize competing demands on
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 mothers, which vary by setting. For instance, in conditions of nutritional scarcity, mothers may
4
5 not have access to sufficient resources for growing a baby or for lactation, which entails greater
6
7 energetic costs than pregnancy (Beehner & Lu, 2013; Worthington-Roberts et al. 1985). To give
8
9 an impression of these painful experiences, we provide ethnographic excerpts in this footnote⁴.

10
11
12 Infanticide might appear at odds with evolutionary theory, but it is not (Hrdy, 1999,
13
14 2009). Natural selection favors strategies (e.g., genes, developmental systems) that optimize
15
16 fitness; that is, which increase their own representation in future generations, relative to other
17
18 strategies in the population. In evolutionary biology, individuals are viewed as instantiating
19
20 strategies. Mathematical theory shows that the lifetime reproductive success of individuals is
21
22 under many conditions a good measure of the fitness of a strategy (Grafen, 2007). Therefore,
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 ⁴ It was an ironclad rule that no [Tapirapé] woman should have more than three living children... A fourth
30 child, or a third child if it were of the wrong sex, was buried immediately after its birth... "We do not want to see
31 hunger in their eyes." They pointed out to me the difficulty of providing food, especially meat, for more than three
32 children. (Wagley, 1977, as quoted in Lancy, 2014, pp. 75–76)

33
34 The Bakairi selectively practice infanticide... Most of such cases occur when the mother is still nursing an
35 older infant and cannot properly care for another baby. (Picchi, 2000, as quoted in Lancy, 2014, p. 76)

36
37 Illegitimate [Mundurucu] children are usually killed at birth, along with twins and children with birth
38 defects. If the child does survive it is referred to as "tun" which means excrement. They are not abused, but they
39 cannot marry due to their indefinite status. (Murphy & Murphy, 1985, as quoted in Lancy, 2014, p. 75)

40
41 Within the shantytown, child death a *mingua* (accompanied by maternal indifference and neglect) is
42 understood as an appropriate maternal response to a deficiency in the child. Part of learning how to mother on the
43 Alto includes learning when to "let go". (Scheper-Hughes, 1985, p. 295)

44
45 The same mother who regretfully eliminates a poorly timed neonate will lovingly care for later ones if
46 circumstances improve. (Hrdy, 1999, as quoted in Lancy, 2015, pp. 124–125)

47
48 Infanticide is, in some cases, related to the subsistence strategy of a group. In particular, a survey of several
49 hunter-gatherer societies suggests an association between the willingness to commit infanticide and the challenge of
50 carrying more than a single young child whilst living and migrating with a nomadic group (Riches, 1974). For
51 instance, among the Ache, a Paraguayan hunter-gatherer society, the death of the mother or father is grounds for
52 infanticide (Hill & Hurtado, 1996; see also Mull & Mull, 1987). Lancy (2015) explains:

53
54 The Ache are particularly direct in disposing of surplus children (approximately one-fifth) because their
55 peripatetic, foraging lifestyle places an enormous burden on the parents. The father provides significant food
56 resources, and the mother provides both food and the vigilant monitoring required by their dangerous jungle
57 environment. Both men and women face significant health and safety hazards throughout their relatively short lives,
58 and they place their own welfare over that of their offspring. (pp. 117–118)

1
2
3 although fitness should, strictly speaking, be assigned to strategies rather than individuals, for
4 practical purposes, individual survival and reproduction are taken as measures of fitness. For
5 caregivers, the fitness benefits of infanticide might outweigh the costs. These benefits include
6 diverting resources to current offspring that have greater chances of surviving, and saving
7 resources for future offspring that are healthier, or which are born into more favorable
8 circumstances (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dickeman, 1975).
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Infanticide typically happened, and still happens, in the context of cultural beliefs that
18 justify or legitimize the difficult act. For instance, in Japan, infanticide used to be rationalized by
19 the view that the newborn's death was not the extinction of a life but a return to the other world,
20 potentially allowing rebirth at a more favorable future time (Kojima, 2003). We do not cover
21 such beliefs, and variation in them across time and space. For information on these topics, we
22 refer readers to work by David Lancy (2014, 2015). Here, we only mention one common cultural
23 response to high infant and child mortality rates, which is that in many societies, infants do not
24 acquire 'personhood' (i.e., humanity) until weeks, months, or even years after being born, often
25 once their chances of survival have increased (Lancy, 2014, 2015). Before then, they are often
26 considered to be in a liminal state, between two worlds, the living and the dead (e.g., "little
27 angels", "little demons"), and essentially not fully human. This may be one reason why children
28 are underrepresented in the historical record: they are not yet 'socially born' and recognized
29 (Fabian, 1992), viewed as 'persons' worthy of being incorporated into historical recordings,
30 literature, burials, and censuses (Perry, 2006; Woods, 2007). Anthropologists have argued that
31 delaying personhood can be functional, helping to limit caregiver attachment, making it
32 somewhat easier to deal with the loss of the child (de Vries, 1987a; Eible-Eibesfeldt, 1983;
33 Hagen, 1999; Konner, 2010; Laes, 2011; Lancy, 2014, 2015). We are not aware of quantitative
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 tests of this hypothesis, though interestingly, Canadian adults rate babies as increasingly ‘cute’
4
5 from birth to six months of age, which is also when babies are better at surviving illnesses
6
7 (Franklin et al., 2018). There is, however, a body of work examining how cultural frames used to
8
9 interpret adverse experience shape subsequent trauma, which we discuss in section 6.
10
11

12 **Violent conflict with non-caregivers**

13
14 A second source of threat for infants and children is violent conflict with non-caregivers,
15
16 inflicted by members of their own group (e.g., bullying, physical sanctions imposed by peers in
17
18 response to a norm violation) and by members of other groups (e.g., cattle raids, warfare). In a
19
20 survey of eight hunter–gatherer and forager-horticulturalists societies, 17% of infant and child
21
22 deaths can be attributed to violence, either by caregivers (e.g., infanticide) or by non-caregivers.
23
24 This percentage drops to 5% if two groups, the Ache and Hiwi, are excluded (Gurven & Kaplan,
25
26 2007).⁵ The range varied from 1.4% to 63.5%, which illustrates diversity in the human childhood
27
28 experience. Overall, violent conflict accounts for a much lower percentage of deaths than disease
29
30 – as noted earlier, disease is estimated to account for 70-80% of deaths (Volk, 2011) – but for a
31
32 higher percentage of deaths than predation (Volk & Atkinson, 2013), discussed below.
33
34
35
36

37
38 Comparisons with other primates and bioarcheological evidence suggest that violent
39
40 conflict has long been a part of primate life and human evolutionary history (Bribiescas, 2021;
41
42 Martin & Harrod, 2015; Wrangham & Peterson, 1996). Though it is challenging to estimate base
43
44 rates of lethal violence in past societies – in part, because not all forms of lethal violence leave a
45
46 trace the fossil record – bioarcheologists do agree there has been substantial variability in the use
47
48 and types of violence across time and space (Martin & Harrod, 2015; Roser, 2013). Ethnographic
49
50
51
52
53

54 ⁵ These values might also be 18% dropping to 6%, respectively. Because the data on violence and accidents
55 were combined into one category for the !Kung, they could not be separated (M. Gurven, personal communication,
56 March 31, 2021).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 studies show large variation in the share of violent deaths (out of all deaths), ranging from a few
4 percent up to 60% (for a compilation of resources, see Roser, 2013). A cross-cultural study of 21
5 foraging bands suggests that 50.0% incidents of lethal violence result from interpersonal events
6 (i.e., homicides) and 33.8% from intergroup events (e.g., war) (Fry & Söderberg, 2013). These
7 percentage change to 63.3% and 15.2%, respectively, if one group (the Tiwi) are excluded.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Historical trends suggest that violence has declined over the course of human history,
16 including the percentage of people who died by the hands of individuals other than their primary
17 caregivers (Roser, 2013). This decline has not been smooth, however, and violence rates are
18 certainly not down to zero. In 2000, the World Health Organization estimated the median
19 national homicide rate among countries to be 6 per 100,000 per year, and the age-adjusted
20 homicide rate (i.e., weighted sums of age-specific rates) to be 8.8 per 100,000 per year (Krug et
21 al., 2002). The differences between countries were large, and in all countries, many more people
22 suffered from non-lethal violence. Nonetheless, both estimates are markedly lower than the
23 triple-digit values documented in some non-industrial societies (Roser, 2013).
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 The historical decline in violence encompasses many different forms, including domestic
37 abuse (e.g., spousal beating), physical punishment (e.g., social sanctions imposed by peers in
38 response to a norm violation; Mathew & Boyd, 2014), interpersonal violence (e.g., competition
39 over resources or mates), and intergroup conflict (e.g., raiding, ambushing, or warfare) (Fry &
40 Söderberg, 2013; Keeley, 1996). In all forms of violence, infants and children could be passive
41 victims, and in some cases, children were actively encouraged to participate. For instance,
42 historically among the hunter-horticulturalist Shuar of southeastern Ecuador, boys as young as
43 seven were encouraged to actively participate in raids to gain war experience (Stirling, 1938), as
44 children still do in some contemporary societies (Krug et al., 2002). Thus, across human
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 evolution, children have likely been exposed to higher rates of violence by non-caregivers than
4
5 they are in contemporary societies.
6

7
8 Violent conflict tends to be more common in places where resources are scarce and
9
10 unpredictable (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Gat, 2008; Homer-Dixon, 1994; Krug et al., 2002; Lancy,
11
12 2015; Nettle, 2015). However, this correlation is far from perfect. Some societies solve
13
14 challenges posed by resource scarcity and unpredictability through peaceful systems of mutual
15
16 interdependence, sharing resources within and between communities (Winterhalder, 2007);
17
18 others through within-group competition or raids of neighboring villages. Nonetheless, in the
19
20 aggregate, scarcity and unpredictability tend to increase competition-related violence. When
21
22 individuals are close to a ‘desperation threshold’, a level of resources below which it is highly
23
24 undesirable or even fatal to fall (De Courson & Nettle, 2021; Mishra et al., 2017; Stephens,
25
26 1981), individuals might resort to aggression to obtain vital resources (Ellis et al., 2012; Hawley,
27
28 2015; Hawley et al., 2007; Turnbull, 1972; Volk et al., 2012). When there are enough vital
29
30 resources, cooperative strategies may re-emerge (Townsend et al., 2020). Still, in more favorable
31
32 conditions, men may compete for resources that increase their chances of having multiple
33
34 partners, even in hunter-gatherer societies, which tend to be more egalitarian than industrialized
35
36 societies (Daly, 2016; for a recent analysis of the emergence of institutionalized inequality, see
37
38 Smith & Coddling, 2021). In sum, violent encounters have long been a part of human history, and
39
40 thus human infants and children could not necessarily ‘expect’ safe and supportive conditions.
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Predation**

47
48
49 Dangerous animals have historically posed a threat to infants and children, and continue
50
51 to do so in certain contemporary societies. Although this threat is considered to be a relatively
52
53 minor cause of mortality in modern humans (Volk & Atkinson, 2013), there are well-
54
55 documented cases of people being killed while hunting big game with simple tools (Walker,
56
57
58
59
60

2001). For earlier hominids, predation was likely a more significant selection pressure (Hart & Sussman, 2009), as it is for many contemporary primates (Anderson, 1986; Cheney et al., 2004). Predator-caused mortality rates have been observed as high as 65% in chimpanzees (Boesch & Boesch-Achermann, 2000) and 40% in baboons (Bulger & Hamilton, 1987). Steep declines in group size due to predation have been recorded for most non-human primates that have been studied for a sufficiently long period of time (Hill & Dunbar, 1998; Hart & Sussman, 2005). Thus, these non-human primate species suffer high predation rates alongside other stressors, including infanticide (Anderson, 1986; Cheney et al., 2004; Hrdy, 1979, 1999, 2009; Hrdy et al., 1994). It can be reasonable to conclude, then, that predation has always been part of primate life, and that the strength of predation on human survival has likely decreased across time (Volk & Atkinson, 2013).

This section has focused on three significant threats: infanticide, violent conflict with non-caregivers, and predation. The first two threats are thought to be the most likely sources of morbidity and mortality, after disease, for ancestral human infants and children. The third, predation, is thought to be a relatively minor cause of morbidity and mortality among *Homo sapiens*, but a major cause of morbidity and mortality in the earlier stages of our lineage.⁶

4. Deprivation

We have argued that, over evolutionary time, human infants and children have been exposed to higher and more variable levels of threat than those in contemporary, industrialized societies. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that natural selection has favored phenotypic plasticity, the ability to tailor development to different conditions, over narrower mechanisms

⁶ We have not discussed several other sources of morbidity and mortality, such as congenital problems, accidents and environmental causes of death (e.g., typhoons), and labor, which do not typically qualify as 'threats' in psychology. We refer readers interested in these topics to the following outstanding resources (Halcrow et al., 2020; Han et al., 2017; Lancy, 2015, 2017; Volk & Atkinson, 2013; Watson, 2018).

1
2
3 that ‘expect’ safe and supportive conditions. In this section, we make a similar argument for
4
5 deprivation: infants and children have been exposed to a wide range of social, cognitive, and
6
7 nutritional input, including – though certainly not always – lower levels than those typical in
8
9 contemporary, industrialized societies, and therefore likely have the capacity to adjust to this
10
11 variation to a large extent. The difference with our analysis of threat is that while variation in all
12
13 three forms of deprivation — social, cognitive, and nutritional — can be found across human
14
15 societies, we only see substantive evidence for a reduction in mean levels of nutritional
16
17 deprivation across time. It is much harder to use objective benchmarks to compare levels of
18
19 social and cognitive input than it is to compare nutritional input, because what counts as
20
21 adequate social and cognitive inputs varies by culture. Thus, we argue that the mean level of
22
23 nutritional input was typically lower in the past, and that children are generally adapted to a wide
24
25 range of other forms of social and cognitive input.
26
27
28
29

30 31 **Social deprivation**

32
33 Social deprivation refers to low levels in the quantity and quality of human interactions.
34
35 We focus on contact with primary caregivers, such as the mother and father. We also include
36
37 *alloparents* — such as siblings and grandparents — due to evidence suggesting that alloparents
38
39 provide nearly half of caretaking in non-industrialized societies (Hrdy, 1999, 2009; Kramer,
40
41 2005; Meehan & Hawks, 2014).⁷ Social deprivation is likely to occur when caregivers die (e.g.,
42
43 complications of childbirth, violent conflict), or when caregivers are alive but provide limited
44
45 investment in a child (e.g., due to their own poor health or scarce resources). Perhaps in part for
46
47 this reason, alloparenting in humans is more common in harsh and unpredictable environments
48
49
50
51
52
53

54
55 ⁷ In a survey of non-industrialized societies by Kramer (2005), infants received about 50% of their direct
56
57 care from mothers, with little variation between cultures; the remaining 50% was provided by siblings (10–33%),
58
59 grandmothers (1–12%), other alloparents (3–21%), and fathers (see also Del Giudice, 2009).
60

1
2
3 (Lancy, 2014; Martin et al., 2020; Simpson & Belsky, 2016). Moreover, in such environments
4
5 alloparenting may have more impact on child outcomes than in safe and supportive environments
6
7
8 (Nenko et al., 2021).
9

10 Alloparenting can act as a buffer against social, cognitive, and nutritional deprivation.
11
12 Alloparents may provide not only material resources that improve survival (Searx & Mace,
13
14 2008), but also cognitive and social inputs that promote the attainment of motor and social
15
16 milestones (Singletary, 2020), often through play (Meehan & Crittenden, 2016). Despite these
17
18 benefits, a cross-cultural survey found that in all of 28 populations (examined in 45 studies), the
19
20 death of the mother – who is typically the primary caregiver in most cultures – was associated
21
22 with much higher child mortality (Sear & Mace, 2008; see also Konner, 2010; Strassmann,
23
24 2011). Only a tiny proportion of children survived if their mothers died giving birth to them: for
25
26 instance, 1.6% of Swedish children in the 19th century and 5% of Bangladeshi children in the late
27
28 1960s (this percentage had increased to 26% in the same Bangladeshi population by the 1980s).
29
30
31 However, the catastrophic effects of the mother’s death on child outcomes depended strongly on
32
33 the age of the child: the effects weaken or even disappear entirely after children are weaned.
34
35
36 Nonetheless, the effects of the mother’s death on child morbidity and mortality are sometimes
37
38 found even among weaned children (Ronsmans et al., 2010), suggesting that at least in some
39
40 cases, the children of deceased mothers experience more precarious circumstances and may
41
42 suffer from reduced care more generally (Konner, 2010; Perry, 2021; Strassmann, 2011). Thus,
43
44 because maternal mortality was more common in historical than contemporary societies, and
45
46 because maternal care was not always (fully) substituted by other caregivers, we may speculate
47
48 that children would have been more at risk of social and other forms of deprivation in the past.
49
50
51 Moreover, because the degree of alloparental care and investment varies substantially across
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 cultures (Gibson & Mace 2005; Hrdy 2009; Konner 2010), children may have evolved the
4
5 capacity to adjust to a wide range of variation in the quantity and quality of human interactions.
6

7
8 Parental investment generally improves infant and child survival (Volk & Atkinson,
9
10 2008; 2013; section 2). In mammals, offspring especially depend on their mothers for nutrition,
11
12 protection, transportation, and learning (Clutton-Brock, 1991). Thus, the amount that a mother
13
14 can or does invest in their offspring is an important determinant of whether the offspring will
15
16 experience social deprivation. If a mother dies prior to weaning, the infant is also more likely to
17
18 die, not only among humans, but also among other mammals (Balshine, 2012; Hasegawa &
19
20 Hiraiwa, 1980; Lahdenperä et al., 2016; van Noordwijk, 2012). When mothers have poor health
21
22 during gestation and lactation, their offspring tend to have lower fitness outcomes (Altmann et
23
24 al., 2005; Bales et al., 2002; Cameron et al., 1993; Clutton-Brock et al., 1987; Fairbanks &
25
26 McGuire, 1995; Keech et al., 2000; Théoret-Gosselin et al., 2015; Zippel et al., 2021). In several
27
28 non-human primates, maternal condition affects offspring survival and reproductive success post
29
30 weaning. For instance, in both chimpanzees and bonobos, the presence of mothers enhances the
31
32 reproductive success of their adult sons, likely by helping them in status competition with other
33
34 males for social rank (Crockford et al., 2020; Surbeck et al., 2011). Further, a recent comparative
35
36 study showed that in five of seven primate species studied, offspring born in the last four years
37
38 *before* a female's death are more likely to die at a young age, possibly because her general
39
40 condition tends to be worse in the last years of her life (Zippel et al., 2021).
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 We have already argued that parental investment tends to be lower in environments
48
49 characterized by famine or warfare, and shaped like an inverted-U in relation to pathogen risk:
50
51 maternal investment first increases from low to moderate levels of pathogens, then decreases
52
53 from moderate to high levels (Ellis et al., 2009; Quinlan, 2007; section 2). In most non-human
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 primates, mothers of lower social rank tend to invest less in their offspring than mothers of
4
5 higher rank (Suomi, 2016). However, these relations vary across primates. For instance, in olive
6
7 baboons, mothers who experienced higher levels of adversity early in their lives tend to invest
8
9 more in their offspring (spent more time nursing and carrying) than mothers who experienced
10
11 lower levels of adversity (Patterson et al., 2021). So, across several taxa and throughout primate
12
13 evolution, infants and children have experienced different degrees of social deprivation, both due
14
15 to variation in exposure to maternal loss and the ability of living parents to invest. Our claim that
16
17 adverse events occurring in past and present societies often fall within the species-typical range
18
19 does not, of course, imply that all forms of adversity do. For instance, a commonly discussed
20
21 example of species-atypical caregiving environments, institutionalized child rearing, is indeed
22
23 likely to be an evolutionary novelty (Humphreys & Salo, 2020; Tottenham, 2012).

