First Names on the Campus: A Semantic Differential Analysis*

EDWIN D. LAWSON

THE SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TECHNIQUE pioneered by Osgood[1] attempts to reduce the meaning of a concept to its basic factors. Research with the semantic differential has previously evaluated stereotypes of first names, and nicknames of men and first names of women.[2] Other recent contributions in the area of first names have been made by Seeman[3] on the naming process, by Harari and McDavid and by Gray on how schoolteachers use name stereotypes.[4] The books by Dunkling and by Stewart have also contributed to our general knowlege of first names.[5]

The earlier semantic differential investigations were somewhat limited by computer capacity so that only about 30 names could be studied at one time. Other studies of name stereotypes have also been limited to about the same number. One exception is the work of Buchanan and

---

*Appreciation is expressed to the Computer Center, State University College and especially Barbara L. Metivier for assistance in the statistical analysis.

[1]Charles E. Osgood, George J. Suci, and Percy Tannenbaum, *The Measurement of Meaning* (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1957), p. 342.

[2]E. D. Lawson, "Semantic Differential Analysis of Men's First Names," *Journal of Psychology*, 78 (1971), pp. 229–240.

E. D. Lawson, "Men's First Names, Nicknames, and Short Names: A Semantic Differential Analysis," *Names*, 21:1 (March, 1973), pp. 22–27.

E. D. Lawson, "Women's First Names: A Semantic Differential Analysis," *Names*, 22:2 (June, 1974), pp. 52–58.

[3]Mary V. Seeman, "The Psychopathology of Everyday Names," *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 49 (1976), pp. 89–95.

[4]Herbert Harari and John W. McDavid, "Name Stereotypes and Teachers' Expectation," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65:2 (1973), pp. 222–225.

S. Gray Garwood, "First-name Stereotypes as a Factor in Self-concept and School Achievement," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68:4 (1976), pp. 482–487.

[5]Leslie Alan Dunkling, *First Names First* (New York: Universe, 1977), p. 285.

George R. Stewart, *American Given Names* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 364.

Bruning[6] who investigated 1060 names on three dimensions. Their statistical analysis was, however, somewhat limited.

Questions have continued to arise as to why stereotypes of a larger range of names are not fully investigated. With recent improvements in computers, it is possible to do research on a larger sample of names, even a whole community of names, at one time. In this investigation a large number of men's and women's were evaluated to determine whether: (1) stereotypes exist over the whole range of names (showing clear preferences for some names, rejection for others), (2) correlations occur between a name's frequency and other attributes, (3) agreement in ratings between men and women shows, and (4) patterns of difference between men's and women's names on the semantic factors are demonstrated.

Method

The rating procedure was based upon the work of Osgood *et al.*[7] Using the semantic differential, Osgood has isolated three dimensions: Evaluation (E), Potency (P), and Activity (A). The specific form used in this investigation consists of a computer card printed with rating scales for each concept evaluated. Each card has nine 7-step subscales: (1) *kind-cruel,* (2) *weak-strong,* (3) *fast-slow*, (4) *cold-hot,* (5) *large-small,* (6) *dishonest-honest,* (7) *happy-sad,* (8) *delicate-rugged,* and (9) *sharp-dull* (the polarity of the subscales is alternated to avoid a directional tendency). Scales 1, 6, 7, measure the E factor; 2, 5, 8, the P; 3, 4, 9, the A.

Three groups of concepts were rated: reference concepts (Good, Bad, Strong, Weak, Active, and Passive), men's names, and women's names. The reference concepts were used as poles for Osgood's E, P, and A dimensions. Thus Good and Bad represent poles for the E dimension, Strong and Weak for the P, Active and Passive for the A.

The names were derived by listing first names of all students at the State University of New York, Fredonia. There were 2215 men, 2419 women. With men there were 304 different names including variant spellings. For the research, 100 names were selected (all those with a frequency of 3 or more). This 100 accounted for 87.48 percent of the men's names.

For women, there were 514 different names. Those with a frequency of 5 or more (103 names) accounted for 78.2 percent of all women's

---

[6]Barbara Buchanan and James Bruning, "Connotative meanings of first names and nicknames on three dimensions," *Journal of Social Psychology,* 85 (1971), pp. 143–144.

