

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1991

Family Naming Practices and Intergenerational Kinship Affiliations

Nancy Immel
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Immel, Nancy, "Family Naming Practices and Intergenerational Kinship Affiliations" (1991). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2413.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2413>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



FAMILY NAMING PRACTICES AND INTERGENERATIONAL
KINSHIP AFFILIATIONS

by

Nancy Immel

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Human Development

Approved:

Major Professor

Committee Member

Committee Member

Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Jay Schvaneveldt, my committee chairman, for the encouragement he gave during my graduate career and for his patience, wisdom, and friendship. He always helped me see the broader picture. Carol Mohar and Brent Miller brought different perspectives to my committee. They are very much appreciated for their help in focusing my efforts. Thanks also to Barre Toelken, who treated my subject seriously and reinforced its legitimacy.

Glenda Nesbit, the world's most organized person, was there from the beginning and deserves special thanks for her help in collecting the data and for typing the survey and the manuscript in their many revisions. Mary Ellen Heiner was wonderful in formatting the manuscript and in assisting with the typing. Lance Mortensen stuck with me through it all and is revered for his skills with the computer and statistical analyses. Beverly Poirier was there when I needed her most.

Finally, and most importantly, thanks to my son, Matthew, who always understood with a wisdom beyond his years.

Nancy Immel

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	2
Objectives	3
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Psychological Literature	4
Social Science and Historical Literature	6
Conceptual Framework	11
Hypotheses	14
III. METHODS	15
Sample	15
Measurement	16
Design	18
Data Collection	19
Data Transformation	20
Data Analyses	20
Ethical Considerations	21
IV. RESULTS	22
Subject Characteristics	22
Research Hypotheses and Data Analyses	41
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	51
Summary	51
Discussion	52
Conclusions	56
Limitations	57
Recommendations	57
REFERENCES	59
APPENDIX: FAMILY NAMING PATTERNS SURVEY	63

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table	
1 Age of Subjects	22
2 Birthplace	23
3 Education	24
4 Occupation	25
5 Religious Preference	27
6 Family Size	27
7 Gender of Children by Generation	28
8 Church Activity	29
9 Church Frequency	30
10 Relationship to Family of Origin	31
11 Relationship to Family of Procreation	31
12 Close if You Were Named for Someone	32
13 Families Closer if Children Named for Family	33
14 Naming Traditions	33
15 Know How You Were Named	35
16 Name Source Frequencies for All Children	36
17 Name Source Origin for All Children	37
18 Generational Depth--All Children	38
19 First and Middle Name Sources by Gender	39
20 Naming for Paternal vs. Maternal Lineages	41
21 Naming for Paternal Vs. Maternal Lines by Gender	41
22 Test of Significance for Source of Children's Names	42
23 Analysis of Source of Children's Names Across Generation	43

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
Table	
24 Analysis of the Relationship Between Sources of Children's Names and Kinship Affiliations	45
25 Analyses of the Relationship Between Sources of Children's Names and Religiosity	47
26 Gender of Child	49

ABSTRACT

Family Naming Practices and Intergenerational
Kinship Affiliations

by

Nancy Immel, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1991Major Professor: Dr. Jay D. Schvaneveldt
Department: Family and Human Development

The study of naming practices has captured the interest of researchers in a variety of related disciplines. Studies of names and naming have led to a body of literature suggesting that naming practices are infused with meaning and reflect emotional ties between family members.

This study examined four research hypotheses related to family naming practices in an intergenerational sample of Mormon women. Ninety women from three generations of 30 families participated in the study. Through telephone interviews, each woman completed a survey designed to gather information about sources of children's names, kinship affiliations, and religiosity.

The information gathered from the surveys was analyzed using three statistical analyses: descriptive statistics, the chi square test of significance, and multiple regression. Data analyses indicated that there were no significant differences in naming practices in this group and that naming practices were similar across generations. Analyses of the relationship between family closeness and naming indicated that

there was no significant relationship between closeness to the family of origin and naming for family members. However, closeness to the family of procreation was found to be inversely related to naming for relatives. Both of the religiosity items--level of church activity and frequency of church attendance for both husbands and wives--were found to be inversely related to naming children for relatives.

Further data analyses revealed that child gender was the factor that contributed most heavily to whether or not children were named for relatives.

(75 pages)

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This study dealt with kinship affiliations and naming practices among families belonging to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons). Naming practices, or more specifically the practice of naming children for relatives, have been examined as expressions of social bonds between family members. This study examined naming practices in relation to religiosity and emotional closeness between generations.

Throughout history, and in all cultures, names have been given to babies and young children as labels that identify them as individuals in their families and communities. However, the specific name selected for each child has additional and more subtle implications. From the perspective of the interactional framework of family study, names and naming practices can be viewed as symbols of relationships that exist within families. Children are named within the context of family relationships, and it is reasonable to conjecture that as symbols, names and naming patterns may provide insight into those relationships.

Contemporary American parents have endless sources from which to select names for their children. They may choose names because they are aesthetically pleasing or simply because they "like them." They may choose from currently fashionable or popular names; from names in religious or popular literature; or even from names of favorite entertainment stars, the roles they play, or songs they sing. In spite of numerous potential sources for names, most American children are

named after family members (Rossi, 1965). In naming children after relatives, parents identify specific kin or kin relationships as meaningful.

Members of the Mormon church, who make up the predominant religious and cultural group in the state of Utah, provide a unique population in which to study family naming practices and the relationships that they represent. The importance of family life, characterized by traditional family values, is a main tenet of the Mormon faith. Furthermore, Mormons tend to have large families, providing parents with many opportunities to choose names for their children.

Statement of the Problem

Troll, Bengtson, and McFarland (1979) identified "interpersonal relationships among family members of different generations" (p. 127) as a significant target of family research. They lament, however, the lack of creativity employed in studies of those relationships, noting that most studies do not include more than two generations, rely on the information gained from only one family member, and are based on self-report data only. Schvaneveldt (1966a), in a study of nuclear and extended families, suggests that novel methods of inquiry may be used to good advantage in family study. In contrasting reports of family affiliations with empirical data related to family naming practices, Rossi (1965) established a relationship between intergenerational cohesion and naming patterns and thereby validated a novel approach: the study of naming patterns.

