Names 40.1 (March 1992)

The Distinctive Hispanic Names (DHN) Technique: A Method for Selecting a Sample or Estimating Population Size

Abraham D. Lavender

Abstract

To address the problem of determining total numbers of a population from a limited sampling, I derived a Distinctive Hispanic Names (DHN) Technique, based on 8,455 United States voters born in Spanish-speaking countries (and Puerto Rico) and classified as Hispanic. I offer suggestions of how many surnames and which surnames to use, and how to adjust the DHN list for Hispanic communities of diverse nationality background. The DHN technique allows an estimate of the total number of Hispanic voters in Miami Beach, Florida, including United States-born Hispanics.

*****

The use of ethnic surnames to select samples of a specific ethnic group, or to estimate the population size of a specific ethnic group, has a long but uneven development in social research.[1] In recent decades, the use of surnames has been of particular importance to small ethnic groups for which a relatively inexpensive but generally efficient method is needed. Jewish communities in a number of cities, without census data to utilize and usually too small to be analyzed separately in general studies, have been a major source of surnames for research purposes and have contributed most to a short distinctive names technique. The DJN (Distinctive Jewish Names) technique was first developed in 1942 by Samuel C. Kohs, who found that 106 surnames accounted for about 16 percent of the Jewish population, but that 35 names accounted for about 12 percent. Because the use of more surnames increases the chance of error from introducing non-Jewish names (or names which include a significant number of non-Jews), most researchers have limited themselves to a list of about 35 names. Different researchers have varied the specific list of names and the number of names, but a strong similarity has existed between most lists (Himmelfarb et al. 249). Studies over several decades have consistently found their lists of 35 names to account for about 12 per cent of the community (Massarik 175). Generally, it has been assumed

that about 90 percent of the people with these 35 names are Jewish, and a correction factor has been used based on this assumption. Recent research by Ira Rosenwaike has made a major improvement to the DJN technique by illustrating that the 90 percent assumption is too high, and by allowing more exact estimates to be used for specific surnames ("Leading Surnames" 31). Rosenwaike's research suggests that a list of 17 surnames which are documented to be held by Jews about 90 percent of the time, and which represent almost 7 percent of the Jewish community, is more accurate than the larger but less Jewish traditional 35-name lists ("Leading Surnames" 35).[2]

Eui-Hang Shin and Eui-Young Yu developed a distinctive surname technique for Korean Americans (347). While a few researchers (e.g., Waters 303) have suggested that surnames are becoming less accurate for classifying ethnic ancestry, a number of other researchers (e.g., Serrie) of various ethnic groups have shown that surnames can be used to obtain samples if the researcher is knowledgeable of the group being studied and can make methodological adjustments. If the purpose is to estimate population size from telephone listings, for example, the researcher must adjust for nonlistings and family size (e.g., Shin and Yu 352; Ritterband and Cohen 41). Harold S. Himmelfarb and his colleagues conclude that "there is impressionistic evidence that name lists of Greek-Americans, Chinese-Americans, and Korean-Americans would be even more efficient than the name lists developed for use in research on Jews" (257).

Hispanics are the other major subjects of distinctive surnames research. In 1950 the United States Bureau of the Census first used a "List of Spanish Surnames" containing 8,000 Spanish surnames to make a special count of Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and California. The Spanish surnames list, periodically updated, now contains 12,497 names. In 1961, Robert W. Buechley published a list of 306 distinctive Spanish surnames which he suggested for consistency in coding ("Reproducible" 95). In two other articles, in 1967 and in 1971, Buechley improved his work by showing how some Spanish names varied in frequency in different localities, and suggested that adjustments might be necessary in different localities. Other researchers have estimated that about 84.1 percent of Mexicans, 72.5 percent of Cubans, 59.9 percent of Puerto Ricans, 68.4 percent of "other Spanish" (largely Hispanos), and 47.9 percent of Central and South Americans have Spanish surnames (Jaffe et al. 340).

A number of researchers[3] have used Hispanic surnames to obtain samples for various purposes. But these studies have used a large list similar to the Census' "List of Spanish Surnames" to select people for samples, or they have relied on a researcher's experience to classify

individuals as Hispanic or non-Hispanic. A short list of distinctive Hispanic surnames, a **Distinctive Hispanic Names (DHN)** technique, has not been developed. There is need for the development of such a short list, which, if reliable, saves money and time. A short list of surnames agreed upon as distinctive Hispanic surnames can allow comparisons between different community studies better than studies based on individual classifications in different communities. In addition, Hispanic communities in the United States are increasingly diverse in their origins, necessitating a list of surnames which accurately represents the diversity of Hispanic subcommunities in the specific Hispanic community. In addition, national studies or studies which cover more than one community need to consider the nationality background of different Hispanic communities.

