



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Note : Masters Theses

The digital copy of a masters thesis is as submitted for examination and contains no corrections. The print copy, usually available in the University Library, may contain corrections made by hand, which have been requested by the supervisor.

**Methodological Issues in the Geochemical Characterisation
and Morphological Analysis of Stone Tools: A Case Study
from Nuku Hiva, Marquesas Islands, East Polynesia**

Andrew Joseph McAlister

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Anthropology, University of Auckland, 2011.

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, three methodological issues pertaining to the geochemical analysis and characterisation of stone tools were investigated. The first consisted of evaluating the potential of Portable X-Ray Fluorescence (PXRF) analysis as a means of characterising archaeological basalt adzes. Several of the methods currently used to analyse stone tools require the partial destruction of specimens and are comparatively expensive, factors which tend to impose limits on the quantity of specimens that can be analysed. In contrast, PXRF technology is relatively inexpensive and non-destructive. The initial testing of the PXRF instrument was unsatisfactory and found the in-built calibration software to be the main limiting factor. Substantially improved results were obtained by processing the raw spectra data independently.

The second part of this study assessed multivariate methods of discriminating among volcanic stone sources. Two techniques, Discriminant Function Analysis (DFA) and Classification Tree (CT) analysis were examined. The implementation of CT analysis developed in this study incorporated Support Vector Machine (SVM) algorithms to determine optimum node divisions. Both of the techniques performed well. However, CT analysis was found to possess several advantages over DFA; it was more robust to unequal and skewed data distributions and the tabular and graphical results were conducive to interpretation and evaluation.

The third part of this research involved applying the methodological findings to investigate the distribution of stone tools on the Marquesan island of Nuku Hiva in East Polynesia. Stone adzes collected from late-prehistoric (i.e., post — A.D. 1600) contexts at four valleys on Nuku Hiva were geochemically and morphologically analysed. The assemblages were found to have derived from six distinct stone sources, five local Nuku Hiva sources and one on Eiao, an island approximately 100 km to the north. Almost one-half of the adzes were imported from Eiao and were common in all of the valleys. In contrast, tools made from local stone were not widely distributed far from their source areas. The morphological analysis found that, while the full range of forms were made from both local and imported materials, stone from Eiao appears to have been preferred for some adze forms that are thought to be functionally distinct.

Keywords: archaeology; Marquesas; Polynesia; interaction; stone tools; geochemistry, PXRF; discriminant function analysis; classification tree; support vector machine

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A great many people were instrumental in bringing this study to completion and I am grateful for the assistance that they have provided. First and foremost, I would like to thank Melinda Allen for inviting me to participate in her research project on Nuku Hiva and giving me the opportunity and inspiration to conduct this study. As my supervisor, Melinda's enthusiasm and seemingly unlimited patience has never wavered, even when suffering through several ill-conceived drafts of these chapters.

Peter Sheppard, my co-supervisor, is also thanked for sharing his extensive knowledge of geology and analytical chemistry and for offering useful feedback on my draft chapters.

The staff and students of the Anthropology Department at the University of Auckland provided much appreciated encouragement and advice, especially Simon Holdaway, Rod Wallace, Roger Green, Bruce Floyd, Geoff Irwin, Tim Mackrell, Jeanette Remeka, Tony Fiske, Alice Storey, Andie Crown, Mara Mulrooney, Jen Huebert and Anneka Anderson.

John Wilmshurst, at the University of Auckland's Geology Department is thanked for instructing me on the preparation of samples for WDXRF analysis and for providing valuable advice on the WDXRF and PXRF instruments that were used in this study.

This research would not have been possible without the ongoing assistance and support of many members of the community at Nuku Hiva. In particular, Moetai Huioutu and Anne Ragu at Taioha'e and Moetai's family at Hatiheu, the Teikiehuupoko family — Mama Tehina, Papa Roger, Panui, Dadou, Sylvia and Keha— have opened their homes to me and treated me like one of the family. I remain deeply indebted to them.

Tuaki and Maia Vaianui have not only provided me with a second home at Anaho for many field seasons, but also, along with Moetai and Tioka, have shared Marquesan music with me. Tehetu and Tioka Puhetini and other members of the Vaianui family — Leo, Teiki, Louise, Coco and David — have also made my work at Anaho a very enjoyable experience.