24
25
26
27
28 Father absence is often construed as a form of social deprivation. This view is motivated
29
30 by findings showing that, at least in WEIRD societies, father absence is negatively associated
31
32 with children's socio-emotional development (e.g., increased externalizing behavior) and with
33
34 lower adult mental health and educational attainment (McLanahan et al., 2013). In WEIRD
35
36 societies, father absence is also associated with accelerated reproductive development and early
37
38 childbearing in women (Belsky et al., 1991; Ellis, 2004; Mishra et al., 2009; Webster et al.,
39
40 2014). There is a tendency in this literature to assume that a high levels of investment from both
41
42 parents is normative. This may be true for the majority of children in some societies such as the
43
44 United States, but this is not the case across cultures. For instance, father absence may be
45
46 associated with limited paternal investment in societies where father absence is due to death,
47
48 abandonment, or divorce; however, in societies where absence is due to migration labor, it may
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 actually be associated with continued paternal investment (Draper & Harpending, 1982; Shenk et
4
5 al., 2013).
6

7
8 Cultural differences explain in large part why cross-cultural research does not provide
9
10 universal support for the acceleration of puberty in father-absent households (Sear et al., 2019).
11
12 Specifically, in societies where father absence is associated with energetic deprivation, the rate
13
14 of maturation is not accelerated but delayed (Ellis, 2004). Puberty can only be accelerated when
15
16 there are adequate energetic resources to support growth and development (Coall & Chisholm,
17
18 2003; for an exception, see Painter et al., 2008). If father absence is not associated with energetic
19
20 deprivation, but instead with reduced social capital and limited future prospects (due to social
21
22 stigma, higher morbidity and mortality, and other factors), a preference to have children at a
23
24 young age may be a ‘reasonable response’; that is, a response to the costs and benefits associated
25
26 with living in disadvantaged conditions. This response may result from ancestral cues that were
27
28 correlated with extrinsic mortality across human evolution, cultural expectations, deliberation, or
29
30 a combination of these (Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020b; Geronimus, 1996; Pepper & Nettle, 2017).
31
32 Thus, the extent and direction of the influence of father absence on child development illustrates
33
34 our larger point: we cannot assume that patterns from WEIRD societies generalize to other
35
36 cultural contexts, nor can we base our assumptions about the expected environment based on a
37
38 small slice of humanity.
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 It is challenging to quantify how much variation in caregiver investment infants and
46
47 children have been exposed to, in part, because caregiver investment may take different forms
48
49 both across and within societies. Some researchers have argued that cultures converge in their
50
51 beliefs about the ideal mother, and that these beliefs overlap with attachment theory’s notion of
52
53 the sensitive mother (Mesman et al., 2016, 2017). Others have argued that sensitive
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responsiveness reflects a cultural ideal of good parenting specific to WEIRD societies, where
4 infants are viewed as emotionally expressive, entitled, and independent agents (Keller, 2008;
5 Keller et al., 2018). In many societies, parents face severe constraints on their time and
6 resources, which are reflected in cultural expectations, norms, and ideals about parenting
7 (Chisholm, 1996; Del Giudice, 2009; Keller, 2008; Kramer, 2005; Simpson & Belsky, 2016),
8 and in actual parenting practices (Bornstein et al., 2015, 2017). Even within WEIRD societies,
9 child-centered parenting may not be representative of the majority (Brown et al., 2008; Ganz,
10 2018). For instance, mothers with low family income or many children are less likely to describe
11 the ideal mother as highly sensitive (Mesman et al., 2016), and behavioral studies have shown
12 large variation in social and cognitive input within communities (Kuchirko & Tamis-LeMonda,
13 2019), and between and even within families (von Stumm & Latham, 2018). In short, convergent
14 evidence suggests that, rather than ‘expecting’ high levels of caregiver investment in a specific
15 form (e.g., sensitive responsiveness), infants and children may have evolved adaptations for
16 dealing with a wide range of quantity and quality of caregiving experiences.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Cognitive deprivation**

36
37
38 Cognitive deprivation refers to low levels in the quantity and quality of inputs that afford
39 learning; that is, the acquisition of knowledge, abilities, or responses as a result of experience
40 (Frankenhuis et al., 2019). In this section, we focus only on cognitive inputs (e.g., child-directed
41 speech, active instruction) provided by caregivers. The inputs we focus on are highly valued in
42 WEIRD societies, and are often used as indices of cognitive deprivation in such societies. As
43 noted earlier, however, what counts as adequate social and cognitive input varies by culture. For
44 this reason, we do not make claims about differences in the mean levels of social and cognitive
45 inputs across history and cultures. Rather, we emphasize variation in these inputs, and how such
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 variation may have shaped developmental adaptations. The main point of this section is thus that
4 certain patterns of input that qualify as ‘deprivation’ in WEIRD societies are actually normative
5 in non-WEIRD societies (and vice versa). In those societies, children develop the ecological and
6 social skills necessary to survive and thrive, showing that developmental mechanisms have the
7 capacity to adjust to a wide range of cognitive inputs.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 An oft-discussed form of cognitive input during development is the quality and quantity
16 of infant- and child-directed speech produced by adults. There is considerable support for the
17 notion that child-directed linguistic input from adults helps shape children’s language
18 development (Cristia et al., 2019), leading to gains in skills such as vocabulary size (Hart &
19 Risley, 1995; Rowe, 2008). Consequently, common policy objectives for those seeking to
20 promote child outcomes, such as reading comprehension or academic success in later ages (Chall
21 et al., 1990), are focused on increasing opportunities for child-directed speech, by promoting
22 activities such as storybook readings at home and in the classroom (Christ & Wang, 2011). Many
23 of these interventions are focused on closing what is known as the ‘vocabulary gap’, or the
24 phenomenon in many industrialized societies in which children raised in higher socioeconomic
25 households have considerably larger vocabulary sizes than those in lower socioeconomic
26 households (Quigley, 2018). There is a tendency, in this framing, to view the linguistic
27 performance of children raised in lower-income households as falling short of a standard or ideal
28 set by their higher-income peers. There is also a tendency to focus specifically on verbal input
29 from a single adult, usually the mother, to a single child. However, both of these beliefs may be
30 cast into doubt when adopting a broader perspective on human development.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 When examining verbal interactions between children and adults in non-WEIRD
53 societies, researchers regularly document significantly less infant- and child-directed speech than
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in WEIRD societies (e.g., Bavin, 1992; Heath, 1983; Ochs & Schieffelin 1984; Pye, 1986;
4
5 Richman et al., 1992; Vogt et al., 2015). In a recent study of child-directed speech among the
6
7 Tsimane forager-horticulturalists of Bolivia, for example, researchers found that children under
8
9 the age of four received less than one minute of one-on-one verbal input from adults during
10
11 daylight hours (Cristia et al., 2019). Instead, it appears a large portion of children's verbal input
12
13 comes from other children, most commonly older siblings (Barton & Tomasello, 1994; Lieven,
14
15 1994). In a similar vein, children's learning of number words displays considerable cross-cultural
16
17 variation. Comparing the ability of children to acquire and use number words in the United
18
19 States, Russia, Japan, and among the Tsimane in Bolivia, Piantadosi and colleagues (2014) find
20
21 that while children from all societies acquire the ability to count in incremental stages as they
22
23 age, there is a substantial delay in the timing of these abilities in the Tsimane compared to the
24
25 other populations, on the order of 2-6 years. These differences are likely driven by variation at
26
27 the level of adult-directed input of number words (LeFevre et al., 2010), particularly as parent-
28
29 child interaction about numbers is particularly important and valued in industrialized societies. In
30
31 sum, these studies tend to suggest that patterns such as limited one-on-one input from adults and
32
33 a diversity of verbal input from other caretakers and peers are more likely to reflect the
34
35 experiences of human children throughout history than the patterns we observe in contemporary,
36
37 industrialized societies. Thus, it appears that the high levels of child-directed speech from one-
38
39 on-one interactions with adults found commonly in the West is actually a rather unusual and
40
41 relatively recent pattern of development, and likely not one that is to be necessarily 'expected' by
42
43 a young mind. This does not imply that there are no benefits to child-directed speech or its
44
45 promotion; rather, we simply make the claim that the limited child-directed speech from adults
46
47 was likely common in our evolutionary history.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 One last domain of cognitive input we will cover here is the primacy of adult teaching
4 and instruction in children's development. When Western adults consider the word 'teaching',
5 they may be imagining a formal school setting in which an adult is explicitly and verbally
6 instructing a class of same-aged children. This scenario is actually a less common and more
7 evolutionarily novel form of teaching which does not occur with the same regularity in non-
8 WEIRD societies (e.g., Clegg et al., 2021; Lancy, 2010; Little et al., 2016; Rogoff et al., 2015).
9 For instance, Marshall (1958) notes that there is no formal instruction among !Kung hunter-
10 gatherers; rather, most children learn through observing those who are more experienced. In
11 many of these societies, children primarily learn by watching, listening, and attending, by taking
12 initiative, and by contributing and collaborating in more informal learning settings (Paradise &
13 Rogoff, 2009). Meta-ethnographic reviews of hunter-gatherer children's learning support a
14 similar conclusion, namely that children largely learn through a mixture of play, observation, and
15 participation (Lew-Levy et al., 2017). A broader definition of teaching, then, that incorporates
16 both informal and formal instruction makes room for teaching through opportunity provisioning,
17 teaching through evaluative feedback, teaching through local enhancement, in addition to the less
18 common direct and active teaching model found in formal education (Kline, 2015). Much
19 attention in industrialized, contemporary societies is paid to the importance of this last type of
20 instruction, with many interventions and public policies aimed at increasing it both in the home
21 and in school, but there is much cross-cultural evidence to suggest that children's learning can
22 accommodate many different forms of teaching, including the often indirect forms prevalent in
23 non-WEIRD societies. We are not suggesting that formal education is unnecessary or unhelpful
24 for development, rather that our assumptions of the type of cognitive inputs that children expect
25 to receive should incorporate the high degree of diversity found across human societies.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nutritional deprivation

Nutritional deprivation refers to low levels in the quantity and quality of nutritional inputs. We have already argued that historically in many human societies, caregivers applied a triage, investing more in infants and children judged to be more likely to survive and become productive family members, and less in infants judged less likely to survive, due to such factors as poor health or severe competition with siblings (Lancy, 2014, 2015; Volk & Atkinson, 2013; section 3). We also explained that in some cases caregivers committed infanticide, for instance, by terminating supply of nutrition to kill an offspring. In this section, we focus on nutritional deprivation that results not from infanticide, but rather from ecological constraints (e.g., famine) that lead to low quantity and quality of nutritional input, which are independent of an active reduction in provisioning from caretakers.

It is well-established that both food scarcity (lack of nutrition) and food insecurity (unpredictable availability of nutrition) have generally posed major challenges for the human lineage, and also that levels of food scarcity and insecurity have varied across time and space. These two forms of adversity likely have deep evolutionary roots, as food scarcity and food insecurity have been documented in various species of non-human primates (Chapman et al., 2012; Hanya & Chapman, 2013; Harris et al., 2010; Koomen & Herrmann, 2017). In more recent human history, there is solid evidence for the existence of food scarcity and food insecurity in both past and present industrialized and non-industrialized societies (Ellison, 2001; Howell, 2010; Kaplan & Lancaster, 2003; Prentice, 2005; Walker et al., 2006). Moreover, despite substantial improvements in food access and security, nearly 7.5% of children are still classified as under-nourished (Baker & Anttila-Hughes, 2020) and across all ages 821 million people were

1
2
3 chronically undernourished in 2018 (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations et
4 al., 2019).

5
6
7
8 A challenging question is whether our ancestors experienced food scarcity and food
9
10 insecurity only over short timescales, relative to the human lifespan (e.g., days, weeks), or over
11
12 longer timescales as well (e.g., years, decades). If food scarcity regularly occurred over longer
13
14 timescales, infants and children may have evolved mechanisms that use nutritional deprivation
15
16 early in life as a cue to nutritional deprivation later in life (e.g., in adulthood), and tailor their
17
18 development accordingly (e.g., by adjusting their metabolic profile). However, it is not known
19
20 whether such ‘weather forecasting’ is feasible for long-lived species, such as humans, if there are
21
22 short-term ecological fluctuations, for instance, due to seasonality (Kuzawa, 2005; Kuzawa &
23
24 Quinn, 2009), or due to high levels of climate variability during hominid evolution generally
25
26 (reviewed by Antón et al., 2014). If food scarcity and food insecurity tended to occur on shorter
27
28 timescales, it might not have been adaptive to use early nutrition to predict nutritional conditions
29
30 in adulthood (Nettle et al., 2013; Wells, 2007). In such conditions, natural selection might
31
32 instead favor organisms to use ‘internal cues’ to somatic degradation (e.g., telomere erosion) –
33
34 which were correlated with life expectancy across evolutionary time – to adaptively tailor long-
35
36 term development (Rickard et al., 2014). The statistical structure of *past* environments is thus a
37
38 crucial piece of the puzzle in evaluating hypotheses about developmental adaptations
39
40 (Frankenhuis et al., 2019). Whether such adaptations increase survival and reproduction in
41
42 contemporary societies depends, of course, on the structure of *current* environments.
43
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 Though there is debate about the timescale of nutritional deprivation in human evolution,
51
52 the prevailing view is that hunter-gatherer populations regularly experienced food shortages, but
53
54 rarely suffered from famines that caused significant mortality (Prentice, 2005; Speakman, 2013;
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 note that rare famines may still have shaped the human genome through effects on fertility;
4
5 Speakman, 2013). The expected human childhood is thus likely to include periodic hunger, but
6
7 unlikely to include famine; at least until the onset of agriculture, which occurred in some
8
9 societies as early as 13,000 years ago. Agriculture appears to be a mixed blessing in this regard
10
11 (Berbesque et al., 2014; Diamond, 1993). On one hand, agriculture enabled populations to
12
13 produce an excess of staple foods, to trade foods, and to create buffers against future shortages.
14
15 On the other, agriculture relies on predictable weather patterns, stable governance, and the
16
17 absence of major conflict (Prentice, 2005). When these conditions break down, agriculture is
18
19 vulnerable to famines, perhaps more so than hunter-gatherer lifestyles, characterized by living in
20
21 small groups, high mobility, and an omnivorous and variable diet (Prentice, 2005). For instance,
22
23 in contemporary egalitarian forager societies resource-sharing often (though not ubiquitously)
24
25 helps buffer variation in caloric access, and its downstream consequences on children's
26
27 energetics (Boyette et al., 2020; Meehan et al., 2014). With agriculture, the rate of famines seems
28
29 to have increased by an order of magnitude, from about once every 150 years, to about once
30
31 every 10 years (Speakman, 2013). With such high rates, it is possible, but not certain, that
32
33 famines over the past 13,000 years have favored the evolution of developmental adaptations for
34
35 dealing with famine that are shaped by all contemporary humans (Prentice, 2005; Speakman,
36
37 2013).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 In short: over the course of human evolution, in both past and present societies, there has
45
46 been large variation in the availability of nutrition (Ó Gráda, 2009). In response to this variation
47
48 (i.e., the expected nutritional environment), humans have evolved adaptations that tailor
49
50 development based on the quantity and quality of nutrition in their environment.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

5. Associations between dimensions of adversity

We have argued that, over evolutionary time, human infants and children have on average been exposed to higher levels of threat and nutritional deprivation than is typical in industrialized societies, and that because these levels were variable over time and space, natural selection has likely favored phenotypic plasticity. In this section, we explore the co-occurrence of different forms of adversities within lifetimes during human evolution. Were individuals who were exposed to higher levels of threat also exposed to higher levels of deprivation?