This article attempts to further the feasibility of using Hispanic surnames by (1) developing a Distinctive Hispanic Names (DHN) technique which can use a shorter list of Hispanic surnames than generally used, (2) illustrating how the DHN technique can be adjusted to represent a diverse Hispanic community, and (3) demonstrating how a sample obtained with the DHN technique can be used to estimate a larger population of Hispanics.[4]

Two major questions relating to the use of surnames for sampling or population estimates are (1) how many surnames to use and (2) which surnames to use. Richard D. Woods used one Hispanic surname—*Martinez*—to obtain a representative listing of Mexican-American given names in the southwestern United States (xv). Stanley Waterman and Barry Kosmin used one Jewish name—*Cohen*—to study the Jewish community in London (62), and Shin and Yu used one Korean surname—*Kim*—to estimate the Korean American population (350). On the other end of the numerical continuum, as we have seen, the U.S. Census Bureau uses its list of 12,497 Hispanic surnames, and Ira M. Sheskin used 1,230 Jewish names in a Jewish demographic study (38).

There are thus no clear rules in deciding how many surnames to use. However, either "too few" surnames or "too many" surnames can present problems in research. One surname or a few surnames can give a very small percentage of an ethnic group, thus increasing the likelihood of chance variation. *Martinez* represents only about three percent or less of the Hispanic community, but Woods' sample consisted of 18,000 people named Martinez, from baptismal records of thirty South Texas counties covering 133 years. The use of *Martinez* probably was sufficient for Woods' purpose (obtaining a sample of Mexican-American given names) but could raise problems with smaller samples and for more complex purposes such

as predicting population size. *Cohen* represents only about two percent of the Jewish community, and presents similar problems of chance variation. On the other hand, one surname, if it accounts for a sizable percentage of the group, can give a representative sample for the ethnic group if the surname is represented randomly in different regional and demographic segments of the ethnic group. Shin and Yu showed that Kim represented 22 percent of all Korean Americans, and they analyzed several variables to indicate that this one surname was randomly distributed on important demographic variables in the Korean American community (350). Knowledge of the ethnic group, or the country from which the group originated, could suggest that more than one surname be used to increase randomness. In general, using one surname when that one surname accounts for a small percentage of the ethnic group is inadvisable for estimating population size, and for some sampling, depending on the purpose of the sample.

Using a large number of surnames can also present problems in research, for two reasons. A large number of surnames can increase cost and the amount of work involved, an important factor in many research projects. If a short list of surnames can give equally reliable results, then it is preferable for time and cost effectiveness. More important methodologically, using a large number of names can increase another problem – the unknown extent to which supposedly distinct ethnic names are held by people not part of the specific ethnic group. For some ethnic groups with one major linguistic background, for example, Koreans, Greeks, or Hispanics, this is not a serious problem. But, especially for ethnic groups with multiple linguistic backgrounds, it can be a serious problem. As noted, Rosenwaike's research on the DJN technique suggests that about 24 percent of the people obtained by using 35 supposedly-distinct Jewish names are not Jewish. For example, even *Cohen*, the quintessential Jewish surname, is held by a non-Jewish person about 8.5% of the time. Rosenwaike found 46 percent of the people named *Schwartz*, 61 percent of the people named *Weiss*, and 77 percent of the people named *Gross* (names generally used on DJN lists) to be non-Jewish.[5] These statistics allow for a correction to be made for estimating population size, but there is no correction factor when using the list for sampling. For large samples of Jewish surnames such as that used by Sheskin (1,230 surnames) the distortion factor is unknown, possibly introducing a major bias.

The development of a DHN technique is facilitated by the fact that a short list of Hispanic surnames can account for a significant sample size. In most Hispanic communities, there are five Hispanic surnames that together account for slightly over 10 percent of the Hispanic community.

Ten surnames usually account for about 20 percent of the total. There also is a high overlap among most Hispanic communities in the most frequently used surnames. Table 1 shows the rankings of the ten most frequent surnames for a number of different Hispanic communities. The United States list is based on Social Security listings (Smith 301ff). The California list is based on Buechley ("Spanish Surnames"). The Miami 1969 list, using local telephone listings, is basically a Cuban-origin list because the Miami (Dade County) Hispanic population was estimated to be 87.3 percent Cuban in 1969 (Salter and Mings 130). The Miami Beach list is the 1990 registered voters list, and the other lists are from recent telephone books. If one compares the ten most frequently used Hispanic surnames in any two Hispanic communities, there generally is an overlap of about seven surnames.[6]

When deciding which names to use, it is clear that names should be used which are found nearly always in the ethnic group being studied. As

Table 1. Most frequently listed Hispanic surnames in selected areas.