[7]Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, pp. 75–85.

first names. These were included in the final list. With both the men's and women's lists, some variant spellings were combined with the more common form, i.e., Alan, Allan with Allen; Lauri, Lori, with Laurie. Variant spellings which were thought to be different enough to be differently perceived were retained as separate categories, e.g., Christine and Christina.

In the first study 40 men and 40 women rated the reference concepts followed by the 100 men's names. The reference concepts and the names were randomized so each respondent would answer in a different order thus avoiding a position effect (ratings influenced by the name or concept appearing at the beginning or end of a series, or being in close proximity to one which was strongly liked or disliked).

Results and Discussion

Results were analyzed by using computer programs developed for use with the semantic differential.[8] Inspection of the data shows that the means for the names and the reference concepts have a good range and the standard deviations average less than 1.6. Following Osgood *et al.*,[9] we can assume that, with such means and standardized deviations, stereotypes of names do exist thus confirming earlier work.

One of the measures for analysis suggested by Osgood is the *D* (distance) score. The *D* score is essentially a difference profile between ratings of two concepts on the same subscales. Thus, scores on the nine subscales (*kind-cruel, weak-strong, fast-slow,* etc.) for the concept Good would represent one profile, for the concept Bad, another profile. The *D* score is the sum of the differences on the subscales and is found by the generalized distance formula $D = \sqrt{\Sigma d^2}$ in which *d* is the difference in rating of a concept on the same two subscales. The nine subscale scores were combined into a single *D* score. For concepts perceived as close together, such as Good and Peter, *D* would be small; for concepts far apart, as Good and Bad, *D* would be large. For each subject *D* scores were computed between each concept and every other concept. The Wilcoxon matched pairs procedure was used with *D*s to determine the level of proximity to Good, Strong, and Active (the attractive ends of each dimension), the Evaluative, Potency, and Activity. A similar procedure was followed for the Potency and Activity dimensions. Ranks and significance levels are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

---

[8]Edwin D. Lawson and Barbara L. Metivier, *Computer Programs for the Semantic Differential* (Fredonia, NY, State University College, 1980), p. 104.

[9]Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, p. 328.

Table 1. Ranks on Three Dimensions of Meaning for Men's Names

Name	Frequency	Evaluation Good-Bad		Potency Strong-Weak		Activity Active-Passive		Composite	
		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1. John	5.20%	2a	9a	1a	5	2d	9a	1	2
2. David	4.83	11b	8a	9c	7a	7	13c	5	3
3. Robert	4.33	9b	3a	40	4a	47+	2a	29	1
4. Michael	4.29	10b	23a	2b	2a	1c	8b	2	8
5. James	4.29	5b	18a	17c	8a	4c	4a	4	7
6. Steven	4.12	32c	37b	42	6a	40	1a	37	4
7. Mark	3.35	29c	13a	13c	25b	30	11c	17	18
8. Richard	3.34	26c	28a	21d	10a	13	3b	15	9
9. Thomas	3.30	3b	77	3b	19b	14	7b	3	27
10. William	2.80	34c	7a	33	18b	53+	27d	39	17
11. Joseph	2.53	13b	1a	25d	15a	11	14c	10	6
12. Daniel	2.30	4b	2a	32	42d	34	42	19	25
13. Jeffrey	1.99	41d	40b	37	57	28	55	27	50
14. Paul	1.81	12b	6a	24d	16a	21	23d	14	11
15. Douglas	1.49	52d	26c	39	44d	31	53	36	40
16. Peter	1.44	1a	29c	16c	23b	27	6c	7	19
17. Timothy	1.40	62	15a	81+	74	56+	78+	71	68
18. Gary	1.36	17c	50c	14c	24b	8	22c	8	26
19. Kevin	1.31	55	11a	73+	1a	89+	18c	75	5
20. Gregory	1.22	61	41c	38	32c	42	31d	42	32
21. Alan	1.18	79	38b	64	31c	46+	25d	65	29
22. Charles	1.17	76	62d	70+	65	61+	68	70	67
23. Donald	1.08	57	43b	67	84+	74+	76+	68	75
24. Christopher	1.04	14c	30b	75+	35c	83+	39	63	33
25. Brian	1.00	37c	34c	4c	14a	22	10c	13	16

