Impressions Created by Given Names

Albert Mehrabian
University of California, Los Angeles

Desirability is an important factor in assigning and evaluating names. The Name Connotation Profile (NCP) characterizes name desirability by six factors that are implied by names: Success, Morality, Popularity, Warmth, Cheerfulness, and Masculine-Feminine. Representative findings obtained with the Name Connotation Profile differentiate the connotations between, e.g., nicknames versus given names, conventionally versus unconventionally-spelled names, long versus short names, and men's versus women's names. A number of applications of the Name Connotation Profile are noted.

First names, like physical appearances (grooming, clothing, accessories, etc.) can impart significant and differentiated impressions, positive and negative. Although historically people have had an intuitive grasp of the significance of physical appearance in social and work situations, there has been considerably less awareness of the important contributions of names in such situations.

Correlates and Effects of Name Desirability

Two important areas of early psychological research on names were (1) desirability of common versus uncommon names and (2) social reactions to persons with desirable versus undesirable names. More common or usual names were more desirable or, alternatively, imparted more positive (or less negative) impressions than more unusual names (Anderson 1985; Busse and Seraydarian 1978; Karlin and Bell 1995; Joubert 1985, 1993; Mehrabian 1992b; West and Shults 1976). These findings can be interpreted by using the more general sociological principal regarding greater liking for more familiar persons and, by extrapolation, for persons with more familiar names (Colman, Hargreaves and Sluckin 1980).

19

Regarding social reactions to desirable names, studies have tended to show that individuals with less desirable names are more likely to be treated negatively in a variety of social situations. Busse and Seraydarian (1978), using sociometric techniques to assess individual popularity, found that persons with more desirable names tended to be more popular. Short essays that were attributed to students with common, popular, and attractive, versus uncommon, unpopular, and unattractive, first names received higher grades from schoolteachers (Erwin and Calev 1984; Harari and McDavid 1973). In a beauty queen contest using six photographs of equally attractive females, college students cast 158 votes in favor of photographs that were arbitrarily assigned desirable names versus 39 votes in favor of photographs assigned undesirable names (Garwood, Cox, Kaplan, Wasserman and Sulzer 1980). Findings showing lasting positive-negative effects of names are exemplified by Willis, Willis and Grier (1982) who showed that a positive relationship exists between name desirability and professional achievement.

The Semantic Differential and Name Connotations

The Semantic Differential was developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) for studies of meaning (e.g., how to describe the meaning of "tree," "pet," or "mother" by using a very few basic dimensions). Their studies identified three basic dimensions of meaning: Evaluation (represented by adjective pairs such as good-bad, kind-cruel, happy-sad), Activity (represented by active-passive, fast-slow, moving-static), and Potency (represented by strong-weak, large-small, powerful-weak).

The Semantic Differential has also been used to study the connotations and desirability of first names (e.g., Lawson 1987). Of 100 most frequently occurring men's names on a college campus, *John, David, James*, and *Michael* were found to have some of the higher ratings on Evaluation, Activity, and Potency; in contrast, the names *Gerald, Eugene, Stanley*, and *Rodney* were among those with lower connotations on these dimensions. Of the 103 most frequently occurring women's names on the same campus, *Barbara, Carol, Janet*, and *Valerie* were among those with higher ratings; in contrast, *Leslie, Jane, Doreen*, and *Marjorie* had some of the lower ratings (Lawson 1980).

Lawson and Roeder (1986) demonstrated the use of the semantic differential technique for studying the connotations of full (e.g., *Barbara*), shortened (e.g., *Barb*), and affectionate (e.g., *Barbie*) forms of ten women's first names. Their findings showed that women tended to dislike affectionate forms, whereas men did not. In general, evaluation, activity, and potency dimensions of the semantic differential have been useful for study of the connotations of names.

The PAD Emotion Model and Name Connotations

Mehrabian (1995) suggested that findings with the Semantic Differential had helped identify three basic dimensions of emotional or affective responses to any stimulus or situation (including names). In his PAD (Pleasure-Arousal-Dominance) Emotion Model, pleasure-displeasure corresponded to high-low Evaluation, arousal-nonarousal (i.e., level of mental alertness and physical activity) corresponded to high-low stimulus Activity, and dominance-submissiveness (i.e., feeling in control, versus feeling controlled or influenced, by a stimulus or situation) corresponded to low-high Potency. Stated otherwise, more highly evaluated stimuli elicit greater pleasure, those that are more active generate greater mental alertness and physical activity, and more potent stimuli elicit less dominance in observers.