Historical studies of naming patterns in reconstituted families provide evidence for the existence of nuclear and extended family ties

(Cody, 1982, 1987; Dupaquier, 1981; Gutman, 1976; Logue, 1987, 1988; Rutman & Rutman, 1984; Smith, 1985; Tebbenhoff, 1985). However, they have not provided information regarding ongoing intergenerational family interactions. Furstenberg and Talvitie (1980) and Rossi (1965) have studied the relationship between the naming of children for kin and reports of kinship interaction patterns in samples of unrelated subjects. Tavuchis (1971) explored naming patterns and kinship ties among related subjects in a study of two generations of Greek-American families. However, an intergenerational study of more than two generations that relates naming patterns to kinship affiliations has not been addressed. Thus, the present study explored the relationships between intergenerational naming patterns and intergenerational family affiliations in three contiguous generations of northern Utah families.

Objectives

Several objectives were addressed in this research study. Mormons comprise the predominant religious and cultural group in northern Utah. Because of the emphasis placed on the importance of the family in this group, it is of interest to determine the following:

1. If any significant patterns exist in naming practices within this group;
2. If any differences exist in naming practices over generations;
3. The degree to which familial naming patterns are associated with self-reported emotional ties to family of origin and family of procreation; and
4. The degree to which familial naming patterns are associated with religiosity.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of names and naming patterns has followed related but divergent courses reflecting, in part, concepts described by Levi-Strauss (1962). Levi-Strauss suggested that names given to children result from a spontaneous act expressing the attitudes and values of the person naming the child or result from a process that identifies the child as a member of an already existing social structure. Naming research suggests that psychologists have focused their attention on the popularity of given names and the impact of given names on developing personalities, while social scientists, in general, and historians, in particular, have used descriptive studies to examine names and naming patterns as expressions of social and familial affiliations, attitudes, and beliefs. Taken together, findings from various disciplines are complementary and suggest that names and naming patterns are invested with meaning and reflect both individual and group values.

Psychological Literature

Although the present study focused on the relationship between naming patterns and kinship affiliations, a brief review of the psychological literature related to names and naming provides background that supports the general social science and historical findings.

As previously indicated, psychological research has examined the reasons for the popularity of some names over others. It has been hypothesized that name preferences follow cyclical trends (Colman, Hargreaves, & Sluckin, 1981; Hargreaves, Colman, & Sluckin, 1983) that

arise from a curvilinear relationship between familiarity and popularity. That is, very familiar or very unfamiliar names are less popular than names in the middle range of familiarity. The cycle occurs as popular names become more familiar and subsequently less popular.

Other psychological research suggests that name preferences are related both to the sex and age of those judging names and to whether the judged names are masculine or feminine. Finch, Kilgren, and Pratt (1944) found that groups of preadolescent children and older adults preferred common to uncommon names for both males and females, while male college students preferred common names and female college students preferred uncommon names, particularly for females.

Busse and Helfrich (1975) reached conclusions similar to those of Finch et al. in a cross sectional study of preadolescent and adolescent youth. Their findings revealed a shift in name preferences that occurred with the onset of adolescence in females and, once again, showed greater variability in preference for female names. However, while both studies described similar results, neither offered adequate explanations for their findings.

Social psychologists have studied names for their effect on personality development (Eagleson, 1946; Ellington, Marsh, & Critelli, 1980; Jahoda, 1954; McDavid & Harari, 1966; Savage & Wells, 1948). Morgan, O'Neill, and Harre (1979) maintain that names are rich in symbolic content and have life-long effects on personalities. Black female college students studied by Eagleson (1946) reported feelings of embarrassment or sensitivity related to their own disliked names, while similar students who liked their names related positive emotional and behavioral effects. Jahoda (1954) found that African children named

for weekdays developed personality traits culturally associated with those days. McDavid and Harari (1966) reported that popularity of specific children was positively related to the desirability of children's names. However, Savage and Wells (1948) found that persons with very unusual names were almost equally likely to demonstrate dysfunctional or superior personality organization. In later studies, undesirable first names were found to affect college students' judgments of physical attractiveness (Garwood et al., 1981) and elementary teachers' perceptions of students' self-concepts and abilities (Garwood, 1976; Harari & McDavid, 1973). The psychological literature, then, suggests that the popularity of specific names varies and that names can affect their bearer's personalities.

Social Science and Historical Literature

Early social scientific studies focused on the study of unusual versus traditional names in an attempt to explain population demographic characteristics. Chappell (1929) and Holmes (1930) described names given to black children and suggested that unusual names found in the population reflected ethnic roots and expressed aspirations for higher social class, prestige, or racial equality. However, Eagleson and Clifford (1945) found little difference in the representation of unusual names in groups of black and white female college students, implying that naming patterns in blacks and whites were similar in their use of traditional names. Taylor (1974) related the use of Junior and numerical suffixes to demographic variables, and he found that the practice was predominant on the eastern seaboard and varied over time with race and social class. Originally, a white upper-class phenomenon,

the practice was adopted by the white working class and blacks. The practice subsequently decreased among the white upper class.

Ethnographic naming literature focused on names and naming patterns as conveyors of information about social relationships and cultural values (Antoun, 1968; Bamberger, 1974; Beidelman, 1974; Brewer, 1981). Brewer (1981) concluded that the Bimanese naming system in Indonesia was a "cultural code" which yielded information about sex roles, life stages, and status. Bamberger (1974), in a study of the Kayapo' Indians of Central Brazil, found that naming practices reinforced kinship ties, particularly between brothers and sisters, and affected social status in succeeding generations. Shared names passed from grandparent to grandchild among the Kaguru of East Africa were thought to reinforce kinship affiliations between alternate generations (Beidelman, 1974).

Through descriptive studies, social scientists and historians have identified naming patterns as indicators of family relations and agreed that kin naming reinforces kinship ties, family commitments, and family obligations (Cody, 1982; Dupaquier, 1981; Furstenberg & Talvitie, 1980; Gutman, 1976; Rossi, 1965; Rutman & Rutman, 1984; Smith, 1985; Tavuchis, 1971; Tebbenhoff, 1985). In a pioneering study of naming patterns and kinship ties in middle-class families, Rossi (1965) studied naming patterns in unrelated families from the 1920s to the 1950s. She concluded that naming children for relatives symbolically reflected positive feelings between parents and specific kin. She found that most children were named for relatives; while the likelihood of being named for relatives remained constant over time, naming patterns changed to reflect social changes within the family. Rossi reasoned that boys, whose names remained constant throughout their lifetimes, as opposed to

girls, whose names were likely to change at marriage, perpetuated family names. However, the evidence showed that boys were increasingly named for maternal kin and girls were named for paternal kin. Rossi suggested this trend reflected increasing social symmetry between the two lineages.