26.	Ronald	.95	59	96	85+	79	84+	83+	82	90
27.	Kenneth	.95	21c	21b	54	50d	73+	44	51	38
28.	Dennis	.90	56	76d	26d	40c	18	63	24	58
29.	Karl	.86	100+	81	47	34c	63+	49	81	52
30.	Scott	.86	22c	33b	20d	28c	23	28d	16	28
31.	Edward	.77	40d	52c	30	58	38	57	32	55
32.	Bruce	.72	73	47c	92	26b	91w+	16c	95	23
33.	Lawrence	.72	72	35b	66+	63	60+	54	67	51
34.	George	.72	83	87	28d	80	41	74+	45	78
35.	Patrick	.72	19c	22b	58	52d	69+	60	50	43
36.	Martin	.63	68	72d	43	82+	52+	86+	54	83
37.	Anthony	.63	87	60c	22d	36c	3	37	22	39
38.	Jay	.54	18b	24b	46	22b	71+	26d	44	22
39.	Raymond	.54	96	94	55	68	43+	79+	66	80
40.	Mathew	.50	16c	5a	41d	47d	36	38	31	31
41.	Frank	.45	58	80	19	30c	37	36	33	42
42.	Glenn	.45	46d	45c	84+	67	96w+	71+	87	66
43.	Frederick	.45	54	66d	44	85+	58+	81c+	53	81
44.	Eric	.45	27c	16a	23d	9a	24	15c	18	10
45.	Barry	.41	49d	44c	60	72	44+	70	55	69
46.	Craig	.41	23c	74d	50	38c	45+	56	43	53
47.	Howard	.41	60	51c	99w+	89+	99w+	96x+	100	88
48.	Philip	.41	31c	67d	62	29c	66+	43	57	41
49.	Ralph	.41	64	73d	45	83+	48+	85+	49	84
50.	Randall	.41	25c	59c	72+	70	100w+	67	79	70
51.	Russell	.41	66	69d	78+	56	75+	66	77	64
52.	Louis	.41	81	63d	77+	61	77+	47	85	59
53.	Wayne	.36	92	48c	18d	51c	17	48	34	47
54.	Gerald	.36	70	95	97+	92+	86+	84+	92	96
55.	Keith	.36	42d	25b	35	33c	25	30d	35	30
56.	Francis	.36	20c	64d	71+	95w+	78+	92+	60	93

Table 1. (*Continued*)

Name	Frequency	Evaluation Good-Bad		Potency Strong-Weak		Activity Active-Passive		Composite	
		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
57. Andrew	.32	28c	14a	53	60	39	62	40	46
58. Samuel	.32	74	19a	52	37c	55+	41	59	35
59. Todd	.27	80	42b	88+	64	93w+	52	94	54
60. Stuart	.27	85	92	94+	71	95w+	77+	98	77
61. Dean	.27	98	79	91+	43d	62+	33d	93	44
62. Joel	.27	35d	39b	79+	53	90+	58	72	49
63. Eugene	.27	90	55c	69	98x+	76+	95w+	84	94
64. Stanley	.27	30c	89	95+	99x+	97w+	100y+	89	100
65. Roger	.27	95	85	57	39c	59+	34d	73	45
66. Arthur	.23	67	82	90+	86+	94w+	90+	91	86
67. Jack	.23	33c	46c	7b	3a	16	12c	12	12
68. Jonathan	.23	6b	20a	63	66	70+	64	46	56
69. Neil	.23	15c	56c	59	54	57+	61	48	57
70. Larry	.23	44d	36b	34	75	19	50	23	61
71. Randy	.23	24c	31b	27d	41c	26	40	21	36
72. Fred	.23	47d	70d	29	55	49+	65	38	63
73. Vincent	.18	78	97	80+	49d	54+	51	78	71
74. Nicholas	.18	39d	10a	8c	21b	9	20c	9	15
75. Norman	.18	50	83	76+	94w+	85+	99x+	74	97
76. Salvatore	.18	97	98	31	46d	12	35d	41	62
77. Kurt	.18	94	86	5c	17a	5	19c	20	34
78. Gordon	.18	43d	53c	61	88+	65+	94w+	58	85
79. Gerard	.18	38d	91	68	93+	79+	91+	64	95
80. Hugh	.18	86	84	74+	69	67+	69	80	73
81. Greg	.18	63	17a	15c	12a	35	21c	28	13