As with the Semantic Differential, the PAD Emotion Model has been used also to study the connotations of names. One hundred thirty names were rated using the PAD scales and these ratings were compared with ratings of name desirability, name uniqueness, and temperament characteristics of the persons with those names (Mehrabian 1992b). Findings showed that (1) names that were more pleasant and represented more dominant qualities were judged to be more desirable (i.e., preferable, attractive), (2) more unique (i.e., more unusual, less common) names were judged to be less pleasant and to represent less dominant qualities, and (3) pleasantness-unpleasantness of a person's name correlated positively with the pleasantness-unpleasantness of his/her temperament. Since pleasant-unpleasant quality of temperament has been found to be a very general indicator of psychological adjustment-maladjustment (Mehrabian, 1996), the latter findings showed a positive correlation between the pleasantness-unpleasantness of names and level of psychological adjustment-maladjustment of the persons so named.[1]

A Differentiated Assessment of Name Desirability

Insofar as name desirability has been found to be an important variable in the study of names, an alternative and more differentiated approach for assessing name desirability was developed using the Name Connotation Profile (NCP) (Mehrabian 1994). The following sections include representative findings obtained with the NCP, and suggest some possible uses of the NCP in future research on names.

Development of the NCP, described by Mehrabian (1992a), included the following procedures. First, 55 judges independently listed 10 characteristics they found most desirable in others. The 38 most frequently mentioned characteristics (e.g., caring, adventurous, honest, polite, obedient) were retained for additional study. The following procedure was used with a second group of judges to elicit their reactions to first names. Each of 168 judges rated a total of 10 different names on all 38 characteristics. In all, 280 men's and 280 women's names were rated, providing a total of 1680 sets of ratings of all 38 characteristics.

To rate a name, judges were asked to imagine that they were about to meet someone for the first time and that all that they knew about that person was their gender and their first name. Judges used a scale that ranged from zero (none of the characteristic) to eight (extremely high degree of the characteristic) to rate each name on each of the 38 characteristics.

To analyze the resulting data, correlations were computed between the ratings for each pair of characteristics (e.g., one of the correlation coefficients represented the relationship between ratings for caring and ratings for adventurous). The statistical procedure of factor analysis was applied to the resulting 38 x 38 matrix of intercorrelations and produced a more economical set of underlying or "rearranged" relationships among the 38 characteristics. The latter rearranged relationships were described in terms of "obliquely rotated factors;" that is, the underlying dimensions that were intercorrelated. Stated otherwise, considering that all 38 characteristics were desirable and, therefore, tended to be positively intercorrelated, "oblique rotation" was used in the factor analysis to allow extraction of meaningful, yet positively intercorrelated, factors.[2]

Six factors were identified along with the characteristics defining each of those factors: success (including ambitious, intelligent, creative), morality (including obedient, respectful, religious, loyal, trustworthy), popularity (including healthy, athletic, good-looking, confident, assertive), warmth (including loving, caring, kind, generous), cheerfulness (including playful, curious, friendly, humorous), and masculine-feminine, i.e. relative masculinity or femininity.

Desirability of names, assessed by the 38 most frequently mentioned desirable individual characteristics, was thus reduced to a concise group of six factors. Although the six factors were moderately and positively intercorrelated, each factor helped identify an important and reasonably distinct desirable characteristic of names and/or persons.

In subsequent studies, the latter factors were used to rate the desirable individual characteristics conveyed by first names. To rate names, judges were given the six groups of characteristics corresponding to the six factors (i.e., success, morality, popularity, warmth, cheerfulness, masculine-feminine). They used a scale that ranged from zero (none of the characteristic) to eight (extremely high degree of the characteristic) and assigned six scores to each name, one each for each of the six characteristic groups. It is important to note that judges did not rate individual characteristics (adjectives), but instead considered the entire list of characteristics corresponding to each individual factor. Thus, to rate a name on the success factor, judges considered the adjectives "successful," "ambitious," "intelligent," and "creative" as a group and assigned a single score to that name for success.