Other trends reported by Rossi represented generational depth and the specific classification of the relatives for whom children were named. Children were typically named for relatives one or two generations removed (parent's and grandparent's generation). They were much more likely to be named for consanguineous relatives than relatives by marriage and more likely to be named for parents and grandparents than for aunts and uncles.

Rossi's findings have been supported by subsequent research, although specific naming patterns and evolutionary changes show some variations among groups, cultures, and historical periods. Naming patterns have been found to vary both with the sex of the child and the relative for whom the child is named. Male children are consistently named for relatives more often than are female children (Alford, 1988; Cody, 1982; Dupaquier, 1981; Furstenberg & Talvitie, 1980; Gutman, 1976; Rossi, 1965; Rutman & Rutman, 1984; Smith, 1985; Tavuchis, 1971; Tebbenhoff, 1985). While males have traditionally been named for paternal consanguineous kin and females have been named for maternal kin, this trend has not always been uniform. Smith (1985) suggested that religious beliefs in seventeenth-century Hingham, Massachusetts, led to increased use of Biblical names over family names and that the advent of middle names in the nineteenth century allowed families to incorporate names that reflected maternal lineages. Rossi (1965), in

her sample of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic families, and Tavuchis (1971), in his sample of Greek-American families, concur. They observed that contemporary American naming patterns that cross lineage boundaries reflect symmetrical family structures.

Conflicting definitions exist for naming patterns identified as a means of expressing generational depth (Alford, 1988; Cody, 1982, 1987; Dupaquier, 1981; Furstenburg & Talvitie, 1980; Gutman, 1976; Rossi, 1965; Rutman & Rutman, 1984; Smith, 1985; Tebbenhoff, 1985; Tavuchis, 1971). Rossi (1965) concluded that naming children for relatives in the parents' and grandparents' generation reflected the importance of the nuclear family while naming beyond grandparents reflected the importance of the extended family. Later studies by Smith (1985), Tebbenhoff (1985), Rutman and Rutman (1984), Cody (1982, 1987), Gutman (1976), and Tavuchis (1971) differed from Rossi (1965) in their interpretation of whether naming patterns reflected nuclear versus extended family ties. In a historical study of generational depth, Smith (1985) found evidence of the importance of nuclear family bonds in the naming of children for parents in seventeenth-century Hingham, Massachusetts. However, he interpreted naming children after immediate grandparents as evidence of the importance of the extended family. The use of grandparent, parent-sibling, and grandparent-sibling names as the source of children's names has been proposed as evidence of the importance of extended family cohesion by Tebbenhoff (1985), Rutman and Rutman (1984), Cody (1982), and Gutman (1976) rather than nuclear family cohesion as noted by Rossi. Cody (1987) examined the naming practices of one South Carolina slave-owning family with the naming practices of the slaves they owned. She found that the slave owners honored generational depth (i.e.,

extended family as defined by Rossi) by naming children for family members removed by as many as four generations (great-great-grandparents). The naming patterns practiced by the slaves reflected generational breadth where children were named most frequently for their grandparents or their aunts and uncles.

Family interaction patterns and involvement are thought to be associated with kin naming patterns. Rossi (1965) showed that families who named children for relatives had closer emotional ties to their extended families and interacted with them more often. Tension between generations was also reported to be less in those families (Rossi, 1965; Tavuchis, 1971). Furstenberg and Talvitie (1980) and Gutman (1976) presented evidence for the strength of nontraditional nuclear family ties in their studies of naming practices in unmarried contemporary black families and historical black slave families. In both groups, naming patterns were thought to reinforce fragile patrilineal and sibling ties. Furstenberg and Talvitie (1980) established that children who were named for their unmarried fathers maintained more contact with those fathers than did children who were not named for their fathers. Only one study exists that examined early Mormon naming patterns. Logue (1987, 1988) indicated that nineteenth-century Mormons in St. George, Utah, named their children most frequently for family members. He suggested this practice reflected that the importance of the family over the individual.

Birth order and religiosity have been found to be related to family naming patterns. First-born children are more likely to be named for kin, while later born children are more apt to be named for aesthetic reasons or for nonrelated others (Alford, 1988; Rossi, 1965; Rutman &

Rutman, 1984). Recently, Alford (1988) replicated the naming study by Rossi and found similar results. However, he added to his study an examination of first versus middle naming patterns and found that first names were more frequently selected for aesthetic reasons. Middle names were more frequently used as opportunities to name children after relatives.

Tavuchis (1971) reported that traditional Greek naming practices were heavily influenced by religious customs, while Smith (1985) stated that decreased religiosity was followed by increased kin naming in seventeenth-century Hingham.

The review of the literature dealing with naming patterns clearly supports the presence of a relationship between naming for kin and kinship affiliations. The psychological literature, in its concern with the desirability, cyclical nature, and gender differences in naming, echoes the findings of social scientists who report relationships across time, sex, culture, class, tradition, and religiosity. However, while study of family naming reveals trends and patterns, it relies almost exclusively on descriptive studies and does not statistically analyze the relationship of those naming patterns to an intergenerational process within families.

Conceptual Framework

Symbolic interaction is a viable framework through which family naming patterns may be productively studied. Symbolic interactionism, as described by Blumer (1969), rests on three premises: (a) Human beings act toward things based on the meanings those things hold; (b) The

meanings of things are derived from or arise out of social interaction; and (c) The meanings of things are interpreted by the individual.

Schvaneveldt (1966b) states that the symbolic interactionist is concerned with studying the internal processes within the family. In this framework, behaviors of family members are not interesting in and of themselves. Rather, it is the meaning attached to those behaviors that is of interest. Family naming practices and patterns are observable as behaviors. They are of interest, however, to the extent that they provide insight into the meanings those patterns hold for family members.

Rossi (1965) suggests that family naming practices reveal information about the meaning of kin relationships. In this sense, names are symbols of those relationships. Parents may or may not choose to name their children for relatives. Either choice requires that they make an active decision based on the meanings those symbols hold; choosing to name a child for a relative implies that the relationship is meaningful.

A review of the literature indicates that researchers found patterns in family naming practices. However, each of the studies only analyzed the proportion of subjects who did or did not fall within a certain category (e.g., naming for relatives vs other name sources). Before addressing the issues of symbolic interactionism, the key question is whether there is, in fact, a significant difference in naming practices. The first hypothesis in this study addresses the differences in naming practices.