At Pua Valley, my field work was greatly assisted by the hospitality of the landowners, the Pahuatini family, particularly Mama Marie and Vincent. Iris Tetohu, Patrick Dourlet and Bobi Tetohu are thanked for allowing me to work on their property at Hakaea Valley and for providing hospitality. The Mayors on Nuku Hiva, Yvonne Katupa at Hatiheu and Benoit Kautai at Taioha'e, are also thanked for providing support.

Over the course of several field seasons on Nuku Hiva, a number of friends and colleagues have assisted with the work that is presented here and also engaged me in thought-provoking discussions; they include Melinda Allen, Panui Teikiehuupoko, Moetai Huioutu, Tehetu Puhetini, Tioka Puhetini, Patrick Allen, David Addison, Andie Crown, Jen Huebert, Ella Ussher, Victoria Wichman, Randy Wichman, Pierre Ottino and Paul Niva. In particular, Moetai and Panui have been instrumental to this study, not only by facilitating my own field work but also by making the wider Marquesan community aware of some of the potentials offered by archaeology.

Tamara Maric and Belona Mou at the Service de la Culture et du Patrimoine of the Ministère de la Culture de Polynésie Française have provided invaluable assistance facilitating the field work. Tamara is also thanked for providing reference samples from the Terre Deserte quarry site on Nuku Hiva for analysis.

John Sinton, from, the Department of Geology and Geophysics, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, graciously shared unpublished geochemical data from Eiao, and for this I am grateful. Michel Charleux is also thanked for discussing his work on Eiao with me.

This research was primarily funded by a University of Auckland Doctoral Scholarship. Grants from the University of Auckland, Faculty of Arts Research Fund, the Department of Anthropology and the Royal Society of New Zealand, Skinner Fund provided additional funding for field work and geochemical analysis. This work has also benefited in no small measure from Allen's larger research project in the Marquesas. Ergo Consulting is thanked for providing the use of their printing facilities.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my partner, Carla. This work would not have been possible without her sustained support and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 — INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 The aims of this study	2
1.3 Approaches to identifying interaction in Polynesia	5
Materials	5
Analytical techniques	7
1.4 The structure of this thesis	11

CHAPTER 2 — BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY AREA

2.1 Introduction	14
2.2 Environmental and geological background	15
2.3 Ethnographic background to study area	20
Historical sources	20
Regional variation	23
Social structure	23
Trade	29
Summary	34
2.4 Archaeological background to the study area	34
Settlement Period	38
Developmental Period	38
Expansion Period	39
Classic Period	40
Archaeological evidence of interaction	41
2.5 Summary	42

CHAPTER 3 — FIELD WORK

3.1 Introduction	43
3.2 Approaches to the field work	44
Selection of locations	44
Surface collections	45
Artefact visibility	47
Selection of specimens	48
Sampling methods	49
3.3 Field work	50
Hakaea Valley	50
Pua Valley	55
Anaho Valley	60
Excavated specimens	61
Hatiheu Valley	62
Summary	68
3.4 Reference specimens	68
3.5 Summary	81

CHAPTER 4 — X-RAY FLUORESCENCE METHODS

4.1 Introduction	82
4.2 Wavelength dispersive X-ray fluorescence	83
4.3 Portable energy dispersive X-ray fluorescence	84
Initial testing of the PXRf instrument	88
4.4 X-ray fluorescence principles	95
4.5. Calibration of the PXRf spectra.....	99
Noise reduction.....	102
Normalisation	107
Background continuum estimation	113
Measuring peak intensity	122
Calibration methods.....	128
Summary	137
4.6. Summary	139

CHAPTER 5 — GEOCHEMICAL PROVENANCING METHODS

5.1 Introduction	141
5.2 Previous provenancing methods	142
5.3 Multivariate methods	144
5.4 Discriminant Function Analysis	149
Multivariate normality	150
Homogeneity of variance	151
Multicollinearity	151
Group sample size.....	151
Number of groups	152
Variable selection	152
Probabilities	154
Data transformation	158
Examination of data distributions	162
Summary	171
5.5 Classification Tree analysis.....	171
Archaeological applications of classification tree analysis.....	172
Classification tree implementations.....	173
Advantages and limitations of classification tree analysis.....	174
Bivariate approaches.....	177
Support Vector Machine analysis.....	182
SVM function algorithms.....	185
Variable selection	185
Cost parameter (C).....	188
Unequal sample size	191
Data scaling	191
Multiple classes	191
Validation	193
Summary	194
5.6 Summary	196