In sum, the Name Connotation Profile (Mehrabian, 1994) is an instrument that measures the characteristics which define each of the six factors, the rating scales, and detailed instructions for obtaining ratings of the impressions conveyed by names.

A Survey of Names Using the Name Connotation Profile

Mehrabian (1992a) reported results of a large-scale survey using the Name Connotation Profile. Judges were asked to imagine they were about to meet someone for the very first time (e.g., a blind date, a prospective roommate, a co-worker) and all they knew about the person was their gender and first name. Judges then used the NCP to describe

the characteristics of the person they were about to meet. Instructions incorporated within the NCP included the following precautions: (1) to rate each name based on the precise spelling as given, (2) not to rate their own names, (3) to avoid thinking of a specific person with the name and instead to think of a stranger they were about to meet who had that name, (4) to keep in mind the gender of the person whose name they were rating, and (5) to consider the entire list of characteristics associated with each factor in rating the name.

Mean ratings, across all judges, of a name on each factor were standardized with mean = 50 and standard deviation = 20. Thus, resulting mean scores ranged mostly from zero to 100 and only exceeded that range for exceptionally high or low scores. A sample male name, Solomon, was rated successful (70), moral (108), popular (29), warm (56), cheerful (19), and masculine-feminine (68) (with the masculine-feminine scale, the higher the score, the more masculine; the lower the score, the more feminine) showing that this name conveyed impressions of an exceedingly moral, highly successful, moderately masculine and warm, and unpopular and cheerless person. A sample female name, Nora, was rated successful (47), moral (80), popular (37), warm (88), cheerful (59), and masculine-feminine (31). Thus, based on this name alone, judges inferred characteristics of high warmth and morality, average cheerfulness and success, low popularity, and moderate femininity. In sum, responses to first names, quantified by using the NCP, indicated consensus reactions of distinctive associations to the names.

Instructions used in the NCP were designed specifically to discourage judges from associating a name with a particular person, but instead to elicit associations to a broad range of persons with that name. Many factors may have contributed to the distinctive connotation profiles of each name; these may include length, sound characteristics, letter shapes (e.g., rounded, straight lines, jagged), familiarity or commonness, and origin (native, foreign). For instance, the success score for Katherine (89) was greater than that for Catherine (75), showing a possible stronger association of more angular letters with success. Table 1 contains examples of men's names that were rated high or low on each of the six factors of the NCP; table 2 includes a corresponding sample of women's names.

Table 1. Sample Male Names with High or Low Ratings on the Six Factors of the Name Connotation Profile

High Success:	Success	Morality	Popularity	Warmth	Cheerfulness	Masculinity
Colby	93	41	84	41	50	80
Langley	92	76	42	52	50	56
Mark	92	35	95	48	76	83
Low Success:						
Clyde	27	37	32	29	36	67
Vinny	25	38	64	47	58	68
Wally	28	46	28	33	52	64
High Morality:						
Ernest	67	93	28	52	17	51
Howard	74	94	30	54	33	64
Jacob	69	100	52	69	44	67
Low Morality:						
Andre	63	15	74	41	44	75
Damon	57	12	85	19	35	82
Rex	64	13	66	14	48	87
High Popularity:						
Blake	82	23	86	34	48	79
Buck	28	10	95	8	59	91
Duke	49	31	85	22	41	89
Low Popularity:						
Archibald	59	86	8	29	19	58
Elmer	24	90	8	65	40	57
Herman	47	89	6	41	10	59
High Warmth:						
Gabriel	71	79	57	76	53	55
Joseph	82	89	65	89	54	75
Theodore	83	92	48	76	33	73
Low Warmth:						
Aldo	17	24	29	13	21	68
Devin	58	32	55	20	53	68
Thornton	57	37	33	6	22	66
High Cheerfulness:						
Charlie	42	30	56	51	91	69
Eric	68	20	89	61	95	84
Todd	76	23	89	42	78	80

Low Cheerfulness:

Caesar	49	44	43	14	7	71
Horace	36	65	10	31	7	66
Winston	81	62	40	21	7	65

High Masculinity:

Duke	49	31	85	22	41	89
Hank	22	31	67	36	57	86
Thor	41	48	53	28	27	86

Low Masculinity:

Darcy	68	48	47	59	45	46
Eugene	70	75	10	42	42	47
Lynn	45	62	50	50	43	42

Ratings on each factor were standardized with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 20; thus, most ratings generally ranged between zero and 100. For masculinity-femininity, higher scores were associated with greater masculinity and lower scores represented greater femininity. Sample names given were not necessarily those with the most extreme scores.