Symbolic interactionism assumes that the family is a constantly changing unit. As family members interact, new elements are introduced

and, in response, family roles adjust. Changes in naming patterns and practices have been found to result from changes within the family (Cody, 1982, 1987; Logue, 1987, 1988; Rossi, 1965; Rutman & Rutman, 1984; Smith, 1985; Tebbenhoff, 1985). However, these premises have not been statistically confirmed. Hypothesis 2 tests the assertion that family naming practices mirror changes within the family over time.

The literature review has explored naming from the perspective of several disciplines. The common thread that runs through this literature, however, is the meaning that each discipline invests in names and naming. The psychological literature suggests that names are invested with meanings which may affect child development and perceptions about the child. Ethnological studies report that cultural values may be shared or expressed through meanings implied in naming practices. Historical studies offer evidence that naming patterns existed and changed in concert with social and economic developments. Students of the family propose that names imply meanings associated with family relationships.

In this study, it was hypothesized that naming children for relatives implies a closeness or kinship within the family. Hypothesis 3 (a,b) reflect this issue of closeness and naming practices by examining the degree or size of this relationship.

Religion is another way of expressing meaning and values. In the literature review conflicting results were found in the relationship between religiosity and naming practices (Logue, 1987, 1988; Smith, 1985). Since neither of these studies were statistically analyzed to support their claims, hypothesis 4 addresses the relationship between religiosity and naming children for relatives.

Hypotheses

The four hypotheses for this study are based on the objectives. The hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in naming practices in the sample of Mormon families.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in naming practices across generations.

Hypotheses 3a

There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of closeness to family of origin and naming of children for relatives.

Hypothesis 3b

There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of closeness to family of procreation and naming of children for relatives.

Hypothesis 4a

There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of perceived level of church activity and naming for relatives.

Hypothesis 4b

There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of church attendance and naming of children for relatives.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter presents the methods used to gather information about family naming patterns in a specific sub-population of families. The chapter also includes information about the way in which subjects were recruited for the study and a description of the survey instrument and study design. Finally, the data collection, data transformation, and data analyses procedures are described. Ethical considerations required for obtaining and storing data are summarized.

Sample

The sample consisted of the maternal members of three generations of 30 Mormon families whose geographical roots were in Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming. Each family was recruited through a married daughter. To be eligible for the study, the married daughter was required to have at least one child and have living and accessible by telephone her mother and maternal grandmother. Final participation in the study required that all three family members agreed to participate.

The sample was solicited through a combination of convenience and snowball sampling techniques and was not considered to be a representative sample of all Mormon families. Initially, undergraduate classes in Family and Human Development and Sociology at Utah State University were contacted. Volunteers meeting the eligibility requirements were requested to participate. Class members were asked for the names and phone numbers of friends or relatives who met the eligibility requirements. The remaining subjects were identified

through women who participated in the study and through coworkers of the author who were asked to volunteer names of additional potential participants.

Subjects were solicited for the study until 30 sets of families who met the eligibility requirements agreed to participate and completed the interview process. Subjects who were eligible for the study were highly cooperative and completed telephone interviews which ranged from 15 to 30 minutes in length. One eligible family was not included in the sample due to the illness of the grandmother who was not able to be interviewed.

Measurement

An interview survey instrument was devised to be administered to the maternal grandmother (first generation), mother (second generation), and married daughter (third generation) of each three-generation family. The purpose of the instrument was to gather descriptive information about naming practices in Mormon families and to measure the relationships between family naming patterns and intergenerational kinship affiliations and religiosity.

The instrument consisted of three sections. The first section was constructed in four subparts which asked for demographic information including education, occupation, year and place of birth, marriage, previous marriages, religious preference, and religiosity of the wife (Part 1) and of the husband (Part 2). Part 3 of the first section requested the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the subject's mother and grandmother for future contact; and Part 4 requested a list

of the first and middle names and dates of birth of children born to or adopted by the subject.

The second section of the survey was completed for each of the subjects' children. Beginning with the oldest child, the child was first identified by birth order and sex. Subjects were then asked to recall how they chose the particular child's first name. Subjects' responses were recorded and classified into one of the following categories: (a) relative, (b) maiden name, (c) friend, (d) nonrelated other, (e) place, (f) practical reason, and (g) other reason. Subjects were asked to recall who had suggested the name. The same questions were asked with regard to the child's middle name.

If a subject's responses indicated that the child was named for neither a friend or relative, no further questions were asked from Section 2. If, however, respondents indicated that the child was named for a friend or relative, the subject was asked to rate the closeness of her relationship to the friend or relative at the time of the child's birth and at the present time on a scale of 1-5. Subjects were asked to rate the closeness of the child's relationship to that person. Finally, subjects were asked whether the child had received or would receive any (a) special gifts, (b) inheritance from the person he or she was named and the nature of those gifts or inheritance, and (c) whether any special visiting relationship existed between the child and the person for whom the child was named.

Section 3 of the survey instrument recorded subjects' responses to questions about family visitation patterns during holidays and celebrations, and subjects' attitudes, traditions, and sentiment attached to names and naming.

Design

A telephone interview was employed to gather self-report information from the intergenerational sample. The instrument, a questionnaire containing both open-ended and close-ended questions, was designed to assess the relationships between naming patterns, intergenerational kinship ties, and religiosity.

The nature of the instrument was self-report and dealt with family history. It was assumed that all of the respondents, even those who were recalling events that took place 50 to 60 years prior to the interview, would remember information related to the sex, birth order, and number of children to whom they had given birth. It was also assumed that they would remember the details surrounding the naming of their children (Rossi, 1965; Alford, 1988). In fact, that assumption proved to be valid as there were no respondents who indicated that they did not know or did not remember how their children were named.

Validity and Reliability

A preliminary instrument was developed and administered to a convenience sample of three subjects. Following this administration, a revised open-ended and close-ended instrument was developed and presented to the candidate's graduate committee. In order to assure the instrument's face validity, each item in the survey was reviewed by the committee. Individual items were refined and incorporated into the final instruments or discarded if they did not conform to the purpose of the study. The survey instrument was pilot tested by the researcher who administered it in person or by telephone to 21 women who were the mothers of at least one child.