82.	Terence	.14	77	88	86+	90+	87+	88+	88	91
83.	Shawn	.14	51d	12a	96+	48d	72+	46	86	37
84.	Roy	.14	71	75d	51	62	33	59	47	65
85.	Rodney	.14	53d	99	100w+	96w+	98w+	97x+	97	99
86.	Kirk	.14	99	65d	6c	11a	6	5b	26	20
87.	Jeff	.14	48d	27b	36	13a	32	32d	35	21
88.	Henry	.14	45d	71d	87+	91+	82+	89+	76	87
89.	Harold	.14	8b	68d	83+	100y+	68+	98x+	56	98
90.	Grant	.14	91	90	10	45c	20	45	30	60
91.	Ernest	.14	75	32	98+	97d+	88+	93+	96	89
92.	Duane	.14	84	100	49	78	51+	73+	62	82
93.	Don	.14	36d	61d	12c	59	10	29d	11	48
94.	Dana	.14	88	57	89+	81+	80+	82+	90	79
95.	Dan	.14	7b	49c	11c	27c	15	17c	6	24
96.	Clifford	.14	65	93	65	87+	29	87+	52	92
97.	Carter	.14	89	58c	48	77	50+	80	61	76
98.	Bradley	.14	93	54c	93+	76	92w+	75+	99	72
99.	Adam	.14	69	4a	56	20b	81+	24d	69	14
100.	Mitchell	.14	82	78	82+	73	64+	72+	83	74

The following letters indicate that the rank was significantly closer to either the Good, Strong, or Active of the appropriate comparison:
a Significant at the .0001 level b Significant at the .001 level c Significant at the .01 level d Significant at the .05 level.

These letters indicate that the rank was significantly closer to either the Weak or Passive poles of the appropriate comparison:
z Significant at the .0001 level y Significant at the .001 level x Significant at the .01 level w Significant at the .05 level.

+ indicates the median rank was closer to the second pole, i.e., Bad, Weak, or Passive. Unmarked ranks were closer to Good, Strong, and Active. Thus, men ranked Peter at Rank 1 on Good-Bad. This is significantly closer to Good than Bad at the .001 level. Charles was ranked 70th on Strong-Weak and was closer to Weak than Strong although not at a significant level. Ranks were derived from Wilcoxon probability levels. Significance levels not available for composite scores.

Differences of 20 points in rank between names or between men and women on the same name are probably significant.

Table 2. Ranks on Three Dimensions of Meaning for Women's Names

Name	Frequency	Evaluation Good-Bad		Potency Strong-Weak		Activity Active-Passive		Composite	
		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1. Susan	4.63%	33c	56c	49	8c	70+	20	44	12
2. Deborah	3.84	95	66c	11	31	10+	26	29	26
3. Mary	3.14	27b	6a	23	58	63+	89+	21	45
4. Barbara	2.44	25b	34b	12	7c	9+	10	4	4
5. Patricia	2.36	45c	50c	26	54	34+	69+	22	58
6. Carol	2.23	4a	27b	51	30	48+	6	16	9
7. Karen	2.10	26b	19a	15	64	50+	79+	11	55
8. Kathleen	2.03	76d	29b	40	60	75+	29+	71	32
9. Linda	1.90	22b	73d	30	56	83+	32+	32	50
10. Nancy	1.82	62d	18a	75+	46	16+	57+	54	29
11. Laurie	1.73	6a	28b	73+	72+	100+x	48+	68	53
12. Ann	1.69	1a	23b	41	65	47+	53+	8	48
13. Margaret	1.57	82	78d	62+	1b	39+	1	75	2
14. Diane	1.40	18b	71c	19	25	51+	31+	13	28
15. Cheryl	1.40	5a	81d	7	45	21+	9	2	30
16. Cynthia	1.36	68d	89	68+	70+	72+	88+	78	93
17. Katherine	1.20	34c	32b	32	22d	64+	8	30	7
18. Elizabeth	1.16	81d	21a	63+	48	62+	61+	80	31
19. Donna	1.12	32c	44c	45	39	45+	60+	28	39
20. Judith	1.07	16b	85	59	9c	65+	12	33	19
21. Catherine	1.07	60d	16a	58	36	71+	45+	69	20
22. Christine	1.03	40c	7a	103+x	79+	102+y	84+	102	64
23. Joanne	1.03	87	76d	29	49	77+	83+	77	69
24. Lisa	1.03	8a	35b	100+	53	88+	39+	85	33
25. Lynn	1.03	39c	46c	69+	21d	57+	21	55	15