Table 2. Sample Female Names with High or Low Ratings on the Six Factors of the Name Connotation Profile.

High Success:	Success	Morality	Popularity	Warmth	Cheerfulness	Masculinity
Katherine	89	89	63	83	63	24
Lauren	80	66	73	67	72	35
Victoria	82	86	64	71	50	24
Low Success:						
Bunny	17	23	58	57	75	10
Dotty	11	27	27	48	54	30
Wilma	1	75	9	79	25	38
High Morality:						
Constance	49	97	39	65	25	27
Henrietta	27	96	8	56	20	36
Mary	75	100	65	96	65	24
Low Morality:						
Brandy	29	11	62	45	67	38
Lana	50	13	84	54	80	26
Roxanne	38	-1	83	54	76	28

High Popularity:

Heather	50	33	**91**	71	91	22
Tiffany	26	12	**88**	46	88	24
Tracy	64	20	**93**	51	87	28

Low Popularity:

Edna	34	78	**10**	68	28	38
Hortense	31	75	**3**	27	6	45
Prunella	27	51	**8**	9	-19	37

High Warmth:

Emma	49	103	26	**102**	35	22
Florence	40	79	17	**95**	29	27
Rose	28	82	36	**105**	54	21

Low Warmth:

Elvira	15	17	27	**12**	38	39
Enid	24	48	16	**31**	16	29
Wilhelmina	25	30	30	**15**	33	38

High Cheerfulness:

Cindy	27	35	89	76	**97**	24
Deedee	23	16	74	58	**101**	22
Robin	64	44	79	71	**93**	34

Low Cheerfulness:

Agatha	61	73	16	42	**2**	33
Hortense	31	75	3	27	**6**	45
Norma	44	78	27	59	**20**	40

High Femininity:

Juliet	51	69	67	100	63	**17**
Katie	54	51	68	62	79	**14**
Maryanne	54	67	53	77	70	**13**

Low Femininity:

Beryl	39	45	37	25	30	**49**
Pat	47	31	49	33	47	**53**
Wesley	55	42	51	50	46	**55**

Ratings on each factor were standardized using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 20; thus, most ratings generally ranged between zero and 100. For masculinity-femininity, higher scores were associated with greater masculinity and lower scores represented greater femininity. Sample names given were not necessarily those with the most extreme scores.

Studies of Some Characteristics of Names Using the NCP

The following sections include summaries of findings from studies that used the NCP to identify major differences in the impressions created by various names.

Nicknames and Given Names

Mehrabian and Piercy (1993b) investigated a sample of 389 names (156 given names and 233 corresponding nicknames). Judges used the NCP to describe the impressions they inferred from the names. Each judge rated a list of given names and the nickname variants of those names. One list, for instance, contained *Katherine* along with *Kate, Kathy, Katie,* and *Kay.* Results showed that, compared with given names, nicknames connoted lower levels of success and morality, but higher levels of popularity and cheerfulness. Furthermore, this pattern of findings did not differ significantly in comparisons of men's and women's names. The latter data suggest that nicknames may be more appropriate and useful in social and work situations (e.g., sales, public relations) where an individual seeks to emphasize *approachable* characteristics (popularity, cheerfulness) at the cost of communicating lower levels of *social stature* (success, morality). In contrast, given names may be more appropriate when a person seeks to project an image of substance and social stature, as might be the case with professionals or business leaders.

Name Length

Mehrabian and Piercy (1993a) investigated a sample of 858 given names (422 men's, 436 women's). To avoid confounding name length with the given name versus nickname distinction, nicknames were excluded from the sample of names investigated. Judges used the NCP to indicate the impressions they formed from the names.