CHAPTER 6 — ANALYTICAL APPROACHES TO PROVENANCING

6.1 Introduction	197
6.2 The reference dataset.....	197
Data from geological studies	198
A regional dataset	200
Combining data from different sources.....	204
6.3 Analytical approaches	206
Geographical units of analysis.....	206
Preliminary examination of the data.....	209
6.4 Summary	219

CHAPTER 7 — GEOCHEMICAL PROVENANCING RESULTS

7.1 Introduction	220
7.2 Analysis of the WDXRF dataset.....	220
Analysis at the geographical scale of archipelago	221
Classification Tree analysis	221
Discriminant Function Analysis	240
Principle Components Analysis.....	245
Summary.....	245
Analysis at the geographical scale of island.....	247
Classification Tree analysis	247
Discriminant Function Analysis	251
Analysis within Nuku Hiva	251
7.3 Analysis of the PXRF dataset.....	259
Analysis at the geographical scale of archipelago	259
Classification Tree analysis	259
Discriminant Function Analysis	260
Analysis within the Marquesas Islands.....	270
Classification Tree analysis	271
Discriminant Function Analysis	280
Examination of the specimens assigned to northern Nuku Hiva.....	295
Summary	296
7.4 Discussion.....	298
Comparison of results	298
Confounding factors.....	301
Missing data.....	301
Absent sources	303
Sample size	303
7.5 Summary	304

CHAPTER 8 — MORPHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

8.1 Introduction	307
8.2 Approaches to artefact analysis	308
Attributes and attribute states	311
Summary	313
8.3. Nomenclature.....	313
8.4 Review of Marquesan adze studies.....	317

Summary	334
8.5. Descriptions of the specimen attributes	336
8.6 Analysis of the sample	341
Analysis of cross-section shape	344
Estimation of complete artefact size	345
Examination of the Bevel Attributes.....	350
Bevel angle	350
Cutting edge width.....	356
Cutting edge curvature.....	357
Examination of the triangular specimens	362
Examination of other cross-section shapes	371
Summary	377
8.7 Summary	382
 CHAPTER 9 — ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS	
9.1 Introduction	383
9.2 Spatial distributions.....	384
9.3 Morphological analysis	393
Manufacturing stage.....	393
Adze form.....	396
Adze size	400
Summary	403
9.4 Excavated specimens	408
9.5 Discussion.....	410
 CHAPTER 10 — CONCLUSIONS	
10.1 Introduction	417
10.2 Evaluation of the PXRf analysis	419
10.3 Source discrimination methods.....	422
Discriminant Function Analysis	423
Classification Tree analysis.....	424
Summary	426
10.4 Discussion of the substantive results	427
10.5 Suggestions for future research.....	431
 APPENDIX 1 — WDXRF GEOCHEMICAL DATA.....	
	433
 APPENDIX 2 — PXRf GEOCHEMICAL DATA	
	445
 REFERENCES.....	
	457

LIST OF FIGURES

2.1. Map of the Pacific Ocean showing the position of the Marquesas Islands.....	16
2.2. Map of the Marquesas Islands.....	17
2.3. Geological map of Nuku Hiva.....	19
2.4. Map of Nuku Hiva showing the localities discussed in the text.....	22
2.5. Comparison of temporal sequences for Marquesan prehistory.	36
3.1. Map of the Hakaea survey area.	52
3.2. Map of the Pua survey area.	57
3.3. Map of the Anaho survey area.....	63
3.4. Typical stratigraphic profile from excavations at the Teavau‘ua coastal flat	64
3.5. Map of Nuku Hiva showing the locations of the reference specimens.....	70
3.6. Outcrop of dyke-stone near Structure 92.	73
4.1. Innov-X Alpha 4000 series PXRF analyser mounted in test stand.	87
4.2. Comparison of EDXRF reported values to WDXRF values after calibration.	90
4.3. Comparison of EDXRF reported values to WDXRF values after calibration using fusion discs.	94
4.4. The principles of X-ray fluorescence.....	96
4.5. The principle components of an EDXRF X-ray spectrum.....	97
4.6. PXRF spectra of a typical of basalt, produced by the Innov-X analyser	100
4.7. Example of moving average smoothing applied to a Sr K_{α} peak.	103
4.8. Example of 9-point polynomial smoothing on a single point of a Sr K_{α} peak... ..	104
4.9. The effect of moving average and 2nd order polynomial smoothing using different numbers of points.	106
4.10. Linear regressions for Sr K_{α} height: a) raw peak heights; b) normalised to Compton peak scattering of Ag K_{α} line.	112
4.11. Linear interpolation of background. B_L and B_R are portions of background either side of the peak of interest.	114
4.12. Examples of 3rd, 4th and 6th order polynomial background fitting.....	115
4.13. Comparison of peak stripping methods due to Clayton et al. (1987) and Van Espen (2002).	119
4.14. Linear regressions based on peak heights using different methods of background estimation	120
4.15. Example of fitting a Gaussian over a peak.....	124
4.16. Linear regressions for Sr using normalised peak height (left), integrated peak area calculation (middle), and fitted Gaussian peak area (right).	126
4.17. Linear regressions for K, Ca and Ti.....	127
4.18. Linear regressions for K, Ca, Ti and Fe.....	132
4.19. Linear regressions for Cr, Mn, Ni, Cu and Zn.....	133
4.20. Linear regressions for Rb, Sr, Zr and Nb.	136
5.1. Plot of P_2O_5 versus $\log_{10}(Ti_2O/Fe_2O_3)$ for: a) reference samples, and b) archaeological specimens.	143
5.2. Example of a pentagonal scatterplot used to display five variables simultaneously	146
5.3. Example of the method used to partition groups in DFA	157
5.4. Example showing the effect of logarithmic transformation.....	159
5.5. Example of a classification tree generated using SYSTAT’s expanded mode. .	178
5.6. Examples of bivariate node splitting procedures.....	180