26.	Sandra	.99	72d	90	81+	75+	17+	71+	63	90
27.	Joan	.99	66d	37b	10	43	35+	27+	19	23
28.	Sharon	.95	86	88	27	11c	1	25	23	24
29.	Janet	.91	12b	31b	1	15d	14+	17	1	8
30.	Jean	.91	73d	43b	36	89+	59+	93+	61	87
31.	Cathy	.87	13b	25b	37	51	7+	52+	7	37
32.	Pamela	.87	17b	83	72+	81+	52+	72+	36	89
33.	Michele	.83	23b	10a	84+	74+	49+	98+w	47	73
34.	Jane	.78	80d	93	64+	97+	37+	77+	74	101
35.	Robin	.74	43c	40b	78+	84+	101+x	62+	93	67
36.	Julie	.74	29b	48c	70+	87+	18+	86+	24	84
37.	Laura	.70	52c	38b	87+	35	99+x	28+	92	21
38.	Ellen	.70	65d	72c	50	88+	15+	91+	40	92
39.	Bonnie	.66	94	14a	16	91+	13+	81+	38	74
40.	Elaine	.62	75d	75d	67+	93+	67+	87+	79	95
41.	Theresa	.62	20b	11a	83+	10c	8+	4	17	102
42.	Gail	.58	14b	77d	6	62	33+	54+	6	66
43.	Leslie	.58	69d	99	94+	67	76+	64+	89	91
44.	Amy	.58	11b	9a	85+	92+	66+	70+	49	65
45.	Ruth	.54	59d	47c	33	76+	41+	73+	42	76
46.	Martha	.54	38c	65c	4	29	40+	58+	10	35
47.	Maureen	.50	93	84	76+	23d	69+	43+	94	42
48.	Judy	.50	42c	22b	46	4c	43+	7	37	1
49.	Brenda	.50	35c	103	25	27	26+	68+	15	81
50.	Wendy	.45	47c	39b	48	55	32+	35+	34	34
51.	Jill	.45	61d	17a	90+	83+	85+	41+	87	51
52.	Rosemary	.41	19b	51c	89+	78+	60+	85+	56	80
53.	Lorraine	.41	36c	69c	9	80+	20+	99+w	9	96
54.	Denise	.41	58d	67c	80+	71+	24+	65+	60	70
55.	Kim	.41	28b	24b	55	103+w	68+	102+x	43	103
56.	Valerie	.37	31c	53c	13	16d	4	19	3	14

Table 2. (*Continued*)