	U.S.A.	California	Mexico City	Buenos Aires	Bogota
1.	Rodriguez	Garcia	Hernandez	Fernandez	Rodriguez
2.	Garcia	Martinez	Garcia	Rodriguez	Gonzalez
3.	Gonzalez	Gonzalez	Gonzalez	Garcia	Gomez
4.	Lopez	Lopez	Martinez	Gonzalez	Martinez
5.	Rivera	Hernandez	Lopez	Lopez	Sanchez
6.	Martinez	Rodriguez	Sanchez	Martinez	Garcia
7.	Hernandez	Sanchez	Rodriguez	Perez	Ramirez
8.	Perez	Perez	Perez	Alvarez	Hernandez
9.	Sanchez	Ramirez	Ramirez	Sanchez	Moreno
10.	Torres	Flores	Flores	Gomez	Lopez

	Madrid	San Juan	Miami–1969	Miami–1990	Miami Beach
1.	Garcia	Rivera	Rodriguez	Rodriguez	Rodriguez
2.	Fernandez	Rodriguez	Gonzalez	Gonzalez	Gonzalez
3.	Gonzalez	Vasquez	Garcia	Garcia	Garcia
4.	Lopez	Gonzalez	Perez	Perez	Perez
5.	Sanchez	Torres	Fernandez	Hernandez	Hernandez
6.	Rodriguez	Perez	Martinez	Fernandez	Lopez
7.	Martin	Ortiz	Hernandez	Martinez	Fernandez
8.	Martinez	Hernandez	Lopez	Lopez	Martinez
9.	Perez	Lopez	Diaz	Diaz	Diaz
10.	Gomez	Diaz	Alvarez	Sanchez	Alvarez

noted, for some nationality or linguistic groups, this goal generally is attainable easily. Shin and Yu, for example, did not use the second and third most frequent Korean surnames – *Lee* and *Park* – because these surnames are not unique to Koreans (348), but did use *Kim* because it is almost totally unique to Koreans. For groups such as Jews which have diverse linguistic origins for surnames (e.g., German, Russian, Polish, Spanish, Arabic, Hebrew, English) the problems require more adjustments. Rosenwaike notes the "striking variation among the surnames of Jews that undoubtedly exists from country to country" ("Leading Surnames" 36). Names used also should be common enough within their group to add sizable numbers to the sample. As noted, one surname accounts for over 20 percent of all Korean Americans, but for American Jews about 35 surnames are necessary to obtain about 12 percent.

The development of a DHN list is also facilitated by the fact that nearly all of the most frequently used Hispanic surnames are used almost exclusively by Hispanics. The few surname exceptions, such as *Martin*, a Hispanic surname shared by many non-Hispanics, can easily be eliminated from samples. While an empirical analysis has not been conducted to determine the percentage of people with Hispanic surnames who do not identify as Hispanic, anecdotal evidence and historical sociology suggest that the figure is very small (Gottlieb 232). An adjustment of a few percentage points could be necessary in some cases.[7] The major group exception would be in some areas of the southwestern United States where some Pueblo Indians have Spanish surnames but identify as Pueblo Indian rather than Hispanic (Gottlieb 233). In communities with significant numbers of people with Portuguese names, the researcher must be knowledgeable of these names and eliminate some surnames or adjust to account for these surnames (Buechley, "Reproducible" 94).[8]

In Hispanic communities which are of one background, for example, Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, or Hispano, the selection of the list of surnames to use for a sample is simple. One uses local telephone listings or other similar published lists to decide on the short list of distinctive and frequently used surnames in the community. If the purpose is estimating population size, then, as noted, more adjustments are necessary (Wolfle 421; Sudman 204). If the top ten Hispanic surnames are used, it is generally safe to conclude that these surnames account for about 15 to 20 percent of the total Hispanic listing source that is used. As we will see, in Hispanic communities with diverse Hispanic subcommunities, or in national or large studies covering more than one Hispanic community, deciding which surnames to include on the DHN list is more complex.

The data reported here are based on an analysis of 8,455 Hispanic registered voters of Miami Beach, Dade County, Florida.[9] Voters are classified by the Dade County Board of Elections as Hispanic on the basis of their place of birth. If they were born in a Spanish-speaking country, they are classified as Hispanic. If they were born in the United States, they are classifed as non-Hispanic even if they were born of Hispanic parents one day after the arrival of their parents in the United States and strongly identify as Hispanic. The voters list divides the Hispanic community into several groups according to place of birth: Cuba, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic, Mexico, Honduras, Colombia, Venezuela, Chile, Spain, and Other Spanish Speaking areas. The Other Spanish category is not separated, but census and local data suggest that this category includes especially Argentina and Nicaragua as well as a number of other countries. Of the 8,455 Hispanic voters, 5,842 (69.1%) are from Cuba, 1,007 (11.9%) are from Puerto Rico, and 1,606 (19.0%) are from Other Spanish Speaking areas. This latter group consists of 370 (4.4%) from Colombia, 121 (1.4%) from the Dominican Republic, 110 (1.3%) from Spain, 66 (0.8%) from Chile, 59 (0.7%) from Honduras, 51 (0.6%) from Venezuela, 44 (0.5%) from Mexico, and 785 (9.3%) from unspecified other Spanish-speaking areas. For our purposes, we use a three-fold division into Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Other Hispanics. At the time of this data (February 1991), the 8,455 Hispanic voters represented 22.84 percent of the 37,020 registered voters in Miami Beach.