Name length was measured in number of syllables and in number of letters, with the two measures intercorrelating .61 (p < .001). Relationships of name length with the six factors of the NCP differed for men's and women's names. The only significant result obtained for women's names showed that shorter names connoted greater warmth (for name length measured in syllables). Stronger effects of name length were obtained for men. Longer names were found to convey more success and morality and less popularity, cheerfulness, and masculinity.

The name length/success relationship was significant only when length was measured in terms of number of letters; otherwise, findings were consistent across both measures of name length.

In sum, for men (but not for women), longer names communicated greater social stature (morality, success), and shorter names communicated more approachable characteristics (popularity, cheerfulness). Absence of the name length/social stature relationship for women's names was explained by noting that some components of women's names lengthen the names while implying diminutive, approachable, or feminine characteristics (e.g., the -a of *Roberta,* the -ette of *Georgette,* the -any of Bethany).

Finally, the finding that shorter names were judged to be more masculine was consistent with additional results from the same study which showed that men's names were significantly shorter than women's names. The latter results were consistent with findings from a study of restaurant names (Nilsen 1995) where the names of men used to name restaurants were shorter, compared with the names of women used similarly.

Conventionally and Unconventionally Spelled Names

Mehrabian and Piercy (1993c) investigated men's and women's names that included conventionally spelled and unconventionally spelled names (e.g., *Linda* versus *Lynda, Courtney* versus *Kortney, Diane* versus *Dyan, Darren* versus *Darin,* and *Mike* versus *Myque).* Results (which were essentially the same for male and for female names) showed that unconventional spelling of names tended to produce strongly undesirable impressions. Specifically, unconventionally spelled names connoted lower levels of success, morality, popularity, warmth, and cheerfulness. Also, for men's names, unconventional spelling yielded judgments of lower masculinity (higher femininity), whereas for women's names, unconventional spelling yielded judgments of lower femininity (higher masculinity). Thus, unconventional spelling of a name to make it distinctive was found to be counterproductive, because it resulted in distinctive, *but strongly negative,* impressions.

Men's and Women's Names

Mehrabian and Valdez (1990) had judges use the NCP to rate 300 men's and 300 women's first names. Analysis of variance[3] explored the

effects of the rater's gender and the "name gender" (i.e., the gender generally associated with a name, such as *Mike* being a man's name) on the six factors of the NCP. Results showed that, compared with men's names, women's names connoted less success and masculinity (greater femininity) and more morality, warmth, and cheerfulness.

Although no significant effects of the rater's gender were obtained, significant rater's gender by name gender interactions were found for warmth, cheerfulness, and masculine-feminine. These interactions consistently showed that impressions generated by men's and women's names were more pronounced for raters of the opposite gender. Thus, even though both male and female raters judged women's names as representing greater warmth and cheerfulness than men's names, male raters attributed even greater warmth and cheerfulness to women's names than did the female raters. In other words, favorable characteristics attributed to women's names were even more favorable for male, than for female, rater-judges. Again, although both the male and female raters judged men's names to represent greater masculinity, female raters attributed even greater masculinity to men's names than did the male raters or, alternatively, male raters attributed even greater femininity to women's names than did the female raters.

Directions for Future Research

The Name Connotation Profile can be used to investigate differences in the impression profiles conveyed by common versus uncommon names, native versus foreign names, androgenous versus gender-specific names, or crisp and snappy-sounding versus soft and melodic-sounding names. It also can be used to investigate connotation profiles of names as functions of the percentage of vowels present in the names, or presence of perceived "harsh" or "jarring" versus "soft" or "smooth"-sounding consonants (e.g., [k], [z] versus [l], [m]). Another area of fruitful application is in the relationships between name connotations, on the one hand, and personality characteristics, psychological adjustment-maladjustment, academic achievement, and professional or more general aspects of achievement, on the other. The NCP can serve as a convenient tool for studying a wide range of issues that are of interest to name researchers.

Notes

1. Incidentally, the PAD Emotion Model has also been used to study the influences of product names on consumer preferences for products. Mehrabian and deWetter (1987) tested their mathematical model and found that 30% of the variance of male, and 37% of female, consumers' preferences for products could be explained in terms of PAD emotional reactions elicited by product names.