The final survey was administered by the researcher or by a paid "interviewer" who received \$3 for each interview completed. The interviewer was trained by the researcher to complete the telephone interview process. Training consisted of the researcher first administering the survey instrument to the interviewer in order to demonstrate the interview process. Using a speaker telephone, the researcher shadow scored the interviewer as she interviewed four subjects. Interrater reliability between the researcher and the interviewer ranged from .94 to .98. The mean interrater reliability was .97. All questionnaires completed by the interviewer were reviewed by the researcher. Where there were any questions regarding the information gathered, subjects were telephoned again and asked for clarification.

While the validity and reliability of an instrument is often difficult to fully assess, it was the conclusion that measurement used in this study was sufficiently stable and accurate to do this type of research. Also, demographic data, relational family contacts, and naming practices represent issues that are less difficult to assess in terms of validity and reliability than would be the case in complex attitude measurement.

Data Collection

The sample of married daughters was contacted initially in college classes or through subjects who had participated in the study. Potential subjects were telephoned, the nature of the study explained, and their participation requested. If the potential subjects agreed to

participate, they were interviewed immediately or scheduled for a time to be interviewed at their convenience.

During the telephone interviews, the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the married daughters' mothers and maternal grandmothers were obtained. These family members were contacted and their participation in the study was requested. Like the married children, these family members were either interviewed immediately or scheduled for more convenient appointments.

Data Transformation

The interview surveys were defined in a codebook prior to the interviews. Information gathered from completed surveys was transformed onto coding sheets and entered into a data file. All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSPC) computer program.

Data Analyses

Three statistical analyses were used to analyze the naming data. Descriptive statistics were used to examine the distribution of responses across each survey item. Because of the large number of response options in the survey instrument, many of the variables were recategorized into relevant groupings to avoid small cell sizes or empty cells during the analyses.

The survey data were tabulated as frequency of occurrence and required that non-parametric statistics be used. The Chi-square statistic and the contingency coefficient were selected as the most appropriate analysis techniques for these types of data. The Chi-square

statistic was used to determine whether the distribution of the frequencies were significantly different. The contingency coefficient was used to measure the magnitude of the relationship between two variables.

Multiple regression was used to examine the contribution of a number of variables in predicting the dependent variable, sources of children's names.

Ethical Considerations

This research used human subjects and was reviewed by the Utah State University Institutional Review Board. All participants were informed of the purpose of the study and the procedures involved, assured that they were free to withdraw from the research, and invited to ask questions at any time during the interviews. Potential risks included concern regarding release of family names; benefit was the increased understanding of intergeneration kinship affiliations that resulted from the study. Confidentiality was strictly observed.

The completed surveys were locked in files in the researcher's home. Data were stored on the computer. The researcher and her major professor had access to the data that were disseminated in this thesis and may be published in appropriate professional journals. All data are in a descriptive form on aggregate level and are not identifiable with a family or individual.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the analysis of data collected through the survey instrument. The chapter begins with a description of the demographic characteristics of the sample. The responses to the religiosity and family closeness items are then summarized. Sources of children's names and naming patterns are identified. Finally, the research hypotheses, results of data analyses, and additional findings are presented.

Subject Characteristics

Age of Subjects

The women fell into three fairly distinct age groups that reflected their membership in each generation. Table 1 presents the mean age for each group of women and their spouses.

Table 1

Age of Subjects

	Range	Mean Age	(N)
Grandmothers	63-99	76.84	(30)
Grandfathers	71-108*	81.23*	30
Mothers	43-73	51.13	(30)
Fathers	44-81	53.4*	30
Married Daughter	20-41	27.33	(30)
Husbands	21-43	29.66*	30

*Range and mean age reflected years since birth. Many of the grandfathers were deceased.

Birthplace

Almost all of the women were born in Utah, Idaho, or Wyoming (Table 2). Most of their husbands were from the same geographical areas. The exceptions were four grandfathers who were from North Carolina, Nebraska, Mexico, and Switzerland; three husbands of married daughters were from California.

Table 2

Birthplace

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Utah	21	21	24
Idaho	5	7	5
Missouri			1
California		1	
Wyoming	2	1	
S. Dakota	1		
Canada	1		

Education

The majority of women had completed high school. Husbands were more highly educated than their wives in the second and third generations; however, in the first generation, the education pattern was less clear. Across generations, educational attainment appeared to increase with successive generations (Table 3).

Table 3

Education

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
5-8 yrs	2		
9-11 yrs	4	2	
12 yr HS Grad	18	13	11
Voc Tech			2
1-3 yr Col	5	9	10
BA-BS Deg	4	7	
Graduate Work	1	2	
.....			
	Grandfather <u>n</u>	Father <u>n</u>	Husband <u>n</u>
5-8 yrs	5		
9-11 yrs	5		
12 yrs HS Grad	12	6	4
Voc Tech		1	3
1-3 yrs Col	3	9	11
BA-BS Deg	1	7	8
Graduate Work	3	7	4
Missing	1		

Occupation

Across the three generations, homemaking was the occupation most frequently reported by women (Table 4). However, the incidence of

Table 4

Occupation

	Married Child <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Grandmother <u>n</u>
Prof. Tech Manage	4	8	2
Clerical, Sales	7	6	
Homemaker	13	11	25
Student	3	1	
Service	1	2	2
Processing	1	1	
Miscellaneous	1	1	1
.....			
	Husband <u>n</u>	Father <u>n</u>	Grandfather <u>n</u>
Prof. Tech Manage	9	16	5
Clerical, Sales	5	3	2
Machine Trades	3	1	2
Structural Work	4	4	
Student	11		
Service		3	1
Farming		3	15
Miscellaneous	1		5

homemaking decreased by more than half between the first and second generations and then increased slightly in the third generation. Mothers and married daughters reported a greater variety of occupations than did grandmothers, and mothers reported the highest incidence of professional, technical, and managerial occupations.

Differences were even more apparent between generations in the occupations of the grandfathers, fathers, and husbands of married daughters. Half of the grandfathers reported that their occupation was farming. Like their wives, fathers reported the highest incidence of professional, technical, and managerial occupations. The largest group of husbands of married daughters were students. This finding may be related to sampling bias since some of the married daughters were identified through college classes.

Overall, the sample represented a predominantly middle-class population with agrarian roots. None of the women or their husbands was reported as unemployed.

Marital Status

The families in this sample presented a picture of marital stability. All of the subjects in each generation were married to the father of their first child at the time of that child's birth. Almost half of the grandmothers were still married to their first husbands at the time of the survey, and almost half were widows of their first husbands. The remaining grandmothers had remarried following the death of their first husbands (two subjects) or following divorce (one subject).