As shown in Table 2, the ten most frequently used Hispanic names on the voters list in Miami Beach are similar to lists in other communities. These ten names total 1,385 and represent 16.38 percent of the 8,445 voters classified as Hispanics in Miami Beach.

To decide which surnames to include on the DHN, and to illustrate the advisability of customizing the DHN list to a Hispanic community of diverse origins, we will now examine five alternative lists of surnames.

Alternative 1. For Alternative 1, we examine the ten most frequently used Hispanic surnames in Miami Beach. As noted, these ten surnames account for 16.38 percent of the 8,455 Hispanic voters. If we used this as our DHN list, then we would use a multiplier of 6.10 (100% divided by 16.38%) to estimate the number of Hispanics in the total population from another sample. For example, if a particular organization has 1,000 members with these ten surnames, then we could estimate the total Hispanic membership at 6,100.

Because the Cuban group represents a large segment of the Hispanic population in Miami Beach, and because the ten most frequent surnames in the Cuban group are also frequently used in the other Hispanic

Table 2. Most frequent surnames of Miami Beach Hispanic voters, 1990.

Miami Beach	%	Cuban	%	Puerto Rican	%	Other Hisp.	%
1. Rodriguez	3.20	Rodriguez	3.11	Rodriguez	5.06	Rodriguez	2.18
2. Gonzalez	2.15	Gonzalez	2.38	Rivera	3.48	Gonzalez	1.31
3. Garcia	1.74	Garcia	2.11	Gonzalez	2.18	Fernandez	.75
4. Perez	1.63	Perez	1.95	Ortiz	1.79	Lopez	.69
5. Hernandez	1.48	Hernandez	1.80	Garcia	1.59	Martinez	.62
6. Lopez	1.43	Fernandez	1.71	Perez	1.59	Sanchez	.62
7. Fernandez	1.41	Lopez	1.64	Lopez	1.39	Ramirez	.56
8. Martinez	1.24	Martinez	1.40	Ramos	1.39	Torres	.56
9. Diaz	1.11	Diaz	1.37	Torres	1.39	Garcia	.50
10. Alvarez	.99	Alvarez	1.27	Hernandez*	1.29	Perez	.50
Number	1385		1095		213		133
Total Sample	8455		5842		1007		1606
Percent	16.38		18.74		21.15		8.28

*For Puerto Rico, there was a tie for tenth position among *Cruz, Hernandez, Martinez*, and *Sanchez*. *Hernandez* is included because of its overall ranking.

groups, it happens in this case that the top ten names for the Cuban group are the same as for the total community. But the representation of the three major Hispanic groups varies on this DHN list. These ten surnames represent 18.74 percent of the 5,842 Cuban voters, 16.09 percent of the 1,007 Puerto Ricans, and only 7.95 percent of the 1,606 Other Hispanics (Table 3). If the researcher believes that the different representation for the different groups is important because of expected differences on important behavioral or attitudinal variables, then the researcher can analyze different lists or try to adjust the surnames to more equally represent all Hispanic groups.

Alternative 2. For Alternative 2, we use the most frequent Puerto Rican surnames as our DHN list. With this alternative, the Puerto Rican representation is 21.15, but the Cuban representation is only 14.26 percent, and the Other Hispanic representation is even lower at 6.98 percent.

Alternative 3. For Alternative 3, we use the Other Hispanic top names as the DHN list. With this list, the Other Hispanic representation is 8.28 percent, the Cuban representation is 15.81 percent, and the Puerto Rican representation is 16.78 percent. While the Cuban and Puerto Rican representations are fairly close, the Other Hispanic representation still is low relative to the other two groups.

Table 3. Results of alternative DHN lists for estimating U.S.-born Hispanics.

(1 = Total Miami Beach and Cuban; 2 = Puerto Rican; 3 = Other Hispanic; 4 = Cuban and Puerto Rican combined; 5 = All three Hispanic groups combined).