What do we know about adversity co-occurrence?

In contemporary industrialized (WEIRD) societies, correlations between different forms of adversity are consistently small to moderate (Dong et al., 2004; Finkelhor et al., 2007; Green et al., 2010; Matsumoto et al., 2021; McLaughlin et al., 2012; McLaughlin et al., 2021; Smith & Pollak, 2021a), though which forms of adversity cluster together is inconsistent across studies (Jacobs et al., 2012). The existence of correlations among forms of adversity is not surprising. For instance, receiving lower levels of parental investment implies being less protected, thus increasing vulnerability to threats (Callaghan & Tottenham, 2016; Hanson & Nacewicz, 2021); and, low-quality nutrition increases vulnerability to infectious disease (Katona & Katona-Apte, 2008). Consistent with such correlations are findings showing that children who experience energy sufficiency but receive low levels of parental care tend to mature faster and toward more adult-like functioning in physiological and neurobiological processes related to fear and stress (Callaghan & Tottenham, 2016; Gee et al., 2013; Gee, 2020; Tooley et al., 2021; see also Belsky et al., 1991; Ellis et al., 2009). Recent evidence even suggests that such reprioritization may be passed down to subsequent generations. For instance, babies of mothers who experienced neglect as children might be predisposed to detecting threat in their environment (Hendrix et al., 2020).

1
2
3 It is tempting to infer that natural selection favored this developmental response – which takes
4 one form of adversity (neglect) as input to adapt to another (threat) – because deprivation and
5 threat were correlated in human evolution.
6
7
8
9

10 Nonetheless, we urge researchers to be cautious. First, a meta-analysis and systematic
11 review shows that exposure to threat (e.g., violence) is associated with accelerated maturation in
12 humans, whereas exposure to deprivation (e.g., neglect) is not (Colich et al., 2020). Second, there
13 is evidence suggesting that correlations between threat and deprivation do not generalize across
14 primates. For instance, in a longitudinal study of wild baboons, the correlations between different
15 forms of adversity were weak or even absent (Snyder-Mackler et al., 2020; Tung et al., 2016).
16
17 Third, the evidence basis on correlations between forms of adversity in both historical and
18 contemporary non-WEIRD societies is too limited to afford confident conclusions. Fourth,
19 because human social organization and provisioning systems are highly flexible, our species may
20 have evolved sensitivity to a broader range of social cues than other primates (Kuzawa & Bragg,
21 2012), and the correlations between different forms of adversity likely varied by cultural context
22 (see section 6).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Challenges to estimating adversity co-occurrence**

38 There are a number of challenges to estimating the co-occurrence of adversity in human
39 societies. The first challenge is that estimation requires individual-level data, rather than
40 population-level data. It is one thing to estimate population statistics (e.g., infant and child
41 mortality), and another to estimate whether individuals who have experienced one form of
42 adversity were also more likely to experience others, because an aggregate statistic may come
43 about in different ways (equifinality). For instance, data from the Standard Cross-Cultural
44 Sample, a survey of 186 largely non-industrial societies, suggests that the frequency of corporal
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 punishment is related to higher prevalence of violence at a societal level (Lansford & Dodge,
4 2008). Such data shows that different forms of violence co-occur at a societal level, but they do
5
6 not show that individuals who experience one form of violence are also more likely to
7
8 experience other forms of violence. The direction of an association in a population may be
9
10 reversed within the subgroups comprising that population ('Simpson's paradox'; Kievit et al.,
11
12 2013). A scenario in which one subgroup experiences threat and a different one deprivation
13
14 might result in the same societal average as a scenario in which all individuals experience
15
16 moderate levels of threat and deprivation. These scenarios, however, create different
17
18 evolutionary selection pressures.
19
20
21
22
23

24 A second challenge to studying adversity co-occurrence is that threat and deprivation are
25
26 broad categories. For instance, in section 3, we have discussed three forms of threats: infanticide,
27
28 violent conflict with non-caregivers, and predation; and in section 4, three forms of deprivation:
29
30 social, cognitive, and nutritional. So, there are really two questions: (1) to what extent did
31
32 different forms of threat, and different forms of deprivation, co-occur with each other?, and (2) to
33
34 what extent did threat and deprivation co-occur with each other? For instance, in a cohort of
35
36 young adult males from a population in Metropolitan Cebu City, the Philippines, the correlation
37
38 between sibling death, an index of local mortality (threat), and maternal absence and paternal
39
40 instability, two indices of parental investment (deprivation), was low; but the correlation *among*
41
42 indices of deprivation, paternal instability and maternal absence, was high (Gettler et al., 2015).
43
44 In other cases, certain forms of threat may be correlated with some forms of deprivation, across
45
46 categories, but not with other forms of threat, within this category. Thus, different patterns of
47
48 correlations between specific forms of threat and deprivation within a society might produce the
49
50 same aggregate correlation between the broad constructs of threat and deprivation. We also note
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

that aggregating estimates is complicated by (a) different studies measuring different forms of adversity or (b) measuring the same form of adversity using different instruments (Pollak & Wolfe, 2020), and (c) by the extent of measurement invariance in many longitudinal studies being unknown (DeJoseph et al., 2021).

A third challenge is that the published record does not reflect a complete picture of the correlations between measures of adversity observed in empirical studies. This is not only true because researchers are more likely to publish positive findings (e.g., by selectively reporting measures of adversity showing correlations with the dependent variables of interests), but also because researchers might validate measures of adversity by examining their correlations with other measures of adversity. For instance, if one particular measure of adversity shows a low or no correlation with other adversity measures, and those measures do correlate highly with each other, a researcher might infer that the uncorrelated measure has low validity in this particular population (e.g., participants misunderstood the items). We are not criticizing this nomological network approach; in fact, we think it can have merit. However, a byproduct of this validation method can be overestimation of adversity co-occurrence in the published record. A potential solution to this challenge is to report in full the correlations between all measures of adversity – assuming these measures have desirable univariate properties (e.g., no restriction of range) – before (a) excluding measures that do not show the expected correlations with other adversity measures or (b) creating composites of those measures that do show the expected patterns of correlations with other adversity measures.

To summarize: the evidentiary base for adversity co-occurrence across human history is too limited to afford strong conclusions. Future research should explore this question.

6. Developmental and clinical implications

In this section, we discuss three major developmental and clinical implications of our main claims that the mean level of adversity in our species was higher than often assumed, and that *variation* in adversity across societies and individuals, not uniformity, was common across human history (Figure 1).

Recognizing adaptive responses to threat and deprivation

Ideas about the expected childhood have consequences for which responses are viewed as deficits or adaptations, and these views may affect research agendas, clinical practice, people's self-views, and their reputations in the eyes of others.

Our claims imply that infants and children might be able to developmentally adjust to a wider range of adversities, including higher levels of adversity, than often assumed. Researchers may use this insight to reconsider which responses are adaptive and which are deficits, in addition to refining the criteria used to classify responses as adaptive or deficits. To refine their criteria, developmental and clinical psychologists can draw on discussions by evolutionary psychologists and anthropologists (Andrews et al., 2002; Cosmides & Tooby, 1999; Ketelaar & Ellis, 2000; Lewis et al., 2017; Nesse & Stein, 2012; Syme & Hagen, 2020; Wakefield, 1999). For instance, as noted in section 2, it is a misunderstanding that developmental adaptations should only generate benefits. There being costs to responses does not disqualify them as adaptive, as long as the developmental response produces a positive contribution to lifetime reproductive success on average (Del Giudice, 2018; Ellis & Del Giudice, 2014, 2019).

We have argued that infants and children are likely equipped with phenotypic plasticity for dealing with adversity. As noted in section 1, organisms can respond to experiences within the species-typical range either with expectant or dependent plasticity (McLaughlin & Gabard-

1
2
3 Durnam, in press). However, when considering organisms across diverse taxa, plasticity that
4 evolves in response to expected conditions can take a variety of other forms as well (Barrett,
5 2015; Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020a; Frankenhuis & Walasek, 2020). Take multiple sex reversals
6 in fish. This ability has some properties of expectant plasticity (e.g., a specific cue triggers a
7 major and rapid reorganization of the phenotype) and others of dependent plasticity (e.g.,
8 reversals can occur at nearly all points in development and multiple times over the life course in
9 sequentially hermaphroditic fish). Still other properties do not fit either type of plasticity (for
10 examples, see Frankenhuis & Nettle, 2020a). Generally, the features of plasticity depend on the
11 specific nature of the adaptive problem, including but not limited to: the rate of environmental
12 change relative to generation time, the extent to which organisms can learn about environmental
13 conditions, the fitness payoffs to different degrees of phenotype-environment match, the costs of
14 building, maintaining, and running the systems supporting plasticity, the preexisting structures
15 and processes in a species (e.g., genes, gene regulatory mechanisms), and other factors (e.g.,
16 population size). As Barrett (2015) quipped, the first law of adaptationism is: it depends.

17
18
19 Further, in studying adaptive developmental plasticity, it is key to distinguish between
20 developmental processes and outcomes. For instance, the Hidden Talents program focuses on
21 abilities that are enhanced by adversity (Ellis et al., 2020; Frankenhuis & de Weerth, 2013). If
22 Jim is exposed to adversity and John is not, Jim might perform better on a task measuring this
23 ability (e.g., memory of threats) compared with John. However, this is not always the case. It
24 depends on how impairment and adaptation processes ‘jointly’ affect performance (Frankenhuis
25 et al., 2020). For instance, John might perform better on two tasks (e.g., memory of threats and
26 memory of abstract geometric shapes) than Jim, who has suffered impairment, but on one task
27 Jim nearly closes the performance gap (e.g., memory of threats), because this task measures an

1
2
3 ability that is enhanced through adversity in Jim. Thus, to understand interacting processes, we
4
5 need research designs that compare not only performance across individuals, but also different
6
7 abilities within the same person (enhanced vs. non-enhanced abilities). Within-between designs
8
9 allow developmental adaptation (process) to manifest in performance (outcome), even if
10
11 impairment processes are simultaneously occurring.
12
13

14 **Understanding and learning from cultural variation**

15
16
17 Human cultures and norms can vary dramatically across contexts. As such, we believe
18
19 developmental science would benefit from a greater acknowledgment and integration of the
20
21 cultural contexts in which development occurs (Amir & McAuliffe, 2020). We argue that future
22
23 work in the field should be focused on either a generalizable definition of childhood adversity
24
25 that can be broadly applied across different cultures, and/or more specialized definitions of
26
27 adversity nested within specific cultural contexts, accompanied by a ‘constraints on generality’
28
29 statement (Simons et al., 2017). Such a statement makes explicit to which human populations or
30
31 cultural contexts ideas and findings apply and opposes the implicit assumption that findings are
32
33 necessarily generalizable to humans as a species. This practice is important to normalize, as
34
35 universal normative claims (e.g., children who receive little child-directed speech are deprived)
36
37 may inadvertently derogate people in cultures that have other norms (e.g., in which child-
38
39 directed speech is rare). In cases where WEIRD norms are the exception in the global
40
41 distribution of norms, this means (inadvertently) derogating more than half of humanity. In other
42
43 words, our current conceptions of the ‘ideal’ caregiving environment may not be either culturally
44
45 or phylogenetically sensitive (Ganz, 2018; Humphreys & Salo, 2020). Assuming generalization
46
47 from WEIRD populations to all populations may also lead to arguably incorrect conclusions, for
48
49 instance, that complex language input is necessarily required for the development of executive
50
51 function skills (McLaughlin, 2016).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Greater attention to cultural diversity and variation is also important when considering
4
5 how adversity is experienced, processed, and culturally understood. Cognitive culture theory
6
7 may be helpful in these endeavors (Dressler et al., 2018). In this framework, culture is
8
9 conceptualized as cognitive models of life that are constructed and shared among members of a
10
11 social group. Individuals within the group may have differing degrees of cultural competence —
12
13 the degree to which their own representations align with these shared models — and various
14
15 degrees of cultural consonance — or, the degree to which their own experiences align with these
16
17 models (Dressler, 2012). Techniques to measure cultural consonance exist, and have been used
18
19 with good reliability and validity across differing cultural contexts (Dressler et al., 2005). So, for
20
21 instance, some societies may have a shared cultural model of parenting that expects maternal
22
23 presence but does not apply the same expectations to fathers. In these communities, if a child is
24
25 raised largely by their mother, these experiences may be viewed as consonant with cultural
26
27 expectations and paternal absence may not be viewed as a deprivation or a form of adversity.
28
29 Indeed, levels of paternal investment vary substantially across environments, with male
30
31 provisioning viewed as more preferable in ecologies where it is more difficult for women to
32
33 obtain resources themselves (Marlowe, 2003). Further, as discussed earlier, the extent and
34
35 direction of influence of father absence on child development varies across societies, depending
36
37 on its association with energetic deprivation, suggesting that the cultural context is crucial for
38
39 understanding how this experience can influence child development (Sear et al., 2019; Shenk et
40
41 al., 2013). These patterns align with the broader argument that the frequency and meaning of
42
43 experiences can vary dramatically across societies, and should be considered when determining
44
45 whether an experience is considered adverse.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The contextualization of experiences within shared cultural models, in addition to the
4
5 diverse ways in which adverse experiences are culturally processed, can have consequences for
6
7 people's own self-views and for how adverse experiences are framed, understood, and treated in
8
9 clinical settings.⁸ People interpret their experiences through a complex web of cultural customs,
10
11 attitudes, and beliefs. Consistent with this perspective is research showing that perceived, rather
12
13 than objective (i.e., actual), experience of childhood adversity is associated with well-being and
14
15 psychopathology (e.g., Danese & Widom, 2020; Smith & Pollak, 2021b), potentially in a causal
16
17 manner (Baldwin & Degli Esposti, 2021). Ignoring how experiences can vary across different
18
19 cultural contexts can lead to ineffective policy and interventions. For instance, marriage
20
21 education workshops based on studies of predominantly white and middle-class couples failed to
22
23 improve outcomes among working class couples of color, who tended to view other concerns,
24
25 such as paying the rent or keeping their children safe, as more deserving of their attention
26
27 (Johnson, 2012; Loeterman & Kotlowitz, 2002).
28
29
30
31
32

33 Conversely, sensitivity to cultural variation can provide important insights into the ways
34
35 in which adversity is socially constructed and processed. In a striking example of the role
36
37 cultural practices can play in shaping psychological experiences, Zefferman and Mathew (2020)
38
39 explore how trauma associated with warfare can vary between U.S. combat veterans and
40
41 Turkana pastoralists. Their field interviews with Turkana pastoralists suggest that cultural
42
43 practices, such as rituals of healing, support, and endorsement of warriors who have killed in
44
45 battle help reassure the warrior that their actions were morally justified and can potentially
46
47 protect against the negative psychological effects of moral injury that combatants may
48
49 experience. Though these warriors do suffer from high rates of symptoms associated with
50
51
52
53
54

55 ⁸ For a culturally sensitive approach to attachment, see Ganz (2018). For a reframing the early childhood
56 obesity prevention narrative through an equitable nurturing approach, see Skouteris et al. (2021).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 protecting against danger, such as flashbacks and startle responses, they are less likely than
4
5 American service members with similar PTSD severity to experience symptoms associated with
6
7 moral violations, such as low mood and depression (Zefferman & Mathew, 2021). In sum, we
8
9 argue that culturally sensitive approaches to the study of adversity and development which
10
11 acknowledge societal variation are integral to the future of the field.
12
13

14 **Reconsidering the definitions of adversity and deprivation**

15
16
17 A common approach in developmental and clinical psychology is to define ‘childhood
18
19 adversity’ in relation to the ‘expected’ human childhood environment (Fox et al., 2010; Gabard-
20
21 Durnam & McLaughlin, 2019; Humphreys & Zeanah, 2015; McLaughlin & Sheridan, 2016;
22
23 McLaughlin, 2016; McLaughlin et al., 2017; McLaughlin et al., 2019; Nelson, 2007; Nelson &
24
25 Gabard-Durnam, 2020; Sheridan & McLaughlin, 2014; Wismer Fries et al., 2005). If one defines
26
27 childhood adversity in terms of deviation from an ‘expected environment’, then it matters what
28
29 the expected environment is for which experiences qualify as adverse. This holds irrespective of
30
31 whether experiences are treated as binary (e.g., neglected vs. not neglected), continuous, as
32
33 univariate or multivariate (e.g., distinguishing between emotional and cognitive neglect), and so
34
35 on (King et al., 2019). We have argued in the sections above that the expected environment has
36
37 regularly included what are typically defined as adverse experiences. For instance, infanticide is
38
39 an expected experience for many species of primates, but it is also an adverse experience for the
40
41 infant and its mother. Thus, experiences can be both species-expected and adverse. We think it is
42
43 problematic to deny such experiences the label adverse just because they occurred with some
44
45 regularity across human evolution.
46
47
48
49
50

51 Adopting a different definition of adversity could leave frameworks that have defined this
52
53 concept in terms of the expected environment largely intact and even strengthen them. These
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approaches could still define the expected (or expectable) environment as “a wide range of
4 species-typical environmental inputs that the human brain requires to develop normally”
5
6 (McLaughlin, 2016, p. 363). They could also maintain that “experience-expectant mechanisms
7
8 utilize environmental information that has been common to all members of a species across
9
10 evolutionary history” (Galván, 2010, p. 880), a concept referred to as the ‘phylogenetic norm’
11
12 (Galván, 2010). However, these frameworks would benefit from revising a number of
13
14 components. First, we should reconsider the definition of childhood adversity as “negative
15
16 environmental experiences that are likely to require significant adaptation by an average child
17
18 and that represent a deviation from the expectable environment” (McLaughlin et al., 2019, p.
19
20 279), and its implication that “environmental circumstances or stressors that do not represent
21
22 deviations from the expectable environment should not be classified as childhood adversity”
23
24 (McLaughlin, 2016, p. 364). Second, we should revise the associated claim that “adversity is not
25
26 itself an expectable experience that the brain prepares for” (Nelson & Gabard-Durnam, 2020, p.
27
28 137). The realization that threat and deprivation are part of the species-expected range might
29
30 help to accommodate and recontextualize findings in the literature. For instance, although
31
32 stressful events increase the probability of negative physical and mental health outcomes, most
33
34 people who experience stressful events do not develop psychopathology; although specific
35
36 estimates of ‘rates of resilience’ vary substantially depending on statistical model specifications
37
38 (Infurna & Luthar, 2016). This is true both for normative stressful events that happen to most
39
40 people, such as losing a valued relationship, and for less common traumatic events, such as
41
42 experiencing physical abuse (Bonanno et al., 2011; Cohen et al., 2019).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 As noted earlier, our claim that adverse events occurring in past and present societies
52
53 often fall within the species-typical range does not, of course, imply that all forms of adversity
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 do. We provided institutionalized child rearing as a likely example of an evolutionary novelty
4 (Humphreys & Salo, 2020; Tottenham, 2012). WEIRD societies also include standard parenting
5 practices that likely fall outside the species-typical range, which may not be considered adverse
6 by most people in WEIRD countries, but which are evaluated more negatively by people in non-
7 WEIRD countries, such as sleeping apart from their babies and sleep training their babies by
8 leaving them on their own to ‘cry it out’ (Mileva-Seitz et al., 2017). However, the fact that
9 certain forms of adversity likely fall within the species-typical range invites us to reconsider
10 definitions of deprivation as “the absence of species- or age-expectant environmental inputs,
11 specifically a lack of expected cognitive and social inputs” (Sheridan & McLaughlin, 2014, p.
12 581). We have deliberately used a definition that is similar to this definition — namely
13 deprivation as low levels of social, cognitive, and nutritional inputs — but we have omitted the
14 word ‘expected’. By omitting this word, our definition is in need of a different benchmark
15 against which to compare ‘lack of inputs’. Future work should endeavor to create a definition
16 that takes these concerns into account.