2. Kim (1975) provides an excellent and readable introduction to the fundamentals of factor analysis.

3. Kim and Kohout (1975) provide a concise introduction to analysis of variance.

References

Anderson, Timothy. 1985. "Unique and Common First Names of Males and Females." *Psychological Reports* 57: 204-206.

Busse, Thomas V. and Louisa Seraydarian. 1978. "Frequency and Desirability of First Names." *Journal of Social Psychology* 104: 143-144.

_____. 1979. "First Names and Popularity in Grade School Children. *Psychology in the Schools* 16: 149-153.

Colman, Andrew M., David J. Hargreaves and Wladyslaw Sluckin. 1980. "Psychological Factors Affecting Preferences for First Names." *Names* 38: 113-129.

Erwin, Philip G. and Avraham Calev. 1984. "The Influence of Christian Name Stereotypes on the Marking of Children's Essays." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 54: 223-227.

Garwood, S. Gary, Lewis Cox, Valerie Kaplan, Neal Wasserman, and Jefferson L. Sulzer. 1980. "Beauty is Only 'Name' Deep: The Effect of First-name on Ratings of Physical Attraction." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 10: 431-435.

Harari, Herbert and John W. McDavid. 1973. "Name Stereotypes and Teachers' Expectations." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 65: 222-225.

Joubert, Charles. 1985. "Sex Differences in Given Name Preferences." *Psychological Reports* 57: 49-50.

_____. 1993. "Personal Names as a Psychological Variable." *Psychological Reports* 73: 1123-1145.

Karlin, Nancy J. and Paul A. Bell. 1995. "Assessing Commonality and Favorability of First Names." *Psychological Reports* 77: 97-98.

Kim, Jae-On. 1975. "Factor Analysis." *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition.* Ed. Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, and Dale H. Bent. New York: McGraw-Hill. 468-514.

_____ and Frank Kohout. 1975. "Analysis of Variance and Covariance." *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition.* Ed. Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner and Dale H. Bent. New York: McGraw-Hill. 398-433.

Lawson, Edwin D. 1980. First Names on the Campus: A Semantic Differential Analysis. *Names* 28: 69-83.

_____. 1987. *Personal Names and Naming: An Annotated Bibliography.* New York: Greenwood.

_____ and Lynn M. Roeder. 1986. Women's Full First Names, Short Names, and Affectionate Names: A Semantic Differential Analysis. *Names* 34: 175-184.

Mehrabian, Albert 1992a. *The Name Game: The Decision that Lasts a Lifetime.* New York: Penguin.

_____. 1992b. "Interrelationships Among Name Desirability, Name Uniqueness, Emotion Characteristics Connoted by Names, and Temperament." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 22: 1797-1808.

_____. 1994. *The Name Connotation Profile.* (Available from Albert Mehrabian, 1130 Alta Mesa Road, Monterey, CA 93940.)

_____. 1995. "Framework for a Comprehensive Description and Measurement of Emotional States." *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 121: 339-361.

_____. 1996. "Pleasure-Arousal-Dominance: A general framework for describing and measuring individual differences in temperament." *Current Psychology* 14: 261-292.

Mehrabian, Albert and Robert de Wetter. 1987. "Experimental test of an emotion-based approach to fitting brand names to products." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 72: 125-130.

Mehrabian, Albert and Marlena Piercy. 1993a. "Affective and personality characteristics inferred from length of first names." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19: 755-758.

_____. 1993b. "Differences in positive and negative connotations of nicknames and given names." *Journal of Social Psychology* 133: 737-739.

_____. 1993c. "Positive or negative connotations of unconventionally and conventionally spelled names." *Journal of Social Psychology* 133: 445-451.

Mehrabian, Albert and Patricia Valdez. 1990. "Basic name connotations and related sex stereotyping." *Psychological Reports* 66: 1-2.

Nilsen, Alleen P. 1995. "From *Aunt Chilada's* to *Cactus Willy's*: Gender naming in the marketing of food in Arizona." *Names* 43: 29-52.

Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci and Percy H. Tannenbaum. 1957. *The Measurement of Meaning*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

West, Stephen G. and Thomas Shults. 1976. "Liking for common and uncommon first names." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 2: 299-302.

Willis, Frank N., Lois A. Willis and Joseph A. Grier. 1982. "Given names, social class, and professional achievement." *Psychological Reports* 51: 543-549.