5.7. Examples of the division of bivariate feature space into quadrants.	187
5.8. Examples of SVM models using different values for the cost parameter.....	190
6.1. Silica versus total alkali plots: a) shows reference samples by archipelago; b) shows reference samples in grey and archaeological samples in red.	211
6.2. Scatterplots of: a) CaO versus Al ₂ O ₃ and, b) TiO ₂ versus P ₂ O ₅	214
7.1. Scatterplots of the two highest-scoring paired variables for the first node split (Node 1).....	223
7.2. Scatterplots of SiO ₂ against K ₂ O showing the results of SVM analysis.....	224
7.3. Scatterplots of the two highest-scoring paired variables for the second node split (Node 3).....	228
7.4. Scatterplot of SiO ₂ against CaO showing the results of SVM division of Node 3 onto Nodes 4 and 5	229
7.5. Scatterplots of the two highest-scoring paired variables for the third node split (Node 5).....	231
7.6. Scatterplots showing the results of SVM division of Node 5 into Nodes 6 and 7:	233
7.7. Scatterplots of the two highest-scoring paired variables for the fourth node split (Node 7).....	235
7.8. Scatterplots showing the results of SVM division of Node 7 into Nodes 8 and 9.	236
7.9. Alternative bivariate split for Nodes 8 and 9 in Figure 7.8.....	237
7.10. Classification tree for the WDXRF dataset at a geographical scale of archipelago	238
7.11. Bivariate plots for the node splits for the classification tree shown in Figure 7.10.....	239
7.12. Scatterplots of the first three discriminant scores of the WDXRF dataset grouped at the geographical scale of archipelago.....	244
7.13. Scatterplots of the factor scores of principle components analysis of the WDXRF dataset grouped at the geographical scale of archipelago	246
7.14. Classification tree for the WDXRF dataset at a geographical scale of island.	248
7.15. Bivariate plots for the node splits for the classification tree shown in Figure 7.14.....	249
7.16. Scatterplot of alternative variables for separating samples from Nuku Hiva and Eiao.....	250
7.17. Scatterplots of the first two discriminant scores of the WDXRF dataset grouped at the geographical scale of island.....	253
7.18. Scatterplots of the elements used to demonstrate the separation of Eiao in previous Marquesan provenancing studies	254
7.19. Scatterplots of the reference data and archaeological samples assigned to Nuku Hiva.	257
7.20. Factor scores from principle components analysis of reference data and archaeological samples assigned to Nuku Hiva.....	258
7.21. Classification tree for the PXRF dataset at a geographical scale of archipelago.	261
7.22. Bivariate scatterplots for the node splits for the classification tree shown in Figure 7.21.....	262
7.23. Scatterplot of the variables used to separate Nodes 4 and 5 in Figure 7.22, using log ₁₀ -transformed values for Ni.....	263