	1	2	3	4	5
Number of DHN not born in the U.S.	1,385	1,159	1,228	1,316	246
Pct. of Cuban Voters	18.74	14.26	15.81	17.33	2.79
Pct. of Puerto Ricans	16.09	21.15	16.78	17.77	3.38
Pct. of Other Hispanics	7.95	6.98	8.28	7.70	3.05
Pct. of Total Hispanics	16.38	13.71	14.52	15.56	2.91
Multiplier (100/total pct.)	6.11	7.29	6.88	6.43	34.36
Number of DHNs born in U.S.	299	268	264	295	67
Number of U.S.-born Hispanics (multiplier x DHNs)	1,827	1,953	1,816	1,897	2,302
Pct. of Additional Hispanics	21.61	23.10	21.48	22.44	27.22
Total number of Hispanic voters (8,455 plus U.S.-born)	10,282	10,408	10,271	10,352	10,757
Pct. of voters who are Hispanic (22.84% plus U.S.-Born)	27.77	28.11	27.74	27.96	29.06

Alternative 4. If none of the DHN lists using one group's surnames fairly represents all groups, then we can adjust lists. For Alternative 4, we can begin with the total Miami Beach list of surnames, remove some surnames (e.g., Fernandez and Alvarez) that partly account for the higher Cuban representation, and replace them with two surnames (e.g., *Sanchez* and *Ramos*) that make the Cuban and Puerto Rican representation more equal. This alternative represents 17.33 percent of Cubans and 17.77 percent of Puerto Ricans, much closer to equal representation than Alternative 1. But the Other Hispanic representation is only 7.70 percent.

Alternative 5. All these lists of DHNs account for a much smaller share of the Other Hispanics than for the Cubans and Puerto Ricans. Even the DHN list (Alternative 3) using the top ten Other Hispanic surnames gives only 8.28 percent representation, only about half of the other two groups. An inspection of the raw data shows that this lower percent is accounted for by the fact that Other Hispanics are more likely

to have non-Hispanic surnames (similar to the finding of Jaffe et al.), and that the Other Hispanics overall have more diversity than the Cubans and Puerto Ricans in their use of Hispanic surnames (some of the subgroups are not diverse). But there are some surnames in this sample that are found about equally among Other Hispanics, Cubans, and Puerto Ricans, although none of these are among the top Hispanic names overall. Alternative 5 uses ten of these surnames (*Castillo, Castro, Dominguez, Gutierrez, Herrera, Jimenez, Morales, Reyes, Ruiz,* and *Flores*) in an attempt to increase the relative representation for Other Hispanics. The representation is more equal for the three groups, but at the cost of using names which give a small percentage of the total Hispanics. Representations are 2.79 percent for Cubans, 3.38 percent for Puerto Ricans, and 3.05 percent for Other Hispanics. Other surnames could be added to this list, but the result would be a long list of names with only a small increase in the total percentage.

The choice of which surnames to include on the DHN list ultimately has to be decided on a mixture of ideal and practical criteria. Frequently, in a Hispanic population with several Hispanic groups, the researcher will not know the percentages of each group as we did here. Even if there are different groups, the researcher could decide that the differences are not important to the goal being sought. Even if there are different representations, the differences might not be large enough to justify the additional time and costs of adjusting the surnames. In this case, I suggest using Alternative 4 because it comes closest to equalizing the Cuban and Puerto Rican groups, while differing with the Other Hispanics. Alternative 5 comes closest to equalizing all three groups, but at too much of a cost in lowered representation. With a total representation of only 2.91 percent, the multiplier is 34.36 (100% divided by 2.91%), introducing too much possible chance variation. It is presented here to illustrate the problems of using a list which represents only a small percentage of the group being analyzed and is presented as an example that should be rejected. For research projects where only a rough estimate is desired, Alternative 1 (the ten most frequently used surnames in the overall Hispanic community, without adjustments for groups) might be more practical.

Having illustrated how different DHN lists can be used, let's turn to the third and final goal of this paper: to demonstrate how a figure obtained with the DHN technique can be used to estimate a larger population of Hispanics. As noted earlier, voters are classified as Hispanic only if they were born in a Spanish-speaking country (or Puerto Rico). But including United States-born Hispanics as well as Hispanics born in Spanish-speak-

ing countries gives a more accurate report of the numbers and percentages of Hispanics among the registered voters of Miami Beach. While researchers can disagree about the degree to which United States-born children of immigrants assimilate, maintain a separate ethnic identity, or develop a new ethnic identity unique to their local situation, it is clear that the younger generation of Hispanics in Miami Beach identify as Hispanics (Perez 7; Stack and Warren 12). Census population figures, exit polls of political behavior, telephone listings, and nearly all other sources of data include United States-born Hispanics in their figures on Hispanics. For comparative statistical purposes, as well as to accurately reflect ethnic identity, data on registered voters should do the same. With the Distinctive Hispanic Names technique we can estimate the number of additional Hispanics in Miami Beach. Most (about 96%) of these additional Hispanics are United States-born Hispanics, and this group will be referred to as "United States-born Hispanics" with knowledge that a small percentage actually were born elsewhere.