34 35 **7. Limitations and future directions**

36
37 We now turn to five limitations of our analysis. The first two concern limitations of the
38 available data, and the third and fourth limitations in our scope. The fifth limitation concerns our
39 approach to synthesizing data.

40 41 42 **Limitations**

43
44
45 First, there are challenges to drawing inferences about historical populations from
46 archeological data, and these challenges are often exacerbated for infants and children, who are
47 underrepresented in burial remains, death records, and written life histories (Konigsberg &
48 Frankenberg, 1994; Lewis & Gowland, 2007; Perry, 2006; Rawson, 2003; Trinkaus, 1995; Volk
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 & Atkinson, 2013; Walker et al., 1988; Woods, 2007). The task of archeologists is like that of
4
5 detectives, who piece together puzzles of the past based on limited evidence. In many cases, not
6
7 all uncertainty will be resolved. It would also be a mistake to infer from some degree of
8
9 uncertainty that different hypotheses are equally likely. Archeologists triangulate across different
10
11 types of evidence and different datasets to draw nuanced conclusions, and make predictions are
12
13 then tested on new data. Through this iterative process, some hypotheses receive more support
14
15 and others less. We believe the literature supports our claims, but would certainly welcome any
16
17 evidence we have overlooked or different interpretations of the same evidence. Our overarching
18
19 point is the need to engage with evidence from history, archeology, and primatology.
20
21
22

23
24 Second, we have used data from contemporary hunter-gatherer societies to inform
25
26 estimates of historical populations, because for roughly 95% of our species' evolutionary history,
27
28 children were born into a hunter-gatherer society. However, such inferences should be qualified
29
30 by the fact that there are important differences between historical and contemporary hunter-
31
32 gatherer societies (Kelly, 2013; Page & French, 2020). First, some contemporary hunter-gatherer
33
34 societies have experienced devastating consequences from coming into contact with Western
35
36 populations, such as catastrophic disease and resource deprivation (Diamond, 2013; Hill &
37
38 Hurtado, 1996). Second, there is debate over whether the lives of contemporary hunter-gatherers
39
40 are indeed harsher (i.e., higher mortality rates) than those of historical populations, as some
41
42 contemporary hunter-gatherers have been pushed to marginalized environments by
43
44 agriculturalists who have displaced them (for different viewpoints, see Bigelow, 1975;
45
46 Cunningham et al., 2019; Lee & DeVore, 1968; Marlowe, 2005; Page & French, 2020; Porter &
47
48 Marlowe, 2007; Silberbauer, 1981), though similar mortality rates have been documented in at
49
50 least one historical hunter-gatherer society that lived in a resource-rich environment (Johnston &
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Snow, 1961; Volk & Atkinson, 2013). Thus, we should not simply assume that statistics (e.g.,
4 mortality rates) of contemporary hunter-gatherer societies automatically generalize to hunter-
5 gatherer societies of the past. In addition, there is significant variation between contemporary
6 hunter-gatherer societies, including between different hunter-gatherer groups, depending on
7 factors such as climate, technology, and societal structure (Kelly, 2013). Yet, because more of
8 these societies are reflected in the statistics we have reported, estimates are likely to be more
9 representative than estimates about historical populations.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Third, we have restricted our scope to discussing findings, not methods. Specifically, we
20 have not discussed which sources of evidence (e.g., skeletal remains) are used, or how, to infer
21 features of past and present populations and their environments (e.g., infant and child mortality
22 rates); for such information, we refer readers to the following resources (Frei et al., 2015;
23 Halcrow et al., 2020; Lewis, 2017; Muthukrishna et al., 2021; Page & French, 2020; Walker,
24 2001).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Fourth, we have also restricted our scope to discussing the species-typical range of
34 adversity for humans, rather than the adaptations that evolved in such environments. This topic
35 merits its own analyses (for overviews, see Del Giudice et al., 2015; Ellis et al., 2009; Kaplan &
36 Lancaster, 2003; Sear, 2020). However, what theory predicts, and how we interpret empirical
37 observations, both depend on an accurate picture of the expected childhood.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Finally, our paper does not present a systematic review or meta-analysis based on preset
45 search terms, inclusion criteria, and statistical plans. It is therefore possible that we have
46 (inadvertently) reported a non-representative selection of evidence that matches our preexisting
47 beliefs about the expected human childhood. That said, our analysis draws heavily on systematic
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 reviews, meta-analyses, and widely-used, large-scale cross-cultural datasets (e.g., the Standard
4
5 Cross-Cultural Sample).

6 7 8 **Future directions**

9
10 Over the past decade, notions of the expected childhood environment have received more
11
12 attention in developmental and clinical psychology. We support this progress, but are concerned
13
14 that this notion has been untethered from, rather than anchored in, evidence from other
15
16 disciplines, including history, anthropology, and primatology. This special issue represents an
17
18 opportunity for psychologists to take a productive turn by connecting with this work, and
19
20 contributing to an interdisciplinary science that advances understanding of human childhood,
21
22 both past and present, in all its richness and diversity. This turn could start by removing the term
23
24 ‘expected’ from the definitions of ‘adversity’, and by taking stock of the information that allied
25
26 disciplines have collected and integrating it into a picture of the expected human childhood.⁹
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 ⁹ We end by providing resources for interested readers that focus on work at the interface between
47
48 psychological and anthropological approaches to development and the human experience. For readers interested in
49
50 ongoing research on these topics, we suggest looking more closely into collaborative research groups such as
51
52 Forager Child Studies (FCS), the Research and Advocacy Group on Hunter-Gatherer Education (HG-EDU), the
53
54 Culture and Ontogeny Research Initiative (CORI), and the International Society for Hunter-Gatherer Research
55
56 (ISHGR). For readers interested in conducting research with existing datasets, we recommend looking into the
57
58 Human Relations Area Files (eHRAF), the Ethnographic Atlas (EA), and the Standard Cross-Cultural Sample
59
60 (SCCS). For those interested in attending academic conferences or joining societies with these research interests, we
recommend the Society for Cross-Cultural Research (SCCR), the Society for Research in Child Development
(SRCD), the Society for the Study of Childhood in the Past (SSCIP), the Society for the History of Children and
Youth (SHCY), as well as the American Anthropological Society (AAA) and the American Anthropological
Association Children and Childhood Interest Group (AAACIG).

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 Altmann, J., & Alberts, S. C. (2005). Growth rates in a wild primate population: Ecological
7
8 influences and maternal effects. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, *57*, 490–501.
9
10 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-004-0870-x>
11
12
13 Amir, D., & McAuliffe, K. (2020). Cross-cultural, developmental psychology: Integrating
14
15 approaches and key insights. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *41*, 430–444.
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.06.006>
18
19
20 Anderson, C. (1986). Predation and primate evolution. *Primates*, *27*, 15–39.
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02382520>
23
24
25 Andrews, P. W., Gangestad, S. W., & Matthews, D. (2002). Adaptationism – how to carry out an
26
27 exaptationist program. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *25*, 489–504.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X02000092>
30
31
32 Antón, S. C., Potts, R., & Aiello, L. C. (2014). Evolution of early Homo: An integrated
33
34 biological perspective. *Science*, *345*, 1236828. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1236828>
35
36
37 Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less
38
39 American. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 602–614. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602)
40
41 [066X.63.7.602](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602)
42
43
44 Baker, R. E., & Anttila-Hughes, J. (2020). Characterizing the contribution of high temperatures
45
46 to child undernourishment in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Scientific Reports*, *10*, 18796.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-74942-9>
49
50
51 Baldwin, J. R., & Degli Esposti, M. (2021). Triangulating on the role of perceived versus
52
53 objective experiences of childhood adversity in psychopathology. *JCPP Advances*, *1*.
54
55 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcv2.12010>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bales, K., French, J. A., & Dietz, J. M. (2002). Explaining variation in maternal care in a
4 cooperatively breeding mammal. *Animal Behaviour*, *63*, 453–461.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.2001.1954>
7
8
9
10 Balshine, S. (2012). Patterns of parental care in vertebrates. In N. J. Royle, P. T. Smiseth & M.
11 Kolliker (Eds.), *The evolution of parental care* (pp. 62–80). Oxford University Press.
12
13 <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199692576.003.0004>
14
15
16
17 Barnard, A. (Ed.). (2020). *Hunter-gatherers in history, archaeology and anthropology*.
18 Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474214926.ch-001>
19
20
21 Barrett, H. C. (2015). *The shape of thought: How mental adaptations evolve*. Oxford University
22 Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199348305.001.0001>
23
24
25
26 Barrett, H. C. (2020). Towards a cognitive science of the human: Cross-cultural approaches and
27 their urgency. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *24*, 620–638.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.05.007>
30
31
32
33 Barton, M. E., & Tomasello, M. (1994). The rest of the family: The role of fathers and siblings in
34 early language development. In C. Gallaway & B. J. Richards (Eds.), *Input and*
35 *interaction in language acquisition* (pp. 109–134). Cambridge University Press.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620690.007>
38
39
40
41
42 Bavin, E. L. (1992). The acquisition of Warlpiri. In D. I. Slobin (Ed.), *The crosslinguistic study*
43 *of language acquisition* (Vol. 3, pp. 309–372). Psychology Press.
44
45
46
47 Beaulieu, D. A., & Bugental, D. (2008). Contingent parental investment: An evolutionary
48 framework for understanding early interaction between mothers and children. *Evolution*
49 *and Human Behavior*, *29*, 249–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2008.01.002>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Beehner, J. C., & Lu, A. (2013). Reproductive suppression in female primates: A review.
4
5 *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 22, 226–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21369>
6
7
8 Belsky, J., Steinberg, L., & Draper, P. (1991). Childhood experience, interpersonal development,
9
10 and reproductive strategy. *Child Development*, 62, 647–670.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.2307/1131166>
13
14
15 Bentley, G. R., Goldberg, T., & Jasińska, G. Z. Y. (1993). The fertility of agricultural and non-
16
17 agricultural traditional societies. *Population Studies*, 47, 269–281.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1080/0032472031000147006>
20
21
22 Berbesque, J. C., Marlowe, F. W., Shaw, P., & Thompson, P. (2014). Hunter-gatherers have less
23
24 famine than agriculturalists. *Biology Letters*, 10, 20130853.
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0853>
27
28
29 Bigelow, R. (1975). The role of competition and cooperation in human evolution. In M. A.
30
31 Nettleship, R. D. Givens & A. Nettleship (Eds.), *War, its causes and correlates* (pp. 235–
32
33 261). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110810523.235>
34
35
36 Bjorklund, D. F., & Ellis, B. J. (2014). Children, childhood, and development in evolutionary
37
38 perspective. *Developmental Review*, 34, 225–264.
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.05.005>
41
42
43 Blackwell, A. D., Snodgrass, J. J., Madimenos, F. C., & Sugiyama, L. S. (2010). Life history,
44
45 immune function, and intestinal helminths: Trade-offs among immunoglobulin E,
46
47 C-reactive protein, and growth in an Amazonian population. *American Journal of Human*
48
49 *Biology*, 22, 836–848. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.21092>
50
51
52 Blurton Jones, N. G., Hawkes, K., & O'Connell, J. F. (1989). Modelling and measuring
53
54 costs of children in two foraging societies. In V. Standen & R. A. Foley (Eds.),
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Comparative socioecology of humans and other mammals* (pp. 367–390).

4
5 London, England: Basil Blackwell.

6
7
8 Bocquet-Appel, J. P. (2002). Paleoanthropological traces of a Neolithic demographic transition.

9
10 *Current Anthropology*, 43, 637–650. <https://doi.org/10.1086/342429>

11
12 Boesch, C., & Boesch-Achermann, H. (2000). *The chimpanzees of the Tai Forest: Behavioral*
13
14 *ecology and evolution*. Oxford University Press.

15
16
17 Bonanno, G. A., Westphal, M., & Mancini, A. D. (2011). Resilience to loss and potential trauma.

18
19 *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 7, 511–535. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032210-104526)
20
21 [clnpsy-032210-104526](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032210-104526)

22
23
24 Bornstein, M. H., Putnick, D. L., Lansford, J. E., Deater-Deckard, K., & Bradley, R. H. (2015).

25
26 A developmental analysis of caregiving modalities across infancy in 38 low- and middle-
27
28 income countries. *Child Development*, 86, 1571–1587.

29
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12402>

32
33 Bornstein, M. H., Putnick, D. L., Park, Y., Suwalsky, J. T. D., Haynes, O. M. (2017). Human

34
35 infancy and parenting in global perspective: Specificity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
36
37 *B*, 284, 20172168. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2168>

38
39
40 Boyette, A. H., Lew-Levy, S., Sarma, M. S., Valchy, M., & Gettler, L. T. (2020). Fatherhood,

41
42 egalitarianism, and child health in two small-scale societies in the Republic of the Congo.
43
44 *American Journal of Human Biology*, 32, e23342. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23342>

45
46
47 Bribiescas, R. G. (2021). Evolutionary and life history insights into masculinity and warfare:

48
49 Opportunities and limitations. *Current Anthropology*, 62(Suppl. 23), 38–53.