Name	Frequency	Evaluation Good-Bad		Potency Strong-Weak		Activity Active-Passive		Composite	
		Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
57. Victoria	.37	103	86	8	6c	30+	2	65	10
58. Kimberly	.37	91	57c	102+w	99+	93+w	92+	103	97
59. Joyce	.37	48c	15a	24	13c	90+	42+	53	11
60. Eileen	.37	49c	36b	96+	37	95+w	49+	98	27
61. Marie	.33	2a	33b	54	63	58+	63+	14	52
62. Darlene	.33	77d	98	79+	38	92+w	47+	90	77
63. Sheila	.33	92	94	74+	42	84+	14	97	56
64. Andrea	.33	24b	42b	86+	77+	91+	46+	73	60
65. Beth	.33	10b	54c	93+	100+	82+	101+x	66	100
66. Jacqueline	.33	96	82d	22	41	19+	67+	58	61
67. Annette	.33	84	26b	95+	73+	44+	80+	96	68
68. Monica	.33	56d	95	47	18d	38+	22	50	41
69. Janice	.33	46c	70c	20	14d	36+	23	18	17
70. Paula	.29	67d	58c	56	44	55+	15	67	22
71. Jodi	.29	55d	55c	34	34	27+	30+	31	25
72. Virginia	.29	70d	100	18	5c	22+	34+	25	40
73. Marjorie	.29	74d	91	31	66	80+	37+	72	79
74. Lauren	.29	57d	45c	38	40	74+	51+	57	36
75. Carolyn	.29	50c	59c	71+	95+	98+	97+w	86	98
76. Rebecca	.29	89	68c	52	57	3	24	48	43
77. Anita	.29	88	87	3	50	6+	38+	12	63
78. Carla	.25	99	60c	5	24d	2	11	26	16
79. Constance	.25	102	63c	53	59	42+	55+	91	57
80. Heidi	.25	7a	1a	66+	101+	79+	103+z	35	99
81. Shirley	.25	64d	92	61+	3b	73+	18	76	18

82.	Marcia	.25	53c	64c	82+	47+	81+	40+	82	44
83.	Maria	.25	21b	12a	92+	82	23+	75+	41	62
84.	Mary Ann	.25	37c	5a	99+	28	96+w	13	99	5
85.	Roberta	.25	85	79d	14	12c	12+	5c	20	13
86.	Sally	.25	30c	41b	42	86+	46+	78+	27	78
87.	Phyllis	.25	100d	96	21	17d	11+	36+	64	49
88.	Helen	.25	78d	52c	28	68	28+	96+w	46	82
89.	Holly	.25	54c	20b	57	96+	53+	95+w	59	88
90.	Alice	.21	97	102	65+	33	25+	33+	84	72
91.	Audrey	.21	90	74d	98+	26	97+	56+	100	38
92.	Marilyn	.21	79d	62c	88+	52	78+	59+	88	54
93.	Julia	.21	3a	8a	97+	69+	94+	66+	81	47
94.	Gretchen	.21	101	97	39	19d	29+	44+	83	59
95.	Grace	.21	9a	4a	60+	102+w	89+	100+x	39	94
96.	Doreen	.21	98	101	44	32	87+	50+	95	75
97.	Dawn	.21	15b	3a	91+	94+	54+	90+	51	71
98.	Connie	.21	71d	30b	35	98+	31+	74+	45	85
99.	Christina	.21	41c	2a	101+w	61	103+y	94+w	101	46
100.	Lee	.21	51c	13a	2	20d	5+	16	5	6
101.	Shelley	.21	44c	61c	77+	85+	61+	76+	62	83
102.	Stephanie	.21	63d	49c	43	90+	86+	82+	70	86
103.	Terry	.21	83	80d	17	2b	56+	3	52	3

The following letters indicate that the rank was significantly closer to either the Good, Strong, or Active of the appropriate comparison:
a Significant at the .0001 level b Significant at the .001 level c Significant at the .01 level d Significant at the .05 level.

These letters indicate that the rank was significantly closer to either the Weak or Passive poles of the appropriate comparison:
z Significant at the .0001 level y Significant at the .001 level x Significant at the .01 level w Significant at the .05 level.

+ indicates the median rank was closer to the second pole, i.e., Bad, Weak, or Passive. Unmarked ranks were closer to Good, Strong, and Active. Thus, men placed Ann at Rank 1 on Good-Bad. This is significantly closer to Good than Bad at the .001 level. Nancy was ranked 75th on Strong-Weak and was closer to Weak than Strong although not at a significant level. Ranks were derived from Wilcoxon probability levels. Significance levels not available for composite scores.