Table 3 shows the results using the alternative DHN lists. Remembering that Alternative 5 should be rejected because of its small sample size, it is noted that there is little variation in the final numbers for the first four alternatives. If we use Alternative 4 for our DHN list, we conclude that there are 295 United States-born voters with one of these ten surnames. With a multiplier of 6.43, this suggests that there are 1,897 United States-born Hispanic voters in addition to the 8,455 voters classified as Hispanic by place of birth. This is an additional 22.44 percent Hispanic voters. The total number of Hispanic voters is 10,352 instead of 8,455, and they represent 27.96 percent rather than 22.84 percent of Miami Beach's 37,020 voters.

Florida International University
North Miami, Florida

Notes

1. The first major use in the United States was a century ago by Lodge (147). See Lawson's article and book for a review of general and specific research up to the 1980s. For very recent examples in addition to references cited, see Zelinsky; McDonald and McDonald; Purvis; and my book and two most recent articles.

2. From an American Cancer Society study with 1,045,685 people identified by religion (including 47,871 people identified as Jewish), Rosenwaike obtained data for 27 surnames frequently used in DJN lists. Only about 76 percent of the people with these surnames were Jewish (a few of the biggest names accounted for many non-Jewish listings). There are regional variations in some surnames, and some communities have a higher percentage. But, clearly, more attention should be given to the choice of DJN surnames.

3. See, for example, Bradshaw and Fonner; Buechley et al.; Duncan et al.; Ellis; Enstrom and Operskalski; Gottlieb; Grenier; Murguia; Rosenwaike and Bradshaw; Salces; Schoen and Nelson; Schoen et al.; Spencer; and West.

4. See "Leading Surnames" 35 for *Schwartz* and *Weiss*. Dr. Rosenwaike provided the information on *Gross* in personal correspondence.

5. Having developed the DHN list, the researcher can then obtain a sample, and this does not need to be illustrated here. Himmelfarb et al. (247) have shown that there are no significant differences on major identification variables between Jews with or without distinctive Jewish names. But the possibility of differences on any variables important to a specific study should be explored by the researcher using any list of distinctive surnames. If a surname list is biased on a relevant variable, the researcher might be able to adjust the results by the expected degree of bias (Wolfle 425).

6. Albuquerque, New Mexico, is a major exception. In a 1988 work on Hispanic given names, I used the same surname list with minor modifications for Miami, Tampa, San Antonio, and Denver. But, of the top eight surnames in Miami, only four were among the top in Albuquerque. San Salvador, El Salvador, and Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, were also analyzed for this project and found to be similar to most Hispanic communities, but results are not presented for space reasons. De Silva counted the top five surnames in seventeen Spanish speaking cities in the world, and found results similar to those presented in this article. The major exception was Quito, Ecuador. For the five cities analyzed both in this study and by de Silva (Bogota, Buenos Aires, Havana [Miami 1969 in this study], Madrid, and Mexico City), de Silva's top five in 1972 were generally the same as the top five in this study's recent data. (See de Silva 95–98.)

7. In addition to individual cases, there are also the Sephardim (Spanish Jews). Among Jews from Turkey and other parts of the Ottoman Empire, there are people with names such as *Castro, Franco*, and *Angel*, descendants of Spanish Jews who left Spain around 1492 and moved to the Ottoman Empire. There is some Spanish "perspective" among these and other Sephardim (Lavender, "Arabic-Islamic" 31–32), a conscious effort is made to preserve the Judeo-Espagnol (Ladino) language (Guleryuz 5), and in Israel they "feel closer to South American Jews than any other immigrant group, both because they can understand Spanish and because they share a similar temperament and social culture" (Immanuel 11). But Turkish Jews also speak Turkish as their first language, most do not know Spanish, and their Turkish identity is strong. Many Filipinos also have Hispanic surnames, but do not identify as Hispanic, a factor that has to be considered in applicable areas.

8. Of the 20 most frequently listed surnames in the telephone book of Lisbon, Portugal, five (*Rodrigues, Fernandes, Lopes, Gomes, Dias*) are the same as frequently used Spanish surnames. The Portuguese spelling ends in *es*, whereas the Spanish spelling ends in *ez*, and that can be a guide to separating the names. But the researcher should be aware that this rule is not rigid. Several more of these Portuguese surnames are also similar to frequently used Spanish surnames, and could have been changed to the Spanish spelling in Spanish areas. The 20 most frequently used surnames in Lisbon are (1) *Silva*, (2) *Santos*, (3) *Ferreira*, (4) *Pereira*, (5) *Costa*, (6) *Rodrigues*, (7) *Martins*, (8) *Almeida*, (9) *Oliveira*, (10) *Fernandes*, (11) *Carvalho*, (12) *Lopes*, (13) *Marques*, (14) *Goncalves*, (15) *Sousa*, (16) *Ribeiro*, (17) *Gomes*, (18) *Pinto*, (19) *Alves*, (20) *Dias*.