50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1086/711688>

- 1
2
3 Brown, D., Hawkins-Rodgers, Y., & Kapadia, K. (2008). Multicultural considerations for the
4 application of attachment theory. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, *62*, 353–363.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.psychotherapy.2008.62.4.353>
7
8
9
10 Bryce, J., Boschi-Pinto, C., Shibuya, K., & Black, R. E. WHO Child Health Epidemiology
11 Reference Group. (2005). WHO estimates of the cause of death in children. *Lancet*, *365*,
12 1147–1152. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)71877-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71877-8)
13
14
15
16
17 Budnik, A., & Liczbińska, G. (2006). Urban and rural differences in mortality and causes of
18 death in historical Poland. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *129*, 294–304.
19
20 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20288>
21
22
23
24 Bugental, D. B., Beaulieu, D. A., & Silbert-Geiger, A. (2010). Increases in parental investment
25 and child health as a result of an early intervention. *Journal of Experimental Child*
26 *Psychology*, *106*, 30–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2009.10.004>
27
28
29
30
31 Bulger, J., & Hamilton, W. J. (1987). Rank and density correlates of inclusive fitness measures
32 in a natural chacma baboon (*Papio ursinus*) population. *International Journal of*
33 *Primatology*, *8*, 635–650. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02735781>
34
35
36
37
38 Buss, D. M. (1999). *Evolutionary psychology: The new science of the mind*. Allyn and Bacon.
39
40 Callaghan, B. L., & Tottenham, N. (2016). The stress acceleration hypothesis: Effects of early-
41 life adversity on emotion circuits and behavior. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*,
42 *7*, 76–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2015.11.018>
43
44
45
46
47 Cameron, R. D., Smith, W. T., Fancy, S. G., Gerhart, K. L., & White, R. G. (1993). Calving
48 success of female caribou in relation to body weight. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *71*,
49 480–486. <https://doi.org/10.1139/z93-069>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Caswell, H. (2007). Extrinsic mortality and the evolution of senescence. *Trends in Ecology &*
4
5 *Evolution*, 22, 173–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.01.006>
6
7
8 Chagnon, N. A. (2012). *The Yanomamo* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.
9
10 Chall, J. S., Jacobs, V. A., & Baldwin, L. E. (1990). *The reading crisis: Why poor children fall*
11
12 *behind*. Harvard University Press.
13
14
15 Chapman, C. A., Rothman, J. M., & Lambert, J. E. (2012). Food as a selective force in primates.
16
17 In J. C. Mitani, J. Call, P. M. Kappeler, R. A. Palombit & J. B. Silk (Eds.), *The evolution*
18
19 *of primate societies* (pp. 149–168). University of Chicago Press.
20
21
22 Charlesworth, B. (2000). Fisher, Medawar, Hamilton and the evolution of aging. *Genetics*, 156,
23
24 927–931. <https://www.genetics.org/content/156/3/927>
25
26
27 Charnov, E. L., & Berrigan, D. (1993). Why do female primates have such long lifespans and so
28
29 few babies? Or life in the slow lane. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 1, 191-194.
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.1360010604>
32
33
34 Cheney, D. L., Seyfarth, R. M., Fischer, J., Beehner, J., Bergman, T., Johnson, S. E., Kitchen, D.
35
36 M., Palombit, R. A., Rendall, D., & Silk, J. B. (2004). Factors affecting reproduction and
37
38 mortality among baboons in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *International Journal of*
39
40 *Primatology*, 25, 401–428. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IJOP.0000019159.75573.13>
41
42
43 Chisholm, J. S. (1996). The evolutionary ecology of attachment organization. *Human Nature*, 7,
44
45 1–38. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02733488>
46
47
48 Christ, T., & Wang, X. C. (2011). Closing the vocabulary gap?: A review of research on early
49
50 childhood vocabulary practices. *Reading Psychology*, 32, 426–458.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702711.2010.495638>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Clancy, K. B., & Davis, J. L. (2019). Soy lent is people, and WEIRD is white: Biological
4 anthropology, whiteness, and the limits of the WEIRD. *Annual Review of Anthropology*,
5 48, 169-186. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102218-011133>
6
7
8
9
10 Clegg, J. M., Wen, N. J., DeBaylo, P. H., Alcott, A., Keltner, E. C., & Legare, C. H. (2021).
11 Teaching through collaboration: Flexibility and diversity in caregiver–child interaction
12 across cultures. *Child Development*, 92, e56–e75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13443>
13
14
15
16
17 Clutton-Brock, T. H. (1991). *Monographs in behavior and ecology: Vol. 64. The evolution of*
18 *parental care*. Princeton University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvs32ssj>
19
20
21
22 Clutton-Brock, T. H., Major, M., Albon, S. D., & Guinness, F. E. (1987). Early development and
23 population dynamics in red deer. I. Density-dependent effects on juvenile survival.
24 *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 56, 53–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4799>
25
26
27
28
29 Coall, D. A., & Chisholm, J. S. (2003). Evolutionary perspectives on pregnancy: Maternal age at
30 menarche and infant birth weight. *Social Science and Medicine*, 57, 1771–1781.
31
32
33
34 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00022-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00022-4)
35
36
37 Cohen, S., Murphy, M. L. M., & Prather, A. A. (2019). Ten surprising facts about stressful life
38 events and disease risk. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 577–597.
39
40
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-102857>
43
44
45 Colich, N. L., Rosen, M. L., Williams, E. S., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2020). Biological aging in
46 childhood and adolescence following experiences of threat and deprivation: A systematic
47 review and meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 146, 721–764.
48
49
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000270>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Cosmides, L., & Tooby, J. (1999). Toward an evolutionary taxonomy of treatable conditions.

4
5 *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 108, 453–464. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021->

6
7 [843X.108.3.453](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.108.3.453)

8
9
10 Cristia, A., Dupoux, E., Gurven, M., & Stieglitz, J. (2019). Child-directed speech is infrequent in
11
12 a forager-farmer population: A time allocation study. *Child Development*, 90, 759–773.

13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12974>

15
16
17 Crittenden, A. N., Conklin-Brittain, N. L., Zes, D. A., Schoeninger, M. J., & Marlowe, F.

18
19 W. (2013). Juvenile foraging among the Hadza: Implications for human life

20
21 history. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34, 299–304.

22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.04.004>

24
25
26 Crockford, C., Samuni, L., Vigilant, L., & Wittig, R. M. (2020). Postweaning maternal care

27
28 increases male chimpanzee reproductive success. *Science Advances*, 6, eaaz5746.

29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaz5746>

31
32
33 Cunningham, A. J., Worthington, S., Venkataraman, V. V., Wrangham, R. W. (2019). Do

34
35 modern hunter-gatherers live in marginal habitats? *Journal of Archaeological Science:*

36
37 *Reports*, 25, 584–599. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasrep.2019.05.028>

38
39
40 Cunningham, H. (2005). *Children and childhood in Western society since 1500* (2nd ed.).

41
42 Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315835495>

43
44
45 Curtis, V., De Barra, M., & Auger, R. (2011). Disgust as an adaptive system for disease

46
47 avoidance behaviour. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 366, 389–401.

48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0117>

50
51
52 Daly, M. (2016). *Killing the competition: Economic inequality and homicide*. Routledge.

53
54 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203787748>

- 1
2
3 Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Aldine De Gruyter.
- 4
5
6 Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (2005). Carpe diem: Adaptation and devaluing the future. *The Quarterly*
7
8 *Review of Biology*, 80, 55–60. <https://doi.org/10.1086/431025>
- 9
10 Danese, A., & Widom, C. S. (2020). Objective and subjective experiences of child maltreatment
11
12 and their relationships with psychopathology. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 4, 811–818.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-020-0880-3>
- 15
16
17 De Courson, B., & Nettle, D. (2021). Why do inequality and deprivation produce high crime and
18
19 low trust? *Scientific Reports*, 11, 1937. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-80897-8>
- 20
21 DeJoseph, M. L., Sifre, R. D., Raver, C. C., Blair, C. B., & Berry, D. (2021). Capturing
22
23 environmental dimensions of adversity and resources in the context of poverty across
24
25 infancy through early adolescence: A moderated nonlinear factor model. *Child*
26
27 *Development*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13504>
- 28
29
30
31 Del Giudice, M. (2009). Sex, attachment, and the development of reproductive strategies.
32
33 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 32, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X09000016>
- 34
35
36 Del Giudice, M. (2018). *Evolutionary psychopathology: A unified approach*. Oxford University
37
38 Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med-psych/9780190246846.001.0001>
- 39
40
41 Del Giudice, M., Gangestad, S. W., & Kaplan, H. S. (2015). Life history theory and evolutionary
42
43 psychology. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (Vol. 1, 2nd
44
45 ed., pp. 88–114). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119125563.evpsych102>
- 46
47
48 De Vries, M. W. (1984). Temperament and infant mortality among the Masai of East Africa.
49
50 *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 141, 1189–1194.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.141.10.1189>
- 53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 De Vries, M. W. (1987a). Alternatives to mother–infant attachment in the neonatal period. In C.
4 M. Super (Ed.), *The role of culture in developmental disorder* (pp. 109–130). Academic
5 Press.
6
7
8
9
10 De Vries, M. W. (1987b). Cry babies, culture, and catastrophe: Infant temperament among the
11 Masai. In N. Scheper-Hughes (Ed.), *Child survival: Anthropological perspectives on the*
12 *treatment and maltreatment of children* (pp. 165–185). Springer.
13
14
15
16
17 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3393-4_9
18
19 Diamond, J. (1993). Agriculture’s mixed blessings. In *The third chimpanzee: The evolution and*
20 *future of the human animal* (pp. 180–191). Harper Perennial.
21
22
23
24 Diamond, J. (2013). *Guns, germs and steel: a short history of everybody for the last 13,000*
25 *years*. Random House.
26
27
28
29 Dickeman, M. (1975). Demographic consequences of infanticide in man. *Annual Review of*
30 *Ecology and Systematics*, 6, 107–137.
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.06.110175.000543>
34
35
36 Dong, M., Anda, R. F., Felitti, V. J., Dube, S. R., Williamson, D. F., Thompson, T. J., & Giles,
37 W. H. (2004). The interrelatedness of multiple forms of childhood abuse, neglect, and
38 household dysfunction. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 28, 771–784.
39
40
41
42 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2004.01.008>
43
44
45 Draper, P., & Harpending, H. (1982). Father absence and reproductive strategy: An
46 evolutionary perspective. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 38, 255–273.
47
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.38.3.3629848>
50
51
52 Dressler, W. W. (2012). Cultural consonance: Linking culture, the individual and health.
53
54 *Preventive Medicine*, 55, 390–393. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2011.12.022>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Dressler, W. W., Balieiro, M. C., & Dos Santos, J. E. (2018). What you know, what you do, and
4
5 how you feel: Cultural competence, cultural consonance, and psychological distress.
6
7 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 2355. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.02355>
8
9
- 10 Dressler, W. W., Borges, C. D., Balieiro, M. C., & Dos Santos, J. E. (2005). Measuring cultural
11
12 consonance: Examples with special reference to measurement theory in anthropology.
13
14 *Field Methods*, 17, 331–355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1525822X05279899>
15
16
- 17 Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I. (1983). Patterns of parent–child interaction in a cross-cultural perspective. In
18
19 A. Oliverio & M. Zappella (Eds.), *The behavior of human infants* (pp. 177–217).
20
21 Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-3784-3_9
22
23
- 24 Ellis, B. J. (2004). Timing of pubertal maturation in girls: An integrated life history approach.
25
26 *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 920–958. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.6.920>
27
28
- 29 Ellis, B. J., Abrams, L. S., Masten, A. S., Tottenham, N., Sternberg, R. J., & Frankenhuis, W. E.
30
31 (2020). Hidden talents in harsh environments. *Development and Psychopathology*.
32
33 Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579420000887>
34
35
- 36 Ellis, B. J., & Del Giudice, M. (2014). Beyond allostatic load: Rethinking the role of stress in
37
38 regulating human development. *Development and Psychopathology*, 26, 1–20.
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579413000849>
41
42
- 43 Ellis, B. J., & Del Giudice, M. (2019). Developmental adaptation to stress: An evolutionary
44
45 perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 111–139. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-
48
49 psych-122216-011732](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-
46
47 psych-122216-011732)
50
51
- 52 Ellis, B. J., Del Giudice, M., Dishion, T. J., Figueredo, A. J., Gray, P., Griskevicius, V., Hawley,
53
54 P. H., Jacobs, W. J., James, J., Volk, A. A., & Wilson, D. S. (2012). The evolutionary
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 basis of risky adolescent behavior: Implications for science, policy, and practice.
4
5 *Developmental Psychology*, 48, 598–623. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026220>
6
7
- 8 Ellis, B. J., Figueredo, A. J., Brumbach, B. H., & Schlomer, G. L. (2009). Fundamental
9
10 dimensions of environmental risk: The impact of harsh versus unpredictable
11
12 environments on the evolution and development of life history strategies. *Human Nature*,
13
14 20, 204–268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-009-9063-7>
15
16
- 17 Ellis, B. J., Sheridan, M. A., Belsky, J., & McLaughlin, K. A. (under review). Why and how does
18
19 early adversity influence development: Toward an integrated understanding of
20
21 dimensions of environmental risk.
22
23
- 24 Ellison, P. T. (2001). *On fertile ground: A natural history of human reproduction*. Harvard
25
26 University Press.
27
- 28 Fabian, S. M. (1992). *Space-time of the Bororo of Brazil*. University Press of Florida.
29
30
- 31 Fairbanks, L. A., & McGuire, M. T. (1995). Maternal condition and the quality of maternal care
32
33 in vervet monkeys. *Behaviour*, 132, 733–754. <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853995X00126>
34
35
- 36 Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. K., & Turner, H. A. (2007). Polyvictimization and trauma in a
37
38 national longitudinal cohort. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19, 149–166.
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579407070083>
41
42
- 43 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, International Fund for Agricultural
44
45 Development, UNICEF, World Food Programme, & World Health Organization (2019).
46
47 *The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2019: Safeguarding against*
48
49 *economic slowdowns and downturns*. [https://www.wfp.org/publications/2019-state-food-](https://www.wfp.org/publications/2019-state-food-security-and-nutrition-world-sofi-safeguarding-against-economic)
50
51 [security-and-nutrition-world-sofi-safeguarding-against-economic](https://www.wfp.org/publications/2019-state-food-security-and-nutrition-world-sofi-safeguarding-against-economic)
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fox, S. E., Levitt, P., & Nelson, C. A. (2010). How the timing and quality of early experiences
4 influence the development of brain architecture. *Child Development, 81*, 28-40.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11 Frankenhuis, W. E., & de Weerth, C. (2013). Does early-life exposure to stress shape or impair
12 cognition? *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 22*, 407–412.
13
14
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413484324>
16
17 Frankenhuis, W. E., & Nettle, D. (2020a). Integration of plasticity research across disciplines.
18
19 *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences, 36*, 157–162.
20
21
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.10.012>
23
24 Frankenhuis, W. E., & Nettle, D. (2020). The strengths of people in poverty. *Current Directions*
25
26 *in Psychological Science, 29*, 16-21. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721419881154>
27
28 Frankenhuis, W. E., Nettle, D., & Dall, S. R. X. (2019). A case for environmental statistics for
29
30 early life effects. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 374*, 20180110.
31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0110>
34
35 Frankenhuis, W. E., Nettle, D., & McNamara, J. M. (2018). Echoes of early life: Recent insights
36
37 from mathematical modeling. *Child Development, 89*, 1504–1518.
38
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13108>
41
42 Frankenhuis, W. E., Panchanathan, K., & Barto, A. (2019). Enriching behavioural ecology with
43
44 reinforcement learning methods. *Behavioural Processes, 161*, 94–100.
45
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2018.01.008>
48
49 Frankenhuis, W. E., Panchanathan, K., & Nettle, D. (2016). Cognition in harsh and unpredictable
50
51 environments. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 7*, 76–80.
52
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.08.011>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Frankenhuis, W. E., & Walasek, N. (2020). Modeling the evolution of sensitive periods.
4
5 *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, *41*, 100715.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcn.2019.100715>
8
9
10 Frankenhuis, W. E., Young, E. S., & Ellis, B. J. (2020). The hidden talents approach: Theoretical
11 and methodological challenges. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *24*, 569–581.
12
13 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.03.007>
14
15
16
17 Franklin, P., Volk, A. A., & Wong, I. (2018). Are newborns' faces less appealing. *Evolution and*
18
19 *Human Behavior*, *39*, 269–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2018.01.003>
20
21
22 Frei, K. M., Mannering, U., Kristiansen, K., Allentoft, M. E., Wilson, A. S., Skals, I., Tridico, S.,
23
24 Nosch, M. L., Willerslev, E., Clarke, L., & Frei, R. (2015). Tracing the dynamic life story
25 of a Bronze Age Female. *Scientific Reports*, *5*, 10431. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep10431>
26
27
28
29 Fry, D. P., & Söderberg, P. (2013). Lethal aggression in mobile forager bands and implications
30 for the origins of war. *Science*, *341*, 270–273. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1235675>
31
32
33
34 Gabard-Durnam, L. J., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2019). Do sensitive periods exist for exposure to
35 adversity? *Biological Psychiatry*, *85*, 789–791.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2019.03.975>
38
39
40 Galván, A. (2010). Neural plasticity of development and learning. *Human Brain Mapping*, *31*,
41
42 879–890. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hbm.21029>
43
44
45 Ganz, Z. (2018). Attachment theory's universality hypothesis: Clinical implications for culturally
46 responsive assessment. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, *88*, 262–281.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377317.2018.1507369>
49
50
51 Garcia, A. R., Blackwell, A. D., Trumble, B. C., Stieglitz, J., Kaplan, H., & Gurven, M. D.
52
53 (2020). Evidence for height and immune function trade-offs among preadolescents in a
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 high pathogen population. *Evolution, Medicine, and Public Health*, 1, 86–99.

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1093/emph/eoaa017>

6
7
8 Gat, A. (2008). *War in human civilization*. Oxford University Press.

9
10 Geary, D. C., & Berch, D. B. (2016). *Evolutionary perspectives on child development and*
11 *education*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-29986-0>

12
13
14
15 Gee, D. G. (2020). Caregiving influences on emotional learning and regulation: Applying a
16 sensitive period model. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 36, 177–184.

17
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.11.003>

20
21
22 Gee, D. G., Gabard-Durnam, L. J., Flannery, J., Goff, B., Humphreys, K. L., Telzer, E. H., ... &
23
24 Tottenham, N. (2013). Early developmental emergence of human amygdala–prefrontal
25 connectivity after maternal deprivation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
26 *Sciences*, 110, 15638–15643. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1307893110>

27
28
29
30 Geronimus, A. T. (1996). What teen mothers know. *Human Nature*, 7, 323–352.

31
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02732898>

34
35
36 Gettler, L. T., McDade, T. W., Bragg, J. M., Feranil, A. B., & Kuzawa, C. W. (2015).

37
38 Developmental energetics, sibling death, and parental instability as predictors of
39 maturational tempo and life history scheduling in males from Cebu, Philippines.

40
41
42 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 158, 175–184.

43
44
45 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22783>

46
47
48
49 Gibson, M. A., & Mace, R. (2005). Helpful grandmothers in rural Ethiopia: A study of the effect
50 of kin on child survival and growth. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 26, 469–482.