Table 2. (*Continued*)

Some variant spellings of names were deliberately combined with the most common, e.g., Suzanne, Susanne, Susanah with Susan; Debra, Debora, Debarah with Deborah; Carole with Carol; Karin, Caryn, Caren with Karen; Cathleen with Kathleen; Lynda with Linda; Lauri, Lori, Lorie with Laurie; Anna, Anne with Ann; Diana, Dianne with Diane; Cheryll, Sheryl with Cheryl; Kathryn with Katherine; Elisabeth with Elizabeth; Cathareine with Catherine; Kristine with Christine; Joann with Joanne; Lynne with Lynn; Janette with Janet; Jeanne with Jean; Cathie, Kathey, Kathie, Kathy with Cathy; Pamala with Pamela; Michelle, Michel with Michele; Jayne with Jane; Teresa with Theresa; Teri with Terry; Rosemarie with Rosemary; Laraine with Lorraine; Valorie with Valerie; Kimberley with Kimberly; Sheilah with Sheila; Andre with Andrea; Jacquelyn, Jacquelynn with Jacqueline; Jody, Jodee with Jodi; Carolynn with Carolyn; Karla with Carla; Leigh with Lee.

Table 3. Categories of Ratings by Sex

	Evaluation		Potency		Activity	
	Good	Bad	Strong	Weak	Active	Passive
Men's names: N=100						
Men	100[r]	0[r]	71[v]	29[v]	42[a]	58
Women	100[s]	0[s]	80[w]	20[w]	70[ax]	30[x]
Women's names: N=103						
Men	103[t]	0[t]	60	43	3[by]	100[y]
Women	103[u]	0[u]	65	38	26[bz]	77[z]

Note: All respondents rated men's names closer to Good than Bad, however, 71 of the men's names were rated on the average closer to Strong, 29, closer to Weak. Differences between pairs with the same superscript letter [a, b,] etc. are significant beyond the .01 level.

The tables show the frequency of the name on the campus, the rank of each name on the three dimensions, Evaluative, Potency, Activity, and Composite. The lower the rank (1, 2, 3) the closer to the positive pole of the dimension. For men's names John, Michael, and Thomas were most liked by men; Robert, John, and David by women. As Table 3 shows both men and women perceived all the men's names as closer to good than Bad. On the Potency dimension, men saw 71 and women 80 names as closer to Strong than Weak; on the Activity dimension, men 42, women 70. Tables 1 and 2 also indicate whether a name was significantly closer to one or the other end of the continuum.

For women's names it is not as clear that proximity to Good, Strong, and Active are the standards for judgment. However, given those criteria, men judged Janet, Cheryl, and Valerie at the top on the Composite index, while Christina, Christine, and Kimberly closest to Bad, Weak and Passive. Women ranked Judy, Margaret, and Terry at

the top while Jane, Theresa, and Kim were at the bottom. Apparently there is a big difference between Theresa and Terry.

As Table 3 again shows men and women ranked all of the women's names closer to Good than Bad. Men ranked 60 closer to Strong, women 65. On Activity, men placed only 3 names closer to Active than Passive; women, 26. Thus, there is a clear pattern of rating all names closer to Good, most names closer to Strong than Weak (more for male names), and somewhat of a pattern for women's names to be closer to Passive. Interestingly, women tended to rate men's names closer to Active than did the men themselves. From the pattern shown one might conclude that women see men's names (and by extension, men themselves) as close to Good, Strong, and Active, perhaps even more than men do but evaluate their own names (and themselves?) as less on Strong, definitely toward Passive, but clearly toward Good.

In making comparisons between names or between the sexes on one name, differences in rank of 20 points are probably significant. Thus, it is clear that while Thomas (#9) and Harold (#89) may be perceived as close to Good by men, and Kevin (#19) and Samuel (#58) by women, the other sex does not agree.

Frequency and ratings. To evaluate the effect of frequency of a name and its rating, rank correlations were computed between frequency of a name on the campus and rank position on the E, P, A, and Composite measures. These results are shown in Table 4. For men's names, relationships between frequency and the positive values, Good, Strong, and Active. With women's names, the correlations are much less, occurring at a significant level only by men on the Evaluation dimension and with both sexes on the Composite. Thus, for women's names, frequency of a name has only a limited relationship to Evaluation, Potency and Activity.