9. Appreciation is expressed to Mehran Basiratmand and Jose Prendes (Computer Services) and Lisandro Perez (Department of Sociology) at Florida International University; Ben Wesley, Executive Director of the Dade County Democratic Party; and Graciela Catasus of the Cuban-American Democratic Association for their assistance or support of this research.

Works Cited

Bradshaw, B. S., and E. Fonner, Jr. "The Mortality of Spanish-Surnamed Persons in Texas: 1969–1971." *The Demography of Racial and Ethnic Groups*. Ed. F. D. Bean and W. P. Frisbie. New York: Academic Press, 1978.

Buechley, Robert W. "Characteristic Name Sets of Spanish Populations." *Names* 15 (1967): 56–69.

___. "A Reproducible Method of Counting Persons of Spanish Surname." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 55 (1961): 88–97.

___. "Spanish Surnames Among the 2,000 Most Common United States Surnames." *Names* 19 (1971): 137–40.

Buechley, Robert W., John E. Dunn, George Linden, and Lester Breslow. "Excess Lung-Cancer-Mortality Rates Among Mexican Women in California." *Cancer* 10 (1957): 63–66.

de Silva, Guido. "The Linguistics of Personal Names." *Onoma* 17 (1972): 92–133.

Duncan, Burris., Ann N. Smith, and Franklin W. Briese. "A Comparison of Growth: Spanish-Surnamed with Non-Spanish Surnamed Children." *American Journal of Public Health* 69 (1979): 903–07.

Ellis, J. M. "Mortality Differentials for a Spanish-Surname Population Group." *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 39 (1959): 314–21.

Enstrom, J. E., and E. V. Operskalski. "Multiple Sclerosis Among the Spanish-Surnamed Californians." *Neurology* 28 (1978): 434–38.

Gottlieb, Karen. "Genetic Demography of Denver, Colorado: Spanish Surname as a Marker of Mexican Ancestry." *Human Biology* 55 (1983): 227–34.

Grenier, Guillermo J. "Ethnic Solidarity and the Cuban-American Labor Movement in Dade County." *Cuban Studies* 20 (1990): 29–48.

Guleryuz, Naim. "The History of the Turkish Jews: A Brief Review." *The Quincentennial Foundation of Istanbul* (1989): 1–6.

Himmelfarb, Harold S., R. Michael Loar, and Susan H. Mott. "Sampling by Ethnic Surnames: The Case of American Jews." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47 (1983): 247–60.

Immanuel, Jon. "Lucky Jews." *The Jerusalem Post* 28 Oct. 1989, internatl. ed.: 11.

Jaffe, A. J., Ruth M. Cullen, and Thomas D. Boswell. *The Changing Demography of Spanish Americans*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Kohs, Samuel C., and W. Blumenthal. "Survey of Recreational and Cultural Needs of the Jewish Community." National Jewish Welfare Board, unpublished report, 1942.

Lavender, Abraham D. "Arabic-Islamic and Spanish-Mediterranean Influences on the 'Jewish Mind': A Comparison to European-Christian Influences." *The Journal of Ethnic Studies* 8 (1981–82): 25–35.

___. *French Huguenots: From Mediterranean Catholics to White Anglo-Saxon Protestants*. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.

___. "Hispanic Given Names in Five United States Cities: Onomastics as a Research Tool in Ethnic Identity." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 10 (1988): 105–25.

___. "United States Ethnic Groups in 1790: Given Names as Suggestions of Ethnic Identity." *Journal of American Ethnic History* 9 (1989): 36–66.

Lawson, Edwin D. *Personal Names and Naming: An Annotated Bibliography*. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1987.

___. "Personal Names: 100 Years of Social Science Contributions." *Names* 32 (1984): 45–73.

Lodge, Henry Cabot. *Historical and Political Essays*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1892.

Massarik, Fred. "New Approaches to the Study of the American Jew." *Jewish Journal of Sociology* 8 (1966): 175–91.

McDonald, Forest, and Ellen Shapiro McDonald. "The Ethnic Origins of the American People." *William and Mary Quarterly* 37 (1980): 179–99.

Murguia, Edward. *Chicano Intermarriage: A Theoretical and Empirical Study*. San Antonio: Trinity UP, 1982.