7.24. Scatterplot of the first two discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset	267
7.25. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset after the removal of the Samoan data.....	269
7.26. Classification tree for PXRf dataset within the Marquesas Islands.....	272
7.27. Bivariate scatterplots for the node splits for the classification tree shown in Figure 7.26.....	273
7.28. Scatterplots of alternative variable pairs for splitting Node 3 into Nodes 6 and 7 in classification tree shown in Figure 7.26.....	276
7.29. Scatterplots of alternative variable pairs for splitting Node 7 into Nodes 12 and 13 in classification tree shown in Figure 7.26.....	277
7.30. Scatterplots of alternative method of splitting Node 13 into Nodes 16 and 17 in classification tree shown in Figure 7.26.....	279
7.31. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset at a geographical scale of island	282
7.32. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset separating Eiao and Nuku Hiva	285
7.33. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions shown in Figure 7.32 using SVM divisions	287
7.34. Scatterplots showing the separation of the archaeological specimens.....	288
7.35. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset within Nuku Hiva	291
7.36. Scatterplots of the discriminant functions from the DFA analysis of the PXRf dataset within northern Nuku Hiva	294
7.37. Scatterplots of a) Zr and $\log_{10}(\text{Cr})$ showing the archaeological specimens assigned to north-east Nuku Hiva, and b) the first two principle components of PCA analysis for the same dataset.....	297
8.1. Terminology commonly used for Polynesian adzes	315
8.2. Common adze cross-section forms	316
8.3. Histogram of front-to-back shoulder width ratios, showing Emory's (1968) division points.....	346
8.4. Kernel density estimates using same data as Figure 8.3.	347
8.5. Front to back shoulder width ratios (after Emory 1968) plotted against shoulder thickness and shoulder index.....	348
8.6. Ratios of front to back shoulder width ratios plotted against shoulder thickness showing a division into three categories.....	349
8.7. Scatterplot showing the relationship between weight and cross-section area for complete adzes and preforms.....	351
8.8. Scatterplot showing the relationship between bevel angle and shoulder index for adzes and preforms with distinct bevels.....	355
8.9. Scatterplots of a) shoulder thickness against cutting edge width (mm), and b) shoulder index against the ratio of cutting edge width to shoulder width. ..	358
8.10. Illustration of the methodology used to construct an index of cutting edge convexity.	363
8.11. Examples of cutting edge convexity for specimens with complete cutting edges	364
8.12. Histograms and KDE's showing distributions of attributes measurable in the majority of triangular-sectioned specimens.....	366
8.13. Scatterplots showing bivariate relationships between the four attributes measurable in the majority of triangular-sectioned artefacts	367

8.14. Bivariate KDE contours for the pairwise combinations of the four attributes measurable in the majority of triangular-sectioned artefacts	368
8.15. Scatterplots showing bivariate relationships between the four attributes measurable in the majority of triangular-sectioned artefacts	369
8.16. Bivariate KDE contours for the pairwise combinations of the four attributes measurable in the majority of triangular-sectioned artefacts.	370
8.17. Scatterplots showing bivariate relationships between the four attributes measurable in the majority of non-triangular artefacts	373
8.18. Bivariate KDE contours for the pairwise combinations of the four attributes measurable in the majority of non-triangular	374
8.19. Scatterplots of, a) cross-section area against shoulder index for the non-triangular artefacts, and b) shoulder width ratio against cross-section area for the quadrangular and reversed-triangular artefacts	376
8.20. Examples of the adze groups identified in this study.	378
9.1. Examples of fall-off curves.	388
9.2. Relative proportions of total stone sources represented at each valley.....	391
9.3. Relative proportions of Nuku Hiva stone sources represented at each valley ...	392
9.4. Examples of petrographic thin-sections from adze specimens assigned to Nuku Hiva and Eiao.....	399
9.5. Boxplots showing comparative size differences between archaeological specimens assigned to Nuku Hiva and Eiao.....	406