Table 4. Rank Correlations between Frequency of a Name and Rank on Semantic Dimensions

	Evaluation Good-Bad		Potency Strong-Weak		Activity Active-Passive		Composite	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Men's names N=100	.43	.44	.33	.46	.27	.44	.38	.50
Women's names N=103	.26	.07	.15	.13	.07	.16	.28	.24

All correlations .24 or higher, significant at the .01 level; .33 or higher, significant at the .001 level.

Table 5. Rank Correlations between Rankings of Men and Women on Semantic Dimensions

	Evaluation	Potency	Activity	Composite
Men's names	.58	.71	.66	.70
Women's names	.51	.39	.24	.24

All correlations are significant at the .01 level or beyond.

Agreement between men and women. Agreement between men and women was evaluated by correlating the respective ranks and is shown in Table 5. As examination of Tables 1 and 2 also shows while there are some clear differences in ranking as mentioned above, the bulk of the rankings do show agreement. The correlations are all significant beyond the .01 level. Agreement seems to be a bit greater for men's names indicating clarity of the stereotypes of men's names.

Additional Study

The results summarized in Table 3 where men's names were shown to be close to Good, Strong, and Active, women's names as less Strong and definitely toward Passive, and sex differences on the Activity dimension raise the question about where in the conceptual framework the culture would place men's and women's names, and by extension, men and women themselves. Do the stereotypes of names reflect where the culture places men and women in the value system?

In order to resolve this question additional samples of 50 men and 50 women completed semantic differential ratings. Respondents completed the same reference concepts, 12 names randomly chosen from the lists (6 men's and 6 women's), and 24 concepts related to values, Myself, Ideal Self, Ideal Man, Ideal Woman, Masculine, Feminine, Life, Death etc. Some of the results are shown in Table 6. For this analysis scores on the three factors were determined by averaging the appropriate subscales as mentioned above in the Methods section. Thus, Good would probably be close to *kind, honest,* and *happy* on the E factor, somewhat intermediate on the P and A factors. As we can see in the table, both sexes rated Masculine as high on the Evaluation, Potency, and Activity factors. Ideal Man was even higher on Evaluation (significantly so) and close on the Potency and Activity factors.

Feminine was rated higher than Masculine on Evaluation and extremely significantly lower on Potency, and significantly lower on Activity scores of Ideal Man and Ideal Woman we can again see the

Table 6. Averages on Cultural Related Concepts

	Evaluation		Potency		Activity	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Masculine	5.0	5.1	6.0	6.4	5.1	5.2
Feminine	5.7	6.0	2.7	2.6	4.6	4.6
Ideal Man	6.3	6.6	5.8	5.9	5.4	5.6
Ideal Woman	6.6	6.6	3.8	4.1	5.5	5.4
Myself	5.8	5.9	4.8	4.1	5.3	5.0
Ideal Self	6.5	6.6	5.6	4.3	5.9	5.6

Note: The possible range is from 1–7. The standard errors for these means ranged from .08–.13. All differences of .4 between means are significant at least to the .01 level, except for the Evaluation difference of Men and Women on Ideal Man which is significant with a difference of .3.

more pronounced lower score again on the Potency. The Activity scores are about the same. It is interesting to note further that women in rating Ideal Self rated themselves lower on Potency and Activity.

What the additional study seems to point out is that men do see themselves as close to Good, Strong, and Active; women as also Good, definitely less Strong, and toward the Weak end of the continuum. Women more or less concur in this evaluation.

The results with the names are somewhat confirmed with the results on the values concepts. The names cognitive placement would then seem to be a projection of the culture, Men = Good, Strong, Active. Women = Good, Weak, and less Active.

This investigation has shown that stereotypes do exist over the whole range of names—that there are correlations between frequency of a name and other attributes. However, these correlations are significant mainly for men's names. Additional analyses indicated close agreement between rankings of names by men and by women but again closer agreement on men's names. Finally, evaluations were made of the differing pattern of men's and women's names. Evidence was presented that these patterns are reflections of the culture's concepts of masculinity and femininity.

The State University College at Fredonia, New York