Perez, Lisandro. "The 1990s: Cuban Miami at the Crossroads." *Cuban Studies* 20 (1990): 3–9.

Purvis, Thomas L. "The European Ancestry of the United States Population, 1790." *William and Mary Quarterly* 41 (1984): 85–101.

Ritterband, Paul, and Steven Martin Cohen. "Study Design to Demographic Study of New York's Jews." Unpublished essay (Department of Sociology, Queens College, CUNY), 1979.

Rosenwaike, Ira. "Leading Surnames Among American Jews." *Names* 38 (1990): 31–38.

___. "Mortality Patterns Among Elderly American Jews." *The Journal of Aging and Judaism* 4 (1990): 289–303.

___. Personal correspondence to the author. March 1991.

Rosenwaike, Ira, and Benjamin S. Bradshaw. "Mortality of the Spanish Surname Population of the Southwest: 1980." *Social Science Quarterly* 70 (1989): 631–41.

Salces, Luis M. "Spanish Americans' Search for Political Representation: The 1975 Aldermanic Election in Chicago." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 6 (1978): 175–87.

Salter, Paul S., and Robert C. Mings. "The Projected Impact of Cuban Settlement on Voting Patterns in Metropolitan Miami, Florida." *The Professional Geographer* 24 (1972): 123–31.

Schoen, Robert, and Verne E. Nelson. "Mortality by Cause Among Spanish Surnamed Californians, 1969–1971." *Social Science Quarterly* 62 (1981): 259–74.

Schoen, Robert, Verne E. Nelson, and Marion Collins. "Intermarriage Among Spanish Surnamed Californians, 1962–1974." *International Migration Review* 12 (1978): 359–68.

Serrie, Hendrick. "The Familial and the Familiar: Constancy and Variation in Chinese Culture with Reference to the Hsu Attributes." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 16 (1985): 271–92.

Sheskin, Ira M. "The Methodology of the Greater Miami Jewish Population Study." Unpublished essay (Department of Geography, U of Miami), 1982.

Shin, Eui-Hang, and Eui-Young Yu. "Use of Surnames in Ethnic Research: The Case of *Kims* in the Korean-American Population." *Demography* 21 (1984): 347–59.

Smith, Elsdon C. *American Surnames*. Philadelphia: Chilton Book Co., 1969.

Spencer, Gregory. "Mortality Among the Elderly Spanish-Surnamed Population in the Medicare File: 1968 to 1978." Unpublished manuscript (presented at the Population Association of America Annual Meeting in 1984).

Stack, John F., Jr., and Christopher L. Warren. "Ethnicity and the Politics of Symbolism in Miami's Cuban Community." *Cuban Studies* 20 (1990) 11– 28.

Sudman, Seymour. "The Uses of Telephone Directories for Survey Sampling." *Journal of Marketing Research* 10 (1973): 204–07.

United States Bureau of the Census. *Spanish Surname List*. Tape. Census of Population and Housing. Washington: GPO, 1980.

Waterman, Stanley, and Barry Kosmin. "The Distribution of Jews in the United Kingdom." *Geography* 71 (1986): 60–64.

Waters, Mary C. "The Everyday Use of Surname to Determine Ethnic Ancestry." *Qualitative Sociology* 12 (1989): 303–24.

West, Robert C. *An Atlas of Louisiana Surnames of French and Spanish Origin*. Baton Rouge: Geoscience Publications, 1986.

Wolfle, Lee M. "Characteristics of Persons With and Without Home Telephones." *Journal of Marketing Research* 16 (1979): 421–25.

Woods, Richard D. "Hispanic First Names: A Comprehensive Dictionary of 250 Years of Mexican-American Usage." Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 1984.

Zelinsky, Wilbur. "Cultural Variations in Personal Name Patterns in the Eastern United States." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 60 (1970): 743–69.

*****

AMERICAN NAME SOCIETY ANNUAL MEETING

New York, December 27-30, 1992

ANS/MLA Session I, Names in Literature
Wednesday, December 30, 8:30 am

ANS/MLA Session II, Names in Geography and Commerce
Wednesday, December 30, 3:30 pm

ANS Business Meeting
Wednesday, December 30, 12:00 noon

ANS (non-MLA) sessions to be announced.

Submit proposals by September 30, 1992, to Lewis McArthur, 4154 SW Tualatin Ave., Portland, OR 97201.

ANS Annual Banquet
Monday, December 28, 7:00 pm
Villa Berulia, 107 East 34th Street
Cost: $40 per person, tax and gratuity included.

Because of limited seating, please reserve early, remitting your check (payable to Wayne H. Finke) no later than December 1, 1992, to Prof. Wayne H. Finke, Dept. of Modern Languages (Box 340), Baruch College (CUNY), 17 Lexington Avenue, New York, NY 10010.