In the second generation, most mothers were still married to their first husbands, and two were divorced. Both mothers who were divorced had remarried; one subject remarried following the death of her first husband. All but one of the women in the married daughter generation were married; that subject was divorced.

Religious Preference

All of the subjects in each generation were selected because they were members of the Mormon church. As seen in Table 5, the overwhelming majority of these women were married to men who were also Mormon.

Table 5

Religious Preference

	Grandfather <u>n</u>	Father <u>n</u>	Husband <u>n</u>
Mormon	28	29	27
Catholic		1	
Other	1		
No Pref.	1		3

Family Size

Family size in this sample was stable across the first and second generations where childbearing years were essentially completed (see Table 6). The married daughter generation represented young families, many of whom were not yet finished bearing children.

Table 6

Family Size

	<u>n</u>	Range	\bar{x}
Grandmothers	153	1-10	5.10
Mothers	157	2-12	5.23
Married Daughters	59	1-5	1.97

Gender of Children

As seen in Table 7, there were more female than male children born to both grandmothers and mothers. The gender was evenly distributed among children of married daughters.

Table 7

Gender of Children by Generation

Married Daughters	Males (<u>n</u>)	Females (<u>n</u>)
Grandmothers	60	93
Mothers	65	92
Married Daughters	<u>31</u>	<u>28</u>
Total	156	213

Religiosity

In order to measure religiosity in this sample, respondents were asked to rate the level of their activity in the Mormon church (Table 8) and to estimate the frequency with which they attended church-related activities (Table 9). On a scale of 1-5, ranging from inactive to extremely active, the majority of the grandmothers, mothers, and married daughters perceived themselves as either highly or extremely active in church participation. Most of the women in each generation attended church one or more times each week.

Respondents were also asked to rate their husbands' level of church activity and frequency of church attendance. In each generation, husbands were perceived as having lower levels of church activity than

Table 8

Church Activity

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Inactive		1	2
Low Activity	4	1	1
Average	11	3	6
High	6	7	6
Extremely Active	9	18	15
.....			
	Grandfather <u>n</u>	Father <u>n</u>	Husband <u>n</u>
Inactive	1	6	4
Low Activity	3	2	1
Average	5	3	6
High	2	6	7
Extremely Active	3	9	12
Deceased or Missing Data	16	4	

Table 9

Church Frequency

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Never	1		2
Less than 1 x mo	3	1	
1-2 x mo.	5	2	5
1 x wk.	10	14	6
more than 1 x wk.	11	13	17
.....			
	Grandfather <u>n</u>	Father <u>n</u>	Husband <u>n</u>
Never	1	5	2
Less than 1 x mo.	3	2	1
1-2 x mo.		4	5
1 x wk.	7	6	11
more than 1 x wk.	3	9	11
Deceased or missing data	16	4	

their wives. Husbands in each generation also attended church slightly less often than their wives, although the majority of husbands attended church-related activities at least once a week.

Family Closeness

Subjects in the study were asked to rate the emotional closeness they felt to their family while they were growing up (family of origin) and to their family at the present time (family of procreation) on a

scale of 1-5 ranging from extremely distant to extremely close (Tables 10 and 11).

Table 10

Relationship to Family of Origin

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Extremely Distant			
Distant		1	1
Average	2	7	4
Close	12	12	13
Extremely Close	16	10	12

Table 11

Relationship to Family of Procreation

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Extremely Distant			
Distant			
Average	1		2
Close	12	16	11
Extremely Close	17	14	17

The overwhelming majority of the subjects in all three generations rated their relationship to their families of origin and to their present families as either close or extremely close, while none reported

being extremely distant. In each generation, subjects reported closer relationships to their families of procreation than to their families of origin.

Closeness if named for someone. Respondents in each generation were asked whether they were named after anyone and if they were, how close was the relationship between them and the person for whom they were named (Table 12). As Table 12 shows, most of the respondents were not named for anyone. Of those respondents who were named for someone, no response pattern was discernible.

Table 12

Close if You Were Named for Someone

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Extremely Distant	2	1	2
Distant	1	1	1
Neutral	2	1	1
Close		3	1
Extremely Close		3	2
Doesn't Apply	25	21	23

Families closer if children named for family. Each respondent was asked whether they thought that family relationships were closer in families where children were named for relatives. Potential responses were rated on a scale ranging from 5 (strongly yes) to 1 (strongly no). The majority of women in each generation responded that they thought there was no relationship or a neutral relationship between family closeness and naming children for relatives (see Table 13).

Table 13

Families Closer if Children Named for Family

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Strongly No			
No	16	16	18
Neutral	7	2	6
Yes	7	12	5
Strongly Yes			1

Naming Traditions

To elicit information about attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge about specific family naming practices, the respondents in each generation were asked whether naming traditions existed in their families. As seen in Table 14, the majority of the respondents reported they were not aware of the existence of any family naming traditions. Each respondent who did report the presence of a family naming tradition was questioned further about the exact naming tradition.

Table 14

Naming Traditions

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Yes	6	10	8
No	24	20	22

Of those grandmothers who reported naming traditions, all stated that family names were "passed down," a subtle expression of connectedness between past and present generations. One grandmother indicated that a second tradition existed in her family which was related to gender; boys were given two names, a first name and a middle name, while girls were only given a first name.

The majority of mothers who reported naming traditions stated that family names were passed down. Several mothers reported more specific traditions. One reported that all of her children were given names that started with the same letter. Three mothers reported gender-related traditions: sons were named after their fathers or they received names from the Bible.

Married daughters provided the most specific and varied responses when asked about family naming traditions. Most of the traditions they identified were related to the naming of sons. For example, one respondent reported that boys were given middle names after their fathers. Other respondents simply stated that boys were given their father's names. One tradition was related to birth order in which first sons were named after their fathers. Married daughters also identified traditions that expressed family connectedness across generations. They, too, reported that names were "passed down" and that middle names came from past generations.

Know How You Were Named

When asked if they knew from whence their own names came, there were differences across generations both in the proportion of respondents who had that knowledge and in the actual sources of names.

The majority of grandmothers, and almost half of the married daughters, did not know the source of their own names, while only one-third of the mothers did not have that knowledge (see Table 15).