51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.03.004>

- 1
2
3 Gonzaga, M. R., Queiroz, B. L., & De Lima, E. E. C. (2018). Compression of mortality: The
4 evolution of the variability in the age of death in Latin America. *Revista Latinoamericana*
5 *de Población*, 12, 9-35. <https://doi.org/10.31406/n23a2>
6
7
8
9
10 Grafen, A. (2007). The formal Darwinism project: A mid-term report. *Journal of Evolutionary*
11 *Biology*, 20, 1243–1254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2007.01321.x>
12
13
14 Green, J. G., McLaughlin, K. A., Berglund, P. A., Gruber, M. J., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A.
15 M., & Kessler, R. C. (2010). Childhood adversities and adult psychopathology in the
16 National Comorbidity Survey Replication I: Associations with first onset of DSM-IV
17 disorders. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 62, 113–123.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2009.186>
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 Greenough, W. T., Black, J. E., & Wallace, C. S. (1987). Experience and brain development.
27 *Child Development*, 58, 539–559. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1130197>
28
29
30
31 Gurven, N., & Kaplan, H. (2007). Longevity among hunter-gatherers: A cross-cultural
32 examination. *Population and Development Review*, 33, 321–365.
33
34 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2007.00171.x>
35
36
37
38 Hagen, E. H. (1999). The functions of postpartum depression. *Evolution and Human Behavior*,
39 20, 325–359. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138\(99\)00016-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(99)00016-1)
40
41
42 Halcrow, S., Warren, R., Kushnick, G., & Nowell, A. (2020). Care of infants in the past:
43 Bridging evolutionary anthropological and bioarchaeological approaches. *Evolutionary*
44 *Human Sciences*, 2, e47. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2020.46>
45
46
47
48
49 Hammer, M. L. A., & Foley, R. A. (1996). Longevity and life history in hominid evolution.
50 *Human Evolution*, 11, 61-66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02456989>
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hamilton, W. D. (1966). The moulding of senescence by natural selection. *Journal of*
4
5 *Theoretical Biology*, 12, 12–45. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(66\)90184-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(66)90184-6)
6
7
8 Han, S., Betsinger, T. K., & Scott, A. B. (Eds.). (2017). *The anthropology of the fetus: Biology,*
9
10 *culture, and society*. New York: Berghahn Books.
11
12 Hanson, J. L., & Nacewicz, B. M. (2020). Amygdala allostasis and early life adversity:
13
14 Considering excitotoxicity and inescapability in the sequelae of stress. *Frontiers in*
15
16 *Human Neuroscience*, 15, 624705. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.624705>
17
18
19 Hanya, G., & Chapman, C. A. (2013). Linking feeding ecology and population abundance: A
20
21 review of food resource limitation on primates. *Ecological Research*, 28, 183–190.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11284-012-1012-y>
24
25
26 Harris, T. R., Chapman, C. A., & Monfort, S. L. (2010). Small folivorous primate groups exhibit
27
28 behavioral and physiological effects of food scarcity. *Behavioral Ecology*, 21, 46–56.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arp150>
31
32
33 Hart, B., & Risley, T. R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experience of young*
34
35 *American children*. Paul H Brookes.
36
37
38 Hart, D., & Sussman, R. W. (2009). *Man the hunted: Primates, predators and human evolution*.
39
40 Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429499081>
41
42
43 Hasegawa, T., & Hiraiwa, M. (1980). Social interactions of orphans observed in a free-ranging
44
45 troop of Japanese monkeys. *Folia Primatologica*, 33, 129–158.
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000155930>
48
49
50 Hawley, P. H. (2015). Social dominance in childhood and its evolutionary underpinnings: Why it
51
52 matters and what we can do. *Pediatrics*, 135(Suppl. 2), 31–38.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2014-3549D>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hawley, P. H., Little, T. D., & Rodkin, P. C. (Eds.) (2007). *Aggression and adaptation: The*
4 *brightside to bad behavior*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203936900>
5
6
7
8 Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*.
9
10 Cambridge University Press.
11
12 Hendrix, C. L., Dilks, D. D., McKenna, B. G., Dunlop, A. L., Corwin, E. J., & Brennan, P. A.
13
14 (2020). Maternal childhood adversity associates with frontoamygdala connectivity in
15
16 neonates. *Biological Psychiatry: Cognitive Neuroscience and Neuroimaging*. Advance
17
18 online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpsc.2020.11.003>
19
20
21
22 Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world?
23
24 *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33, 61–83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
25
26
27
28 Hewlett, B. S. (1991). Demography and childcare in preindustrial societies. *Journal of*
29
30 *Anthropological Research*, 47, 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.47.1.3630579>
31
32
33 Hill, R. A., & Dunbar, R. I. M. (1998). An evaluation of the roles of predation rate and predation
34
35 risk as selective pressures on primate grouping behaviour. *Behaviour*, 135, 411–430.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853998793066195>
38
39
40 Hill, K., & Hurtado, A. M. (1996). *Ache life history: The ecology and demography of a foraging*
41
42 *people*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351329248>
43
44
45 Hill, K., Hurtado, A. M., & Walker, R. S. (2007). High adult mortality among Hiwi hunter-
46
47 gatherers: Implications for human evolution. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 52, 443–454.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2006.11.003>
50
51
52 Hill, K., & Kaplan, H. (1988). Tradeoffs in male and female reproductive strategies among the
53
54 Ache: Part 2. In L. Betzig, P. Turke & M. Borgerhoff-Mulder (Eds), *Human reproductive*
55
56 *behavior: A Darwinian perspective* (pp. 291–306). Cambridge University Press.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Homer-Dixon, T. F. (1994). Environmental scarcities and violent conflict: Evidence from cases.
4
5 *International Security*, 19, 5–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539147>
6
7
8 House, B. R., Silk, J. B., Henrich, J., Barrett, H. C., Scelza, B. A., Boyette, A. H., ... & Laurence,
9
10 S. (2013). Ontogeny of prosocial behavior across diverse societies. *Proceedings of the*
11
12 *National Academy of Sciences*, 110, 14586-14591.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1221217110>
15
16
17 Howell, N. (2010). *Life histories of the Dobe !Kung: Food, fatness, and well-being over the life*
18
19 *span*. University of California Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/j.ctt1pnrsp>
20
21
22 Hrdy, S. B. (1979). Infanticide among animals: A review, classification, and examination of the
23
24 implications for the reproductive strategies of females. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 1, 13–
25
26 40. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095\(79\)90004-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0162-3095(79)90004-9)
27
28
29 Hrdy, S. B. (1999). *Mother nature: A history of mothers, infants, and natural selection*.
30
31 Pantheon.
32
33 Hrdy, S. B. (2009). *Mothers and others: The evolutionary origins of mutual understanding*.
34
35 Harvard University Press.
36
37
38 Hrdy, S. B. (2016). Development plus social selection in the emergence of “emotionally
39
40 modern” humans. In C. L. Meehan & A. Crittenden (Eds.), *Childhood: Origins,*
41
42 *evolution, and implications* (pp. 11–44). SAR Press.
43
44
45 Hrdy, S. B., Janson, C., & Van Schaik, C. (1994). Infanticide: 'et's not throw out the baby with
46
47 the bath water. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 3, 151–154.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.1360030503>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Human Mortality Database. University of California; Berkeley (USA); and Max Planck Institute
4 for Demographic Research (Germany). Available at www.mortality.org or
5
6 www.humanmortality.de (data downloaded on June 16, 2008).
7
8
9
10 Humphreys, K. L., & Salo, V. C. (2020). Expectable environments in early life. *Current Opinion*
11 *in Behavioral Sciences*, 36, 115–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cobeha.2020.09.004>
12
13
14 Humphreys, K. L., & Zeanah, C. H. (2015). Deviations from the expectable environment in early
15 childhood and emerging psychopathology. *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 40, 154-170.
16
17 <https://doi.org/10.1038/npp.2014.165>
18
19
20
21 Infurna, F. J., & Luthar, S. S. (2016). Resilience to major life stressors is not as common as
22 thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 11, 175-194.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615621271>
25
26
27
28 Jacobs, J., Agho, K., Stevens, G., & Raphael, B. (2012). Do childhood adversities cluster in
29 predictable ways? A systematic review. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 7, 103–
30
31 115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450128.2012.658886>
32
33
34
35 Johnson, M. D. (2012). Healthy marriage initiatives: On the need for empiricism in policy
36 implementation. *American Psychologist*, 67, 296–308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027743>
37
38
39
40 Johnston, F. E., & Snow, C. E. (1961). The reassessment of the age and sex of the Indian Knoll
41 skeletal population: Demographic and methodological aspects. *American Journal of*
42 *Physical Anthropology*, 19, 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330190304>
43
44
45
46
47 Jones, J. H. (2009). The force of selection on the human life cycle. *Evolution and Human*
48 *Behavior*, 30, 305–314. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2009.01.005>
49
50
51
52 Kaplan, H. S., & Lancaster, J. B. (2000). The evolutionary economics and psychology of the
53 demographic transition to low fertility. In L. Cronk, N. Chagnon & W. Irons (Eds.),
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 *Adaptation and human behavior: An anthropological perspective* (pp. 238–322).
4
5 Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351329200-18>
6
7
8 Kaplan, H. S., & Lancaster, J. B. (2003). An evolutionary and ecological analysis of human
9 fertility, mating patterns, and parental investment. In K. W. Wachter & R. A. Bulatao
10 (Eds.), *Offspring: Human fertility behavior in biodemographic perspective* (pp. 170–
11 223). National Academies Press. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK97292/>
12
13
14
15
16
17 Katona, P., & Katona-Apte, J. (2008). The interaction between nutrition and infection. *Clinical*
18 *Infectious Diseases*, 46, 1582–1588. <https://doi.org/10.1086/587658>
19
20
21 Keech, M. A., Bowyer, R. T., Ver Hoef, J. M., Boertje, R. D., Dale, B. W., & Stephenson, T. R.
22 (2000). Life-history consequences of maternal condition in Alaskan moose. *The Journal*
23 *of Wildlife Management*, 64, 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3803243>
24
25
26
27
28 Keeley, L. H. (1996). *War before civilization: The myth of the peaceful savage*. Oxford
29 University Press.
30
31
32
33 Keller, H. (2008). Attachment—Past and present: But what about the future? *Integrative*
34 *Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 42, 406–415. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-008-9080-9)
35 9080-9
36
37
38
39
40 Keller, H., Bard, K., Morelli, G., Chaudhary, N., Vicedo, M., Rosabal-Coto, M., Scheidecker, G.,
41 Murray, M., & Gottlieb, A. (2018). The myth of universal sensitive responsiveness:
42 Comment on Mesman et al. (2017). *Child Development*, 89, 1921–1928.
43 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.13031>
44
45
46
47
48
49 Kelly, R. L. (2013). *The lifeways of hunter-gatherers: The foraging spectrum*. Cambridge
50 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139176132>
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Ketelaar, T., & Ellis, B. J. (2000). Are evolutionary explanations unfalsifiable? Evolutionary
4
5 psychology and the Lakatosian philosophy of science. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 1–21.
6
7 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1101_01
8
9
- 10 Kievit, R. A., Frankenhuis, W. E., Waldorp, L. J., & Borsboom, D. (2013). Simpson's paradox in
11
12 psychological science: A practical guide. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *4*, 513.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00513>
15
16
- 17 King, L. S., Humphreys, K. L., & Gotlib, I. H. (2019). The neglect–enrichment continuum:
18
19 Characterizing variation in early caregiving environments. *Developmental Review*, *51*,
20
21 109–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2019.01.001>
22
23
- 24 Kline, M. A. (2015). How to learn about teaching: An evolutionary framework for the study of
25
26 teaching behavior in humans and other animals. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *38*, e31.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X14000090>
29
30
- 31 Kojima, H. (2003). The history of children and youth in Japan. In W. Koops & M. Zucherman
32
33 (Eds.), *Beyond the century of the child: Cultural history and developmental psychology*
34
35 (pp. 112–135). University of Pennsylvania Press.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812208238.112>
38
39
- 40 Konigsberg, L. W., & Frankenberg, S. R. (1994). Paleodemography: “Not quite dead”.
41
42 *Evolutionary Anthropology*, *3*, 92–105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.1360030306>
43
44
- 45 Konner, M. J. (2010). *The evolution of childhood: Relationships, emotion, mind*. Belknap Press.
46
- 47 Konner, M. (2016). Hunter-gatherer infancy and childhood in the context of human evolution. In
48
49 C. J. Meehan & A. N. Crittenden (Eds.), *Childhood: Origins, evolution, and implications*
50
51 (pp. 123–154). Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Koomen, R., & Herrmann, E. (2018). The effects of social context and food abundance on
4
5 chimpanzee feeding competition. *American Journal of Primatology*, *80*, e22734.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22734>
8
9
10 Korbin, J. E. (1987). Child maltreatment in cross-cultural perspective: Vulnerable children and
11
12 circumstances. In R. J. Gelles & J. B. Lancaster (Eds.), *Child abuse and neglect:*
13
14 *Biosocial dimensions* (pp. 31–56). Aldine de Gruyter. <https://bit.ly/3oEmmGM>
15
16
17 Kramer, K. L. (2005). Children's help and the pace of reproduction: Cooperative breeding in
18
19 humans. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, *14*, 224–237. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20082>
20
21
22 Krug, E. G., Mercy, J. A., Dahlberg, L. L., & Zwi, A. B. (2002). The world report on violence
23
24 and health. *Lancet*, *360*, 1083–1088. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)11133-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)11133-0)
25
26
27 Kuchirko, Y. A., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2019). The cultural context of infant development:
28
29 Variability, specificity, and universality. In D. A. Henry, E. Votruba-Drzal & P. Miller
30
31 (Eds.), *Advances in child development and behavior: Vol. 57. Child development at the*
32
33 *intersection of race and SES* (pp. 27–63). Academic Press.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2019.04.004>
36
37
38 Kuzawa, C. W. (2005). Fetal origins of developmental plasticity: Are fetal cues reliable
39
40 predictors of future nutritional environments? *American Journal of Human Biology*, *17*,
41
42 5–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20091>
43
44
45 Kuzawa, C. W., & Bragg, J. M. (2012). Plasticity in human life history strategy: Implications for
46
47 contemporary human variation and the evolution of genus *Homo*. *Current Anthropology*,
48
49 *53*, S369-S382. <https://doi.org/10.1086/667410>
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kuzawa, C. W., & Quinn, E. A. (2009). Developmental origins of adult function and health:
4
5 Evolutionary hypotheses. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 38, 131–147.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-091908-164350>
8
9
10 Laes, C. (2011). *Children in the Roman Empire: Outsiders within*. Cambridge University Press.
11
12 Lahdenperä, M., Mar, K. U., & Lummaa, V. (2016). Short-term and delayed effects of mother
13
14 death on calf mortality in Asian elephants. *Behavioral Ecology*, 27, 166–174.
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arv136>
17
18
19 Lancy, D. F. (2010). Learning ‘from nobody’: The limited role of teaching in folk models of
20
21 child’ en’s development. *Childhood in the Past*, 3, 79–106.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1179/cip.2010.3.1.79>
24
25
26 Lancy, D. F. (2014). Babies aren’t persons: A survey of delayed personhood. In H. Otto & H.
27
28 Keller (Eds.), *Different faces of attachment: Cultural variations of a universal human*
29
30 *need* (pp. 66–110). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.3027.6801>
31
32
33 Lancy, D. F. (2015). *The anthropology of childhood: Cherubs, chattel, changelings* (2nd ed.).
34
35 Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139680530>
36
37
38 Lancy, D. F. (2017). *Anthropological perspectives on children as helpers, workers, artisans, and*
39
40 *laborers*. Palgrave MacMillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-53351-7>
41
42
43 Lansford, J. E., & Dodge, K. A. (2008). Cultural norms for adult corporal punishment of children
44
45 and societal rates of endorsement and use of violence. *Parenting*, 8, 257–270.
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15295190802204843>
48
49
50 Lee, R. B., & DeVore, I. (Eds.). (1968). *Man the hunter*. Routledge.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203786567>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Lee, R. D., & Kramer, K. L. (2002). Children's economic roles in the Maya family life cycle:
4 Cain, Caldwell, and Chayanov revisited. *Population and Development Review*, 28(3),
5
6 475-499. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1728-4457.2002.00475.x>
7
8
9
10 Legare, C. H. (2019). The development of cumulative cultural learning. *Annual Review of*
11
12 *Developmental Psychology*, 1, 119–147. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-121318-084848)
13
14 [121318-084848](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-121318-084848)
15
16
17 LeFevre, J. A., Polyzoi, E., Skwarchuk, S. L., Fast, L., & Sowinski, C. (2010). Do home
18
19 numeracy and literacy practices of Greek and Canadian parents predict the numeracy
20
21 skills of kindergarten children? *International Journal of Early Years Education*, 18, 55–
22
23 70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669761003693926>
24
25
26 Lew-Levy, S., Reckin, R., Lavi, N., Cristóbal-Azkarate, J., & Ellis-Davies, K. (2017). How do
27
28 hunter-gatherer children learn subsistence skills? *Human Nature*, 28, 367–394.
29
30 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12110-017-9302-2>
31
32
33 Lewis, D. M. G., Al-Shawaf, L., Conroy-Beam, D., Asao, K., & Buss, D. M. (2017).
34
35 Evolutionary psychology: A how-to guide. *American Psychologist*, 72, 353–373.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040409>
38
39
40 Lewis, M. E. (2017). *Paleopathology of children: Identification of pathological conditions in the*
41
42 *human skeletal remains of non-adults*. Academic Press.
43
44
45 Lewis, M. E., & Gowland, R. (2007). Brief and precarious lives: Infant mortality in contrasting
46
47 sites from medieval and post-medieval England (AD 850-1859). *American Journal of*
48
49 *Physical Anthropology*, 134, 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20643>
50
51
52 Lieven, E. V. M. (1994). Crosslinguistic and crosscultural aspects of language addressed to
53
54 children. In C. Gallaway & B. J. Richards (Eds.), *Input and interaction in language*
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 *acquisition* (pp. 56–73). Cambridge University Press.
4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620690.005>
6
7
8 Little, E. E., Carver, L. J., & Legare, C. H. (2016). Cultural variation in triadic infant-caregiver
9
10 object exploration. *Child Development*, *87*, 1130–1145.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12513>
13
14
15 Loeterman, B. (Writer & Director), & Kotlowitz, A. (Writer). (2002). Let's get married
16
17 [Television broadcast No. 2106]. In B. Loeterman (Executive Producer), *Frontline*.
18
19 Public Broadcasting Service.
20
21
22 Lozoff, B., & Brittenham, G. (1979). Infant care: Cache or carry. *Journal of Pediatrics*, *95*, 478–
23
24 483. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3476\(79\)80540-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0022-3476(79)80540-5)
25
26
27 Lukas, D., & Huchard, E. (2014). The evolution of infanticide by males in mammalian societies.
28
29 *Science*, *346*, 841–844. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1257226>
30
31
32 Lukas, D., & Huchard, E. (2019). The evolution of infanticide by females in mammals.
33
34 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, *374*, 20180075.
35
36 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2018.0075>
37
38
39 Lupien, S. J., Ouellet-Morin, I., Hupbach, A., Tu, M. T., Buss, C., Walker, D., et al. (2006).
40
41 Beyond the stress concept: Allostatic load: A developmental biological and cognitive
42
43 perspective. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Vol.*
44
45 *2. Developmental neuroscience* (2nd ed., pp. 578–628). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
46
47
48 Mace, R. (2000). Evolutionary ecology of human life history. *Animal Behaviour*, *59*, 1–10.
49
50 <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1999.1287>
51
52
53 Marlowe, F. W. (2003). The mating system of foragers in the standard cross-cultural sample.
54
55 *Cross-Cultural Research*, *37*, 282–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397103254008>
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Marlowe, F. W. (2005). Hunter-gatherers and human evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 14,
4 54–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20046>
5
6
7
8 Marshall, J. (1958). Man as hunter. *Natural History*, 72, 1–89.
9
10 Martin, D. L., & Harrod, R. P. (2015). Bioarchaeological contributions to the study of violence.
11 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 156, 116-145.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22662>
13
14
15
16
17 Martin, J. S., Ringen, E. J., Duda, P., & Jaeggi, A. V. (2020). Harsh environments promote
18 alloparental care across human societies. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 287,
19 28720200758. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2020.0758>
20
21
22
23
24 Mathew, S., & Boyd, R. (2014). The cost of cowardice: Punitive sentiments towards free riders
25 in Turkana raids. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 35, 58–64.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.10.001>
27
28
29
30
31 Matsumoto, M., Piersiak, H. A., Letterie, M. C., & Humphreys, K. L. (2020). Population-based
32 estimates of associations between child maltreatment type: A meta-analysis. *Trauma,*
33 *Violence, & Abuse*. Advance online publication.
34 <https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380211030502>
35
36
37
38
39
40 Maynard-Smith, J. M., & Harper, D. (2003). *Animal signals*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
41
42 McDade, T. W. (2003). Life history theory and the immune system: Steps toward a human
43 ecological immunology. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 122(Suppl. 37),
44 100–125. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10398>
45
46
47
48
49 McDade, T. W., Georgiev, A. V., & Kuzawa, C. W. (2016). Trade-offs between acquired and
50 innate immune defenses in humans. *Evolution, Medicine, and Public Health*, 2016, 1–16.
51 <https://doi.org/10.1093/emph/eov033>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 McDade, T. W., Reyes-García, V., Tanner, S., Huanca, T., & Leonard, W. R. (2008).
4
5 Maintenance versus growth: Investigating the costs of immune activation among children
6
7 in lowland Bolivia. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *136*, 478–484.
8
9 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20831>
10
11
12 McEwen, B. S., & Stellar, E. (1993). Stress and the individual: Mechanisms leading to disease.
13
14 *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *153*, 2093–2101.
15
16 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archinte.1993.00410180039004>
17
18
19 McLaughlin, K. A. (2016). Future directions in childhood adversity and youth psychopathology.
20
21 *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, *45*, 361–382.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2015.1110823>
24
25
26 McLaughlin, K. A., & Gabard-Durnam, L. J. (in press). Experience-driven plasticity and the
27
28 emergence of psychopathology: A mechanistic framework integrating development and
29
30 the environment into the Research Domain Criteria (RDoC) model. *Journal of Abnormal*
31
32 *Psychology*.
33
34
35 McLaughlin, K. A., Green, J. G., Gruber, M. J., Sampson, N. A., Zaslavsky, A., & Kessler, R. C.
36
37 (2012). Childhood adversities and first onset of psychiatric disorders in a national sample
38
39 of adolescents. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *69*, 1151–1160.
40
41 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.2277>
42
43
44 McLaughlin, K. A., & Sheridan, M. A. (2016). Beyond cumulative risk: A dimensional approach
45
46 to childhood adversity. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *25*, 239–245.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721416655883>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- McLaughlin, K. A., Sheridan, M. A., & Nelson, C. A. (2017). Neglect as a violation of species-expectant experience: Neurodevelopmental consequences. *Biological Psychiatry*, *82*, 462-471. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2017.02.1096>
- McLaughlin, K. A., Sheridan, M. A., Humphreys, K. L., Belsky, J., & Ellis, B. J. (2021). The value of dimensional models of early experiences: Thinking clearly about concepts and categories. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691621992346>
- McLaughlin, K. A., Weissman, D., & Bitrán, D. (2019). Childhood adversity and neural development: A systematic review. *Annual Review of Developmental Psychology*, *1*, 227-312. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-devpsych-121318-084950>
- McLanahan, S., Tach, L., & Schneider, D. (2013). The causal effects of father absence. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *39*, 399-427. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145704>
- Meehan, C. L., & Crittenden, A. N. (Eds.). (2016). *Childhood: Origins, evolution, and implications*. University of New Mexico Press.
- Meehan, C. L., & Hawks, S. (2014). Maternal and allomaternal responsiveness: The significance of cooperative caregiving in attachment theory. In H. Otto & H. Keller (Eds.), *Different faces of attachment* (pp. 113-140). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Meehan, C. L., Helfrecht, C., & Quinlan, R. J. (2014). Cooperative breeding and Aka children's nutritional status: Is flexibility key?. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *153*, 513-525. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22415>
- Mesman, J., Minter, T., Angged, A., Cisse, I. A. H., Salali, G. D., & Migliano, A. B. (2017). Universality without uniformity: A culturally inclusive approach to sensitive