LIST OF TABLES

2.1. List of historically-documented items circulated in the Marquesan Islands.	32
3.1. Summary of the surface structures at Hakaea.	53
3.2. Summary of the surface-collected archaeological specimens from Hakaea.	54
3.3. Summary of the surface structures at Pua.	58
3.4. Summary of the surface-collected archaeological specimens from Pua.	59
3.5. Summary of the structures associated with the surface-collected archaeological specimens from Anaho Valley.	65
3.6. Summary of surface-collected archaeological specimens from Anaho.	66
3.7. Summary of excavated archaeological specimens from Anaho Valley.	67
3.8. List of Marquesan reference samples used in this analysis.	71
3.9. List of reference samples used to characterise Eiao.	80
4.1. Detection, determination and quantitation limits for WDXRF analysis on fusion discs using 2 g samples.	84
4.2. Correlation coefficients for whole rock and fusion discs.	93
4.3. Summary data for calibration test specimens.	110
4.4. Correlation coefficients for linear regressions based on raw peak heights and peak heights normalised to Compton peak scattering of the Ag K α line.	111
4.5. Correlation coefficients and error estimates for PXRf linear regressions.	134
5.1. Summary of average group univariate skewness (RMSskew) by element for raw data and selected transformations.	164
5.2. Statistics and <i>p</i> -values for Small's Q1 and Srivastava's bp1 tests for multivariate skewness by archipelago, using raw data and selected transformations.	166
5.3. Levene's statistic for equality of variances (W) using raw data and selected transformations.	167
5.4. Summary of correlations between group means and variances by element for raw data and selected transformations.	168
5.5. Classification results for raw, log ₁₀ transformed and Box-Cox transformed data.	170
6.1. List of geological reference specimens included in this study.	203
6.2. Summary data of major element concentrations (wt%) and distributions for archaeological and geological specimens used in this study.	215
6.3. Summary of the reference datasets after the removal of cases with extreme values.	216
6.4. Means and standard deviations for major element concentrations (wt%) of reference samples after the removal of cases with extreme values.	217
6.5. Geochemical concentrations of two distinctive archaeological specimens compared to averages for similar geological reference samples.	218
7.1. Approximate <i>p</i> -values for paired variables used to determine first node split (<i>n</i> =432)	221
7.2. Comparison of misclassifications and cases within the margin for SVM analysis of the three most promising source groupings.	225
7.3. Approximate <i>p</i> -values for paired variables used to determine second node split (<i>n</i> = 402)	227
7.4. Approximate <i>p</i> -values for paired variables used to determine third node split (<i>n</i> =382)	230
7.5. Approximate <i>p</i> -values for paired variables used to determine fourth node split (<i>n</i> =127)	234

7.6. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating at the geographical scale of archipelago using the WDXRF dataset.	242
7.7. Conditional probabilities, posterior probabilities and squared Mahalanobis distance for archaeological samples and the misclassified reference sample. .	243
7.8. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating at the geographical scale of island using the WDXRF dataset.	252
7.9. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating at the geographical scale of archipelago using the PXRF dataset.....	266
7.10. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating at the geographical scale of archipelago using the PXRF dataset after the removal of the Samoan samples.....	268
7.11. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating at the geographical scale of island using the PXRF dataset.	281
7.12. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating between Eiao and Nuku Hiva using the PXRF dataset.	284
7.13. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating within Nuku Hiva using the PXRF dataset.	290
7.14. Summary statistics and results of DFA, discriminating within north coast of Nuku Hiva using the PXRF dataset.	293
7.15. Comparison of source assignments for the archaeological specimens common to both datasets.	299
7.16. Summary of source assignments for the WDXRF and PXRF datasets.	302
8.1. Frequency distributions of Suggs' adze types.	323
8.2. Emory and Sinoto's (1964) adze typology for the Maupiti assemblage.....	329
8.3. Emory's (1968) cross-section shape criteria.	331
8.4. Summary of the metric attributes measured in this study.	338
8.5. Summary statistics for correlations between weight (g) and shoulder cross-section area (cm ²) for complete adzes and preforms.	352
8.6. Means and ranges for bevel angle measurements, separated by artefact class and cross-section shape.	353
8.7. Means, medians and ranges for cutting edge width, and cutting edge width to shoulder width ratio, separated by cross-section shape.	359
8.8. Results of two-group t-tests for artifacts with complete cutting edges separated by cross-section shape.	360
8.9. Means and ranges for selected attributes separated by cross-section shape.	372
8.10. Means and ranges for selected attributes separated by morphological group.	379
9.1. Counts, percentages and rank orders for the archaeological specimens, by source.....	385
9.2. Counts and percentages of blanks, adzes and preforms, separated by source and valley.	395
9.3. Counts, percentages and rank orders of archaeological specimens by source and morphological group	398
9.4. Summary metric data for archaeological specimens assigned to Eiao and Nuku Hiva.	401
9.5. Results of t-tests for equalities of means between Group A and Group B1 archaeological specimens assigned to Eiao and Nuku Hiva.	404
9.6. Results of Mann-Whitney tests for independent samples between archaeological specimens assigned to Eiao and Nuku Hiva.	405
9.7. Summary metric data for length-to-width and length-to-thickness ratios for complete archaeological specimens assigned to Eiao and Nuku Hiva.	407

9.8. Summary of the excavated archaeological specimens from Anaho
excluded from the distributional analyses. 409