Table 15

Know How You Were Named

	Grandmother <u>n</u>	Mother <u>n</u>	Married Daughter <u>n</u>
Relatives	5	11	4
Liked it	1	3	5
Friends	1	4	2
Other	3	2	5
Don't know	20	10	14

Gifts, Inheritance, Visiting

Gift giving, inheritance, and visiting patterns have been identified as indicators of kinship affiliations (Rossi, 1965). In this sample, however, very few of the respondents indicated that their children who were named for relatives received any special favors from, or spent more time with, the persons for whom they were named than did their children who were not named for an identified relative. When the respondents did indicate that there was a special gift, inheritance, or visiting relationship, the response was typically qualified by a statement to the effect that the relationship existed because of the child's birth order. The oldest child of the family, who was the most likely to be named for a relative, was also more likely to be identified as the recipient of an inheritance or to have the opportunity to

establish a special relationship with the person for whom he or she was named.

Holidays. Respondents were asked with whom they typically spent the following holidays: Easter, Thanksgiving, Christmas, Mother's Day, Father's Day, and Independence Day (Fourth of July), and family birthdays as an additional symbolic indicator of family closeness. The responses were categorized into immediate family, parents, children, and friends. The respondents in each generation reported spending virtually all celebration days with family members.

Name Sources for all Children

Mormon parents drew from a number of sources in selecting names for their children (Table 16). Most children, however, received the names of relatives as either a first or middle name. Other name sources included names selected for aesthetic reasons (liked it), names of friends, and a variety of additional sources including the names of presidents and movie stars, names from television and radio shows, "names picked from a

Table 16

Name Source Frequencies for All Children

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Relatives	200	54.2
Liked it	71	19.2
Friends	16	4.3
Other	<u>82</u>	<u>22.2</u>
	369	99.9*

* Total not equal to 100% due to rounding

hat," names chosen because they "went with a twin's name," names for months of the year, names from the Bible, and ethnic names.

When name sources for first and middle names were examined separately, differences in name sources were apparent (Table 17). First names were selected most frequently because parents liked them. In contrast, when children were actually given middle names, family names were the most frequent source. However over one-fourth of the children in the sample did not receive middle names.

Table 17

Name Source Origin for All Children

	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
First Name		
Relatives	71	19.2
Liked It	233	63.1
Friends	22	6.0
Other	43	11.7
Missing	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	369	100
Middle Name		
Relatives	165	44.7
Liked It	58	15.7
Friends	2	.5
Other	40	10.8
No Middle Name	<u>104</u>	<u>28.4</u>
Total	369	100.1*

*Total not equal to 100% due to rounding

Specific relatives for whom all children were named. The sample contained a core of relatives for whom most children were named. These relatives primarily included the child's father and mother and specific grandparents. Other relationships cited as name sources included siblings, cousins, aunts, and uncles of the child's mother or father. The children were named after a total of 19 different relationships. The most common relative for whom children were named was their father, naming for mothers was not a predominant practice.

Generational Depth

Sources of first names were almost evenly divided between names selected from one generation away and those selected from two generations away. The majority of middle names were selected from one generation away (see Table 18).

Table 18

Generational Depth--All Children

	First Name		Middle Name	
	(n)	%	(n)	%
1 Generation away (parents)	36	52.2	84	62.2
2 Generations away (grandparents)	30	43.5	49	36.3
3 Generations away (great grandparents)	3	4.3	2	1.5
Total	69	100	135	100

Name Sources by Gender

Specific naming patterns emerged in this sample that varied by gender. Boys received the names of relatives more frequently than did girls. This trend was apparent in the choice of first names and even more apparent in the choice of middle names (see Table 19).

Table 19

First and Middle Name Sources by Gender

	Boys		Girls	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
First Names				
Relatives	35	22.4	36	16.9
Liked it	105	67.3	128	60.1
Friends	2	1.2	20	9.4
Other	<u>14</u>	<u>9.0</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>13.6</u>
Total	156	99.9*	213	100
Middle Names				
Relatives	117	75.0	46	21.6
Liked it	26	16.7	35	16.6
Friends	0	0	3	1.4
Other	12	7.7	24	11.3
No Middle Name	<u>1</u>	<u>.6</u>	<u>105</u>	<u>49.3</u>
Total	156	100	213	100.2*

* Total not equal to 100% due to rounding.

For both boys and girls, specific first names were selected most often because the parents liked them. Relatives were the second most frequent source of first names for both boys and girls. Girls were given first names after friends more often than were boys.

As previously reported, on the whole, naming for a relative occurred more frequently in the choice of middle names than in the choice of first names. An examination of the selection of middle names by gender indicated that it was the practice of naming boys after relatives that accounted for that finding.

An additional category, "no middle name," was included as a source of middle names. The "no middle name" category occurred frequently for girls. When questioned about why they did not select middle names for their daughters, respondents typically stated that, "She doesn't need one," "Girls get married," "It would be too long," or "It's a hassle when you get married." Only one boy in the sample was not given a middle name.

Naming for paternal and maternal lineages. In this sample family names from both the paternal and maternal family lines were sources of first and middle names for children (Table 20). Overall, children were given paternal family names slightly more often than maternal names. Table 21 shows that while boys received more family names than girls, the proportion of boys named for paternal relatives is similar to the proportion of girls named for maternal relatives. This is particularly true for middle names.

Table 20

Naming for Paternal vs. Maternal Lineages

	First Names (<u>n</u>)	Middle Names (<u>n</u>)
Paternal	38	88
Maternal	<u>29</u>	<u>69</u>
Total	67	157

Table 21

Naming for Paternal vs. Maternal Lines by Gender

	First Names				Middle Names			
	Boys		Girls		Boys		Girls	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Paternal	24	68.6	14	43.8	74	65.5	14	31.8
Maternal	<u>11</u>	<u>31.4</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>56.3</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>34.5</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>68.2</u>
Total	35	100	32	100	113	100	44	100

*Total not equal to 100% due to rounding.

Research Hypotheses and Data Analyses

The preceding section described the characteristics of the sample, reported responses to the family closeness and religiosity items, and summarized family naming patterns. In the following section, findings from this study are presented for each hypothesis. Other related issues, previously cited in the review of the literature, were addressed in this study and are covered in the additional findings subsection.

As noted earlier, many items on the survey had a range of possible response options. Because of the spread of responses and small cell sizes, responses were recoded for the analyses. The dependent variable, source of children's names, was recoded into two discrete categories: (a) child named for a relative, and (b) child named for other source.