- responsiveness in infant caregiving. *Child Development*, 89, 837–850.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12795>
- Mesman, J., van IJzendoorn, M., Behrens, K., Carbonell, O. A., Cárcamo, R., Cohen-Paraira, I., de la Harpe, C., Ekmekçi, H., Emmen, R., Heidar, J., Kondo-Ikemura, K., Mels, C., Mooya, H., Murtisari, S., Nóbrega, M., Ortiz, J. A., Sagi-Schwartz, A., Sichimba, F., Soares, I., ... Zreik, G. (2016). Is the ideal mother a sensitive mother? Beliefs about early childhood parenting in mothers across the globe. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 40, 385–397. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025415594030>
- Mileva-Seitz, V. R., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., Battaini, C., & Luijk, M. P. C. M. (2017). Parent-child bed-sharing: The good, the bad, and the burden of evidence. *Sleep Medicine Reviews*, 32, 4–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smrv.2016.03.003>
- Mishra, G. D., Cooper, R., Tom, S. E., & Kuh, D. (2009). Early life circumstances and their impact on menarche and menopause. *Women's Health*, 5, 175–190.
<https://doi.org/10.2217/17455057.5.2.175>
- Mishra, S., Barclay, P., & Sparks, A. (2017). The relative state model: Integrating need-based and ability-based pathways to risk-taking. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21, 176–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316644094>
- Mitterauer, M., & Sieder, R. (1997). *The European family: Patriarchy to partnership from the Middle Ages to the present*. University of Chicago Press.
- Mull, D. S., & Mull, J. D. (1987). Infanticide among the Tarahumara of the Mexican Sierra Madre. In N. Scheper-Hughes (Ed.), *Child survival: Anthropological perspectives on the treatment and maltreatment of children* (pp. 113–132). Dordrecht: Reidel.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3393-4_6

- 1
2
3 Muthukrishna, M., Bell, A. V., Henrich, J., Curtin, C. M., Gedranovich, A., McInerney, J., &
4
5 Thue, B. (2020). Beyond Western, Educated, Industrial, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD)
6
7 psychology: Measuring and mapping scales of cultural and psychological distance.
8
9 *Psychological Science*, 31, 678–701. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620916782>
10
11
12 Muthukrishna, M., Henrich, J., & Slingerland, E. (2021). Psychology as a historical science.
13
14 *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 717–749. [https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-082820-111436)
15
16 [082820-111436](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-082820-111436)
17
18
19 Nelson, C. A. (2007). A neurobiological perspective on early human deprivation. *Child*
20
21 *Development Perspectives*, 1, 13-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00004.x>
22
23
24 Nelson, C. A., III, & Gabard-Durnam, L. J. (2020). Early adversity and critical periods:
25
26 Neurodevelopmental consequences of violating the expectable environment. *Trends in*
27
28 *Neurosciences*, 43, 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2020.01.002>
29
30
31 Nenko, I., Chapman, S. N., Lahdenperä, M., Pettay, J. E., & Lummaa, V. (2021). Will granny
32
33 save me? Birth status, survival, and the role of grandmothers in historical Finland.
34
35 *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 42, 239-246.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.11.002>
38
39
40 Nesse, R. M., & Stein, D. J. (2012). Towards a genuinely medical model for psychiatric
41
42 nosology. *BMC Medicine*, 10, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1741-7015-10-5>
43
44
45 Nettle, D. (2015). *Tyneside neighbourhoods: Deprivation, social life and social behaviour in one*
46
47 *British city*. Open Book Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0084>
48
49
50 Nettle, D., Frankenhuys, W. E., & Rickard, I. J. (2013). The evolution of predictive adaptive
51
52 responses in human life history. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 280, 20131343.
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2013.1343>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Nielsen, M., Haun, D., Kärtner, J., & Legare, C. H. (2017). The persistent sampling bias in
4
5 developmental psychology: A call to action. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*,
6
7 162, 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jecp.2017.04.017>
8
9
10 Nisbett, R. E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently ...*
11
12 *and why*. The Free Press.
13
14 Ó Gráda, C. (2009). *Famine: A short history*. Princeton University Press.
15
16
17 Ochs, E., & Schieffelin, B. (1984). Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental
18
19 stories and their implications. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory:*
20
21 *Essays on mind, self, and emotion* (pp. 276–320). Cambridge University Press.
22
23
24 Omran, A. R. (1983). The epidemiologic transition theory. A preliminary update. *Journal of*
25
26 *Tropical Pediatrics*, 29, 305-316. <https://doi.org/10.1093/tropej/29.6.305>
27
28
29 Page, A. E., & French, J. C. (2020). Reconstructing prehistoric demography: What role for extant
30
31 hunter-gatherers? *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 29, 332–345.
32
33 <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21869>
34
35
36 Page, A. E., Viguier, S., Dyble, M., Smith, D., Chaudhary, N., Salali, G. D., ... & Migliano, A. B.
37
38 (2016). Reproductive trade-offs in extant hunter-gatherers suggest adaptive mechanism
39
40 for the Neolithic expansion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113,
41
42 4694-4699. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1524031113>
43
44
45 Painter, R. C., Westendorp, R. G., de Rooij, S. R., Osmond, C., Barker, D. J., & Roseboom, T. J.
46
47 (2008). Increased reproductive success of women after prenatal undernutrition. *Human*
48
49 *Reproduction*, 23, 2591–2595. <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/den274>
50
51
52 Paradise, R., & Rogoff, B. (2009). Side by side: Learning by observing and pitching in. *Ethos*,
53
54 37, 102–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1352.2009.01033.x>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Patterson, S. K., Hinde, K., Bond, A. B., Trumble, B. C., Strum, S. C., & Silk, J. B. (2021).
4
5 Effects of early life adversity on maternal effort and glucocorticoids in wild olive
6
7 baboons. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 75, 114. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-021-03056-7)
8
9 [021-03056-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-021-03056-7)
10
11
12 Pavard, S., & Coste, C. F. D. (2021). Evolutionary demographic models reveal the strength of
13
14 purifying selection on susceptibility alleles to late-onset diseases. *Nature Ecology &*
15
16 *Evolution*, 5, 392–400. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-020-01355-2>
17
18
19 Pepper, G. V., & Nettle, D. (2013). Death and the time of your life: Experiences of close
20
21 bereavement are associated with steeper financial future discounting and earlier
22
23 reproduction. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34, 433–439.
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.08.004>
26
27
28 Pepper, G. V., & Nettle, D. (2017). The behavioural constellation of deprivation: Causes and
29
30 consequences. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences*, 40, Article e314.
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X1600234X>
33
34
35 Perry, G. C. (2021). Non-parental investment in children and child outcomes after parental death
36
37 or divorce in a patrilocal society. *Social Sciences*, 10, 196.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10060196>
40
41
42 Perry, M. A. (2006). Redefining childhood through bioarchaeology: Toward an archaeological
43
44 and biological understanding of children in antiquity. *Archeological Papers of the*
45
46 *American Anthropological Association*, 15, 89–11.
47
48 <https://doi.org/10.1525/ap3a.2005.15.89>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Piantadosi, S. T., Jara-Ettinger, J., & Gibson, E. (2014). Children's learning of number words in
4
5 an indigenous farming-foraging group. *Developmental Science*, *17*, 553–563.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12078>
8
9
10 Pollak, S. D., & Wolfe, B. L. (2020). Maximizing research on the adverse effects of child
11
12 poverty through consensus measures. *Developmental Science*, *23*, e12946.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.12946>
15
16
17 Porter, C. C., & Marlowe, F. W. (2007). How marginal are forager habitats? *Journal of*
18
19 *Archeological Science*, *34*, 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2006.03.014>
20
21
22 Prentice, A. M. (2005). Starvation in humans: Evolutionary background and contemporary
23
24 implications. *Mechanisms of Ageing and Development*, *126*, 976–981.
25
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mad.2005.03.018>
27
28
29 Pye, C. (1986). Quiché Mayan speech to children. *Journal of Child Language*, *13*, 85–100.
30
31 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000900000313>
32
33
34 Qu, Y., Jorgensen, N. A., & Telzer, E. H. (2021). A call for greater attention to culture in the
35
36 study of brain and development. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *16*, 275–293.
37
38 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620931461>
39
40
41 Quigley, A. (2018). *Closing the vocabulary gap*. Routledge.
42
43 <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315113272>
44
45
46 Quinlan, R. J. (2007). Human parental effort and environmental risk. *Proceedings of the Royal*
47
48 *Society B*, *274*, 121–125. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2006.3690>
49
50
51 Rawson, B. (2003). *Children and childhood in Roman Italy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Richardson, G. B., Blount, T. N., & Hanson-Cook, B. S. (2019). Life history theory and recovery
4 from substance use disorder. *Review of General Psychology*, *23*, 263–274.
5
6 <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000173>
7
8
9
10 Riches, D. (1974). The Netsilik Eskimo: A special case of selective female infanticide.
11
12 *Ethnology*, *13*, 351–361. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3773051>
13
14
15 Richman, A. L., Miller, P. M., & LeVine, R. A. (1992). Cultural and educational variations in
16 maternal responsiveness. *Developmental Psychology*, *28*, 614–621.
17
18 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.28.4.614>
19
20
21 Rickard, I. J., Frankenhuis, W. E., & Nettle, D. (2014). Why are childhood family factors
22 associated with timing of maturation? A role for internal state. *Perspectives on*
23
24 *Psychological Science*, *9*, 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691613513467>
25
26
27
28 Rifkin-Graboi, A., Goh, S. K. Y., Chong, H. J., Tsotsi, S., Sim, L. W., Tan, K. H., Chong, Y. S.,
29
30 & Meaney, M. J. (2021). Caregiving adversity during infancy and preschool cognitive
31 function: Adaptations to context? *Journal of Developmental Origins of Health and*
32
33 *Disease*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420001348>
34
35
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420001348>
38 [Rogoff, B. \(2011\). Childhood and learning: How do children learn without being taught? One](https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420001348)
39
40 [way is by observing and pitching in. *Anthropology of Childhood and Youth Interest*](https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420001348)
41
42 [*Group Newsletter* 3\(2, October\), 8–10. American Anthropological Association.](https://doi.org/10.1017/S2040174420001348)
43
44
45 Rogoff, B., Coppens, A. D., Alcalá, L., Aceves-Azuara, I., Ruvalcaba, O., López, A., & Dayton,
46
47 A. (2017). Noticing learners' strengths through cultural research. *Perspectives on*
48
49 *Psychological Science*, *12*, 876–888. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617718355>
50
51
52 Rogoff, B., Mejía-Arauz, R., & Correa-Chávez, M. (2015). A cultural paradigm—Learning by
53
54 observing and pitching in. In M. Correa-Chávez, R. Mejía-Arauz & B. Rogoff (Eds.),
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Advances in child development and behavior* (Vol. 49, pp. 1–22).

4
5 <https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.acdb.2015.10.008>

6
7
8 Ronsmans, C., Chowdhury, M. E., Dasgupta, S. K., Ahmed, A., & Koblinsky, M. (2010). Effect
9
10 of parent's death on child survival in rural Bangladesh: A cohort study. *The Lancet*, 375,
11
12 2024–2031. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)60704-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60704-0)

13
14
15 Roser, M. (2013). Ethnographic and archaeological evidence on violent deaths. Retrieved from
16
17 <https://ourworldindata.org/ethnographic-and-archaeological-evidence-on-violent-deaths>.

18
19 Roser, M., Ritchie, H., & Dadonaite, B. (2019a, November). Child and infant mortality.
20
21 Retrieved from <https://ourworldindata.org/child-mortality>.

