

CROSSTABS

```

/TABLES=V2.1 BY V4.1 V4.2 V4.3 V4.4 V5.6 V5.7 V5.19 V5.20 V5.21 V5.22 V5.23
V5.24 V5.25 V5.26
/FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES
/STATISTICS=CHISQ
/CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW
/COUNT ROUND CELL.

```

Crosstabs

Notes

Output Created		15-MAR-2016 11:07:05
Comments		
Input	Data	\\elda\anthropology\peregrip\My Documents\PETER\In Progress\SFI\ag_workinggroup\agriculture_plus.sav
	Active Dataset	DataSet1
	Filter	<none>
	Weight	<none>
	Split File	<none>
	N of Rows in Working Data File	18
Missing Value Handling	Definition of Missing	User-defined missing values are treated as missing.
	Cases Used	Statistics for each table are based on all the cases with valid data in the specified range(s) for all variables in each table.
Syntax		CROSSTABS /TABLES=V2.1 BY V4.1 V4.2 V4.3 V4.4 V5.6 V5.7 V5.19 V5.20 V5.21 V5.22 V5.23 V5.24 V5.25 V5.26 /FORMAT=AVALUE TABLES /STATISTICS=CHISQ /CELLS=COUNT EXPECTED ROW...
Resources	Processor Time	00:00:00.03
	Elapsed Time	00:00:00.03
	Dimensions Requested	2
	Cells Available	524245

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Population density	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Community size	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Number of communities	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Catchment area	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Intra-community violence	16	88.9%	2	11.1%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Inter-community violence	17	94.4%	1	5.6%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Specialization of tasks	18	100.0%	0	0.0%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Informal social control mechanisms	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Genetic social control mechanisms	6	33.3%	12	66.7%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Communal social control mechanisms	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Authoritarian social control mechanisms	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Traditional coordination of labor	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Genetic coordination of labor	3	16.7%	15	83.3%	18	100.0%
Degree of dependence on domesticates * Authoritarian coordination of labor	15	83.3%	3	16.7%	18	100.0%

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Population density

Crosstab

			Population density		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	2	3	5
		Expected Count	1.1	3.9	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
34 to 67%	Count	1	7	8	
	Expected Count	1.8	6.2	8.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%	
68 to 100%	Count	1	4	5	
	Expected Count	1.1	3.9	5.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	
Total	Count	4	14	18	
	Expected Count	4.0	14.0	18.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	22.2%	77.8%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.366 ^a	2	.505
Likelihood Ratio	1.307	2	.520
Linear-by-Linear Association	.546	1	.460
N of Valid Cases	18		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.11.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Community size

Crosstab

			Community size		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	2	3	5
		Expected Count	1.4	3.6	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	1	7	8
		Expected Count	2.2	5.8	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	2	3	5
		Expected Count	1.4	3.6	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	5	13	18	
	Expected Count	5.0	13.0	18.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	27.8%	72.2%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.675 ^a	2	.433
Likelihood Ratio	1.782	2	.410
Linear-by-Linear Association	.000	1	1.000
N of Valid Cases	18		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.39.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Number of communities

Crosstab

			Number of communities			Total
			declines	stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	0	3	2	5
		Expected Count	.3	1.7	3.1	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	0	1	7	8
		Expected Count	.4	2.7	4.9	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	1	2	2	5
		Expected Count	.3	1.7	3.1	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	1	6	11	18	
	Expected Count	1.0	6.0	11.0	18.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	5.6%	33.3%	61.1%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.416 ^a	4	.170
Likelihood Ratio	6.491	4	.165
Linear-by-Linear Association	.264	1	.608
N of Valid Cases	18		

a. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Catchment area

Crosstab

			Catchment area		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	1	1	2
		Expected Count	.3	1.7	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	0	8	8
		Expected Count	1.1	6.9	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	1	4	5
		Expected Count	.7	4.3	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	2	13	15	
	Expected Count	2.0	13.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.750 ^a	2	.153
Likelihood Ratio	4.004	2	.135
Linear-by-Linear Association	.202	1	.653
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .27.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Intra-community violence

Crosstab

			Intra-community violence		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	2	1	3
		Expected Count	1.3	1.7	3.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	2	6	8
		Expected Count	3.5	4.5	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	3	2	5
		Expected Count	2.2	2.8	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	7	9	16	
	Expected Count	7.0	9.0	16.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	43.8%	56.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.320 ^a	2	.314
Likelihood Ratio	2.383	2	.304
Linear-by-Linear Association	.008	1	.930
N of Valid Cases	16		

a. 6 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.31.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Inter-community violence