22
23
24 Roser, M., Ritchie, H., & Ortiz-Ospina, E. (2019b, May). World population growth. Retrieved
25
26 from <https://ourworldindata.org/world-population-growth>.

27
28 Rottman, J. (2014). Evolution, development, and the emergence of disgust. *Evolutionary*
29
30 *Psychology*, 12, 417–433. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491401200209>

31
32
33 Rowe, M. L. (2008). Child-directed speech: Relation to socioeconomic status, knowledge of
34
35 child development and child vocabulary skill. *Journal of Child Language*, 35, 185–205.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305000907008343>

38
39
40 Salhi, C., Beatriz, E., McBain, R., McCoy, D., Sheridan, M., & Fink, G. (2021). Physical
41
42 discipline, deprivation, and differential risk of developmental delay across 17 countries.
43
44 *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 60, 296–306.

45
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2020.02.016>

48
49 Scheper-Hughes, N. (1985). Culture, scarcity, and maternal thinking: Maternal detachment and
50
51 infant survival in a Brazilian shantytown. *Ethos*, 13, 291–317.

52
53
54 <https://doi.org/10.1525/eth.1985.13.4.02a00010>

- 1
2
3 Sear, E. (2020). Do human ‘life history strategies’ exist? *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *41*,
4 513–526. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.09.004>
5
6
7
8 Sear, R. (2015). Evolutionary demography: A Darwinian renaissance in demography. In J. D.
9 Wright (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (Vol. 8, 2nd
10 ed., pp. 406–412). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.81057-0>
11
12
13
14 Sear, R. (2021). The male breadwinner nuclear family is not the ‘traditional’ human family, and
15 promotion of this myth may have adverse health consequences. *Philosophical*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 Sear, R., & Mace, R. (2008). Who keeps children alive? A review of the effects of kin on child
25 survival. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *29*, 1–18.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 Sear, R., Sheppard, P., & Coall, D. A. (2019). Cross-cultural evidence does not support universal
39 acceleration of puberty in father-absent households. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Shonkoff, J. P., Garner, A. S., Siegel, B. S., Dobbins, M. I., Earls, M. F., McGuinn, L., et al.
4
5 (2012). The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress. *Pediatrics*, *129*,
6
7 e232–e246. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2011-2663>
8
9
10 Silberbauer, G. B. (1981). *Hunter and habitat in the central Kalahari Desert*. Cambridge
11
12 University Press.
13
14 Simons, D. J., Shoda, Y., & Lindsay, D. S. (2017). Constraints on generality (COG): A proposed
15
16 addition to all empirical papers. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 1123–1128.
17
18 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617708630>
19
20
21 Simpson, J., & Belsky, J. (2016). Attachment theory within a modern evolutionary framework.
22
23 In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and*
24
25 *clinical implications* (3rd ed., pp. 91–116). Guilford Press.
26
27
28 Singh, M., & Glowacki, L. (2021, March 13). Human social organization during the Late
29
30 Pleistocene: Beyond the nomadic-egalitarian model. <https://doi.org/10.32942/osf.io/vusy6>
31
32
33 Singletary, B. (2020). Familial allomaternal care exposure is predictive of infant development.
34
35 *American Journal of Human Biology*, e23498. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23498>
36
37
38 Skouteris, H., Bergmeier, H. J., Berns, S. D., Betancourt, J., Boynton-Jarrett, R., Davis, M. B.,
39
40 Gibbons, K., Pérez-Escamilla, R., & Story, M. (2021). Reframing the early childhood
41
42 obesity prevention narrative through an equitable nurturing approach. *Maternal & Child*
43
44 *Nutrition*, *17*, e13094. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.13094>
45
46
47 Smith, E. A., & Coddig, B. F. (2021). Ecological variation and institutionalized inequality in
48
49 hunter-gatherer societies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*,
50
51 e2016134118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.201613411>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Smith, K. E., & Pollak, S. D. (2021a). Rethinking concepts and categories for understanding the
4
5 neurodevelopmental effects of childhood adversity. *Perspectives on Psychological*
6
7 *Science*, 16, 67–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620920725>
8
9
- 10 Smith, K. E., & Pollak, S. D. (2021b). Social relationships and children's perceptions of
11
12 adversity. *Child Development Perspectives*. Advance online publication.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12427>
15
16
- 17 Snyder-Mackler, N., Burger, J. R., Gaydos, L., Belsky, D. W., Noppert, G. A., Campos, F. A.,
18
19 Barolomucci, A., Yang, Y. C., Aiello, A. E., O'Rand, A., Mullan-Harris, K., Shively, C.
20
21 A., Alberts, S. C., & Tung, J. (2020). Social determinants of health and survival in
22
23 humans and other animals. *Science*, 368, eaax9553.
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aax9553>
26
27
- 28 Speakman, J. R. (2013). Evolutionary perspectives on the obesity epidemic: Adaptive,
29
30 maladaptive, and neutral viewpoints. *Annual Review of Nutrition*, 33, 289–317.
31
32 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nutr-071811-150711>
33
34
- 35 Stallard, E. (2016). Compression of morbidity and mortality: New perspectives. *North American*
36
37 *Actuarial Journal*, 20, 341-354. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10920277.2016.1227269>
38
39
- 40 Stearns, P. N. (2006). *Childhood in world history*. Routledge.
41
- 42 Stephens, D. W. (1981). The logic of risk-sensitive foraging preferences. *Animal Behaviour*, 29,
43
44 628–629. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472\(81\)80128-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(81)80128-5)
45
46
- 47 Sternberg, R. J. (2014). The development of adaptive competence: Why cultural psychology is
48
49 necessary and not just nice. *Developmental Review*, 34, 208–224.
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.05.004>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stirling, M. W. (1938). *Historical and ethnographical material on the Jivaro Indians*. United
4
5 States Government Printing Office.

6
7
8 Strassmann, B. I. (2011). Cooperation and competition in a cliff-dwelling people. *Proceedings of*
9
10 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(Supplement 2), 10894-10901.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1100306108>

13
14
15 Sumner, J. A., Colich, N. L., Uddin, M., Armstrong, D., & McLaughlin, K. A. (2019). Early
16
17 experiences of threat, but not deprivation, are associated with accelerated biological aging
18
19 in children and adolescents. *Biological Psychiatry*, 85, 268-278.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biopsych.2018.09.008>

22
23
24 Surbeck, M., Mundry, R., & Hohmann, G. (2011). Mothers matter! Maternal support, dominance
25
26 status and mating success in male bonobos (*Pan paniscus*). *Proceedings of the Royal*
27
28 *Society B*, 278, 590–598. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2010.1572>

29
30
31 Suomi, S. J. (2016). Attachment in rhesus monkeys. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.),
32
33 *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (3rd ed., pp. 133–
34
35 154). Guilford Press.

36
37
38 Syme, K. L., & Hagen, E. H. (2020). Mental health is biological health: Why tackling “diseases
39
40 of the mind” is an imperative for biological anthropology in the 21st century. *American*
41
42 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 171, 87–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23965>

43
44
45 Thalmayer, A. G., Toscanelli, C., & Arnett, J. J. (2020). The neglected 95% revisited: Is
46
47 American psychology becoming less American? *American Psychologist*, 76, 116–129.
48
49 <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000622>

- 1
2
3 Théoret-Gosselin, R. Hamel, S., & Côté, S. D. (2015). The role of maternal behavior and
4
5 offspring development in the survival of mountain goat kids. *Oecologia*, *178*, 175–186.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-014-3198-x>
8
9
- 10 Thompson, W. S. (1929). Population. *American Journal of Sociology*, *34*, 959–975.
11
12 <https://doi.org/10.1086/214874>
13
14
- 15 Tooby, J., Cosmides, L. (1996). Friendship and the banker's paradox: Other pathways to the
16
17 evolution of adaptations for altruism. In Runciman, W. G., Maynard Smith, J., Dunbar, R.
18
19 I. M. (Eds.), *Evolution of social behavior patterns in primates and man* (pp. 119–143).
20
21 Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
22
23
- 24 Tooley, U. A., Bassett, D. S., & Mackey, A. P. (2021). Environmental influences on the pace of
25
26 brain development. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *22*, 372–384.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-021-00457-5>
29
30
- 31 Tottenham, N. (2012). Human amygdala development in the absence of species-expected
32
33 caregiving. *Developmental Psychobiology*, *54*, 598–611.
34
35 <https://doi.org/10.1002/dev.20531>
36
37
- 38 Townsend, C., Aktipis, A., Balliet, D., & Cronk, L. (2020). Generosity among the Ik of Uganda.
39
40 *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, *2*, e23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2020.22>
41
42
- 43 Tracer, D. P. (2002a). Did the australopithecines crawl? *American Journal of Physical*
44
45 *Anthropology*, *117*(Suppl. 34), 156–157.
46
47
- 48 Tracer, D. P. (2002b). Somatic versus reproductive energy allocation in Papua New Guinea: Life
49
50 history theory and public policy. *American Journal of Human Biology*, *14*, 621–626.
51
52 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.10073>
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Tracer, D. P., & Wyckoff, S. L. (2020). Determinants of infant carrying behavior in rural Papua
4
5 New Guinea. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 32, e23429.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23429>
8
9
10 Trinkaus, E. (1995). Neanderthal mortality patterns. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, 22, 121–
11
12 142. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-4403\(95\)80170-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-4403(95)80170-7)
13
14
15 Tronick, E. Z., Morelli, G. A., & Winn, S. (1987). Multiple caretaking of Efe (Pygmy) infants.
16
17 *American Anthropologist*, 89, 96-106. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1987.89.1.02a00050>
18
19
20 Tung, J., Archie, E. A., Altmann, J., & Alberts, S. C. (2016). Cumulative early life adversity
21
22 predicts longevity in wild baboons. *Nature Communications*, 7, 11181.
23
24 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11181>
25
26
27 Turnbull, C. M. (1972). *The mountain people*. Touchstone.
28
29 Tybur, J. M., & Lieberman, D. (2016). Human pathogen avoidance adaptations. *Current Opinion*
30
31 *in Psychology*, 7, 6–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.06.005>
32
33
34 Tybur, J. M., Lieberman, D., Kurzban, R., & DeScioli, P. (2013). Disgust: Evolved function and
35
36 structure. *Psychological Review*, 120, 65–84. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030778>
37
38
39 Urlacher, S. S., Ellison, P. T., Sugiyama, L. S., Pontzer, H., Eick, G., Liebert, M. A., Cepon-
40
41 Robins, T. J., Gildner, T. E., & Snodgrass, J. J. (2018). Tradeoffs between immune
42
43 function and childhood growth among Amazonian forager-horticulturalists. *Proceedings*
44
45 *of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, E3914–E3921.
46
47 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717522115>
48
49
50 U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, Administration for Children and Families,
51
52 Administration on Children, Youth and Families, Children's Bureau. (2021). Child
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Maltreatment 2019. Available from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/report/child->
4
5 [maltreatment-2019](https://www.acf.hhs.gov/cb/report/child-maltreatment-2019).
6
7
8 Van Noordwijk, M. A. (2012). From maternal investment to lifetime maternal care. In J. C.
9
10 Mitani, J. Call, P. M. Kappeler, R. A. Palombit & J. B. Silk (Eds.), *The evolution of*
11
12 *primate societies* (pp. 321–342). University of Chicago Press.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-70319>
15
16
17 Van Schaik, C. P. (2016). *The primate origins of human nature*. John Wiley & Sons.
18
19 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119118206>
20
21
22 Vogt, P., & Mastin, J. D. (2013). Rural and urban differences in language socialization and early
23
24 vocabulary development in Mozambique. In M. Knauf, M. Pauen, M. Sebanz & I.
25
26 Wachsmuth (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science*
27
28 *Society* (pp. 3787–3792). The Cognitive Science Society.
29
30 <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5tn4654w>
31
32
33 Vogt, P., Mastin, J. D., & Schots, D. M. A. (2015). Communicative intentions of child-directed
34
35 speech in three different learning environments: Observations from the Netherlands, and
36
37 rural and urban Mozambique. *First Language*, 35, 341–358.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142723715596647>
40
41
42 Volk, A. A. (2011). Evolution of the history of childhood. *Journal of the History of Childhood*
43
44 *and Youth*, 4, 470–493. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hcy.2011.0042>
45
46
47 Volk, A. A., & Atkinson, J. A. (2013). Infant and child death in the human environment of
48
49 evolutionary adaptation. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34, 182–192.
50
51 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2012.11.007>
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Volk, A. A., Camilleri, J. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2012). Is adolescent bullying an
4
5 evolutionary adaptation? *Aggressive Behavior*, *38*, 222–238.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21418>
8
9
- 10 Volk, T., & Atkinson, J. (2008). Is child death the crucible of human evolution? *Journal of*
11
12 *Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, *2*, 247–260.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0099341>
15
16
- 17 Von Stumm, S., & Latham, R. M. (2018). Early life experiences: Meaningful differences within
18
19 and between families. *Infant Behavior and Development*, *53*, 56–63.
20
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infbeh.2018.09.001>
22
23
- 24 Wakefield, J. C. (1999). Evolutionary versus prototype analyses of the concept of disorder.
25
26 *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *108*, 374–399. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.108.3.374)
27
28 [843X.108.3.374](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843X.108.3.374)
29
30
- 31 Walker, P. L. (2001). A bioarchaeological perspective on the history of violence. *Annual Review*
32
33 *of Anthropology*, *30*, 573–596. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.573>
34
35
- 36 Walker, P. L., Johnson, J. R., & Lambert, P. M. (1988). Age and sex biases in the preservation of
37
38 human skeletal remains. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *76*, 183–188.
39
40 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330760206>
41
42
- 43 Walker, R., Gurven, M., Hill, K., Migliano, A., Chagnon, N., De Souza, R., Djurovic, G.,
44
45 Hames, R., Hurtado, A. M., Kaplan, H., Kramer, K., Oliver, W. J., Valeggia, C., &
46
47 Yamauchi, T. (2006). Growth rates and life histories in twenty-two small-scale societies.
48
49 *American Journal of Human Biology*, *18*, 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.20510>
50
51
- 52 Watson, T. (2018). Prehistoric children as young as eight worked as brickmakers and miners.
53
54 *Nature*, *561*, 445–446. <https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-06747-w>
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Webster, G. D., Graber, J. A., Gesselman, A. N., Crosier, B. S., & Schember, T. O. (2014). A life
4
5 history theory of father absence and menarche: A meta-analysis. *Evolutionary*
6
7 *Psychology*, *12*, 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147470491401200202>
8
9
- 10 Weisdorf, J. L. (2005). From foraging to farming: Explaining the Neolithic Revolution. *Journal*
11
12 *of Economic Surveys*, *19*, 561–586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0950-0804.2005.00259.x>
13
14
- 15 Wells, J. C. K. (2007). Flaws in the theory of predictive adaptive responses. *Trends in*
16
17 *Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *18*, 331–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tem.2007.07.006>
18
19
- 20 Wilmoth, J. R., & Horiuchi, S. (1999). Rectangularization revisited: Variability of age at death
21
22 within human populations. *Demography*, *36*, 475–495. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2648085>
23
24
- 25 Winterhalder, B. (2007). Risk and decision-making. In R. I. M. Dunbar & L. Barrett (Eds.),
26
27 *Oxford handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 433–445). Oxford University Press.
28
29 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198568308.013.0029>
30
- 31 Wismer Fries, A. B., Ziegler, T. E., Kurian, J. R., Jacoris, S., & Pollak, S. D. (2005). Early
32
33 experience in humans is associated with changes in neuropeptides critical for regulating
34
35 social behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *102*, 17237–17240.
36
37 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0504767102>
38
39
- 40 Woods, R. (2007). Ancient and early modern mortality: Experience and understanding.
41
42 *Economic History Review*, *6*, 373–399. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0289.2006.00367.x>
43
44
- 45 Worthington-Roberts, B. S., Vermeersch, J., & Williams, S. R. (1985). *Nutrition in pregnancy*
46
47 *and lactation*. Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.
48
- 49 Wrangham, R., & Peterson, D. (1996). *Demonic males: Apes and the origins of human violence*.
50
51 Houghton Mifflin.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


- 1
2
3 Young, E. S., Frankenhuis, W. E., & Ellis, B. J. (2020). Theory and measurement of
4
5 environmental unpredictability. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *41*, 550-556.
6
7 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.08.006>
8
9
10 Zefferman, M. R., & Mathew, S. (2020). An evolutionary theory of moral injury with insight
11
12 from Turkana warriors. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *41*, 341-353.
13
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2020.07.003>
15
16
17 Zefferman, M. R., & Mathew, S. (2021). Combat stress in a small-scale society suggests
18
19 divergent evolutionary roots for posttraumatic stress disorder symptoms. *Proceedings of*
20
21 *the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*, e2020430118.
22
23 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2020430118>
24
25
26 Zelizer, V. A. (1985). *Pricing the priceless child: The changing social value of children*. Basic
27
28 Books.
29
30
31 Zippel, M. N., Altmann, J., Campos, F. A., Cords, M., Fedigan, L. M., Lawler, R. R., Lonsdorf,
32
33 E. V., Perry, S., Pusey, A. E., Stoinski, T. S., Strier, K. B., & Alberts, S. C. (2021).
34
35 Maternal death and offspring fitness in multiple wild primates. *Proceedings of the*
36
37 *National Academy of Sciences*, *118*, e2015317118.
38
39 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2015317118>
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

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

Development and Psychopathology

High deprivation

Proposed view
higher means
higher variances



variance

mean

Low threat

High threat

mean



variance

Common view
lower means
lower variances

Low deprivation

Early *H. sapiens*
~150kya

present
day



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