Crosstab

			Inter-community violence			Total
			declines	stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	0	3	1	4
		Expected Count	.2	2.1	1.6	4.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	75.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	0	4	4	8
		Expected Count	.5	4.2	3.3	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	1	2	2	5
		Expected Count	.3	2.6	2.1	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	1	9	7	17	
	Expected Count	1.0	9.0	7.0	17.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	5.9%	52.9%	41.2%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.346 ^a	4	.502
Likelihood Ratio	3.398	4	.494
Linear-by-Linear Association	.038	1	.846
N of Valid Cases	17		

a. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Specialization of tasks

Crosstab

			Specialization of tasks		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	4	1	5
		Expected Count	1.9	3.1	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	80.0%	20.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	2	6	8
		Expected Count	3.1	4.9	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	1	4	5
		Expected Count	1.9	3.1	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	7	11	18	
	Expected Count	7.0	11.0	18.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	38.9%	61.1%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.956 ^a	2	.084
Likelihood Ratio	5.052	2	.080
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.577	1	.059
N of Valid Cases	18		

a. 6 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.94.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Informal social control mechanisms

Crosstab

			Informal social control mechanisms		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	3	2	5
		Expected Count	1.0	4.0	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	0	8	8
		Expected Count	1.6	6.4	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	0	2	2
		Expected Count	.4	1.6	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	3	12	15	
	Expected Count	3.0	12.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.500 ^a	2	.024
Likelihood Ratio	8.282	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.250	1	.022
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Genetic social control mechanisms

Crosstab

			Genetic social control mechanisms		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	34 to 67%	Count	3	0	3
		Expected Count	2.5	.5	3.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.5	.5	3.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	5	1	6
		Expected Count	5.0	1.0	6.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	83.3%	16.7%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	1.200 ^a	1	.273		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	1.588	1	.208		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.500
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.000	1	.317		
N of Valid Cases	6				

a. 4 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .50.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Communal social control mechanisms

Crosstab

			Communal social control mechanisms			Total
			declines	stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	0	3	2	5
		Expected Count	1.0	2.3	1.7	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	2	4	2	8
		Expected Count	1.6	3.7	2.7	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	1	0	1	2
		Expected Count	.4	.9	.7	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	3	7	5	15	
	Expected Count	3.0	7.0	5.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	46.7%	33.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	3.543 ^a	4	.471
Likelihood Ratio	5.174	4	.270
Linear-by-Linear Association	.724	1	.395
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 9 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Authoritarian social control mechanisms

Crosstab

			Authoritarian social control mechanisms		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	5	0	5
		Expected Count	2.0	3.0	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	1	7	8
		Expected Count	3.2	4.8	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	12.5%	87.5%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	0	2	2
		Expected Count	.8	1.2	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	6	9	15	
	Expected Count	6.0	9.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	40.0%	60.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	11.354 ^a	2	.003
Likelihood Ratio	14.162	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.774	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 6 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Traditional coordination of labor

Crosstab

			Traditional coordination of labor		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	3	2	5
		Expected Count	1.0	4.0	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	0	8	8
		Expected Count	1.6	6.4	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	0	2	2
		Expected Count	.4	1.6	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	3	12	15	
	Expected Count	3.0	12.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	20.0%	80.0%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	7.500 ^a	2	.024
Likelihood Ratio	8.282	2	.016
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.250	1	.022
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 5 cells (83.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Genetic coordination of labor

Crosstab

			Genetic coordination of labor		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	68 to 100%	Count	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.0	1.0	3.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	2	1	3
		Expected Count	2.0	1.0	3.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	66.7%	33.3%	100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value
Pearson Chi-Square	. ^a
N of Valid Cases	3

a. No statistics are computed because Degree of dependence on domesticates is a constant.

Degree of dependence on domesticates * Authoritarian coordination of labor

Crosstab

			Authoritarian coordination of labor		Total
			stable	increases	
Degree of dependence on domesticates	0 to 33%	Count	5	0	5
		Expected Count	2.3	2.7	5.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
	34 to 67%	Count	2	6	8
		Expected Count	3.7	4.3	8.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
	68 to 100%	Count	0	2	2
		Expected Count	.9	1.1	2.0
		% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	7	8	15	
	Expected Count	7.0	8.0	15.0	
	% within Degree of dependence on domesticates	46.7%	53.3%	100.0%	

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	8.973 ^a	2	.011
Likelihood Ratio	11.730	2	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.594	1	.006
N of Valid Cases	15		

a. 6 cells (100.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .93.