Objective 1

To determine whether any differences exist in naming practices within this group.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference in naming practices in this sample.

The null hypothesis was tested using a Chi-square test of significance (Table 22). The analysis showed a non-significant difference between the number of children who were named for relatives and those who were named for other sources. This result indicates that although the percentage of children named for relatives was higher than the percentage named for other sources, the difference was not large enough to be meaningful.

Table 22

Test of Significance for Source of Children's Names

	<u>n</u>	%
Named for Relative	200	54.2
Named for Other	169	45.8

χ^2 test of significance = 2.60
P = .11

Objective 2

To determine if any differences exist in naming practices across generations.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference in naming practices across generations.

Table 23 shows that the Chi-square test of statistical significance resulted in no significant differences in naming children for relatives versus naming children for other sources across the three generations. The proportion of responses was consistent across generations as well as between the named for relative and named for other source categories.

Table 23

Analysis of Source of Children's Names Across Generation

Generation	Relative <u>n</u>	Other <u>n</u>	Row Total
Grandmother	85	68	153 41.5%
Mother	80	77	157 42.5%
Married Daughter	35	24	59 16.0%
Column Total	200 54.2%	169 45.8%	369 100%

χ^2 test of significance = 1.40
 $P = .50$

Objective 3

To determine the degree to which family naming patterns are associated with self-reported emotional ties to the family of origin and the family of procreation.

Hypothesis 3a. There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of closeness to the family of origin and naming of children for relatives.

Hypothesis 3b. There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of closeness to the family of procreation and naming of children for relatives.

To evaluate these hypotheses, contingency coefficients (C) were used to analyze the relationship of each of the kinship affiliation items with the variable "source of children's names." The coefficients and their probability levels are reported in Table 24. The data collected in this study supported Hypothesis 3a. No relationship existed between closeness to the family of origin and naming children for relatives. The null hypothesis was, however, rejected for Hypothesis 3b. Closeness to the family of procreation was significantly related to the naming of children for relatives. However, the contingency coefficients explained less than two percent of the variation in naming.

Objective 4

To determine the degree to which familial naming patterns are associated with religiosity in this population.

Hypothesis 4a. There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of perceived level of church activity and naming of children for relatives.

Table 24

Analysis of the Relationship Between Sources of Children's Names and Kinship Affiliations

	Named for Relatives	Named for Others	Row Total
<i>A. Closeness to Family of Origin</i>			
Extremely Distant to Average	31	22	53 14.4
Close	91	72	163 44.2
Extremely Close	78	75	153 41.5
Column	200	169	369
Total	54.2	45.8	100.0

Contingency Coefficient .06 $P = .55$

B. Closeness to Family of Procreation

Extremely Distant to Average	5		5 1.4
Close	104	77	181 49.1
Extremely Close	91	92	183 49.6
Column	200	169	369
Total	54.2	45.8	100.0

Contingency Coefficient is .13 $P = .04$

Hypothesis 4b. There is no significant relationship between subjects' ratings of church attendance and naming of children for relatives.

Religiosity was defined by two items in the survey; perceived level of church activity and frequency of church attendance. Under each of the religiosity variables, both wives' and husbands' levels of church activity and frequency of church attendance were examined. Contingency coefficients were used to estimate the degree of the relationship between each of the variables and the sources of children's names. The null hypotheses were rejected for both Hypothesis 4a and Hypothesis 4b. Significant relationships were found to exist between each of the religiosity variables for both husbands and wives and sources of children's names (Table 25). Further examination of the distribution of responses across all four variables revealed an inverse trend. That is, as the degree of religiosity increased (more than once a week), children were named less often for a relative.

Additional Findings

The Chi-square test of significance was used to evaluate the relationship between the gender of child and naming of children for relatives. A significant relationship was found to exist between the variables (Table 26). The distribution of responses indicated that boys were more likely to be named for relatives than were girls.

Multiple regression was conducted on the closeness variables, the wife's religiosity variables, and selected demographic variables to determine which of these contributed most heavily to the dependent variable, sources of children's names. The items on husband's

Table 25

Analyses of the Relationship Between Sources of Children's Names and Religiosity

	Named for Relative	Named for Other	Row Total
A. Frequency of Church Attendance			
Wife			
Never to Twice per Month	42	24	66 17.9
Once per Week	85	56	141 38.2
More Than Once Per Week	73	89	162 43.9
Column Total	200 54.2	169 45.8	369 100.0
<i>Contingency Coefficient .16 $P = .007$</i>			
Husband			
Never to Twice per month	45	30	75 28.2
Once per Week	59	39	98 36.8
More Than Once per Week	40	53	93 35.0
Column Total	144 54.1	122 45.9	266 100.0
<i>Contingency Coefficient .16 $P = .03$</i>			

(continued)

Table 25 (continued)

Analyses of the Relationship Between Sources of Children's Names and Religiosity

	Named for Relative	Named for Other	Row Total
B. Church Activity			
Wife			
Inactive to Average Activity	68	41	109 29.5
High Activity	47	36	85 22.5
Extremely High Activity	85	92	177 48.0
Column Total	200 54.2	169 45.8	369 100.0
<i>Contingency Coefficient .13 $P = .05$</i>			
Husband			
Inactive to Average Activity	66	43	109 41.0
High Activity	39	22	61 22.9
Extremely High Activity	39	57	96 36.1
Column Total	144 54.1	122 45.9	266 100.0
<i>Contingency Coefficient .20 $P = .003$</i>			

Table 26

Gender of Child

	Named for Relatives	Named for Other Source
Males	124	34
Females	76	135

$$\chi^2 = 65.6 \quad p = .000$$

$$\text{Contingency coefficient} = .39 \quad p = .000$$

religiosity were not included in the regression analysis since data were unavailable for deceased husbands. Including husbands in the regression would have eliminated many of the children of first-generation respondents. A stepwise regression analysis resulted in four variables remaining in the regression equation. Gender of the child was found to contribute most heavily to whether children were named for relatives ($r = -.44$). Wife's frequency of church attendance ($r = -.11$), the birth order of the child ($r = -.14$), and the respondent's closeness to the family of procreation ($r = 0.11$) were included in the final regression equation in the order given. The final multiple R was .48, with an f value of .47 ($p = .000$). Each of the variables resulted in a negative relationship with source of children's names. Gender of child and source of children's names yielded the strongest, albeit negative, contribution to predicting whether children were named after a relative. It should be noted that males were coded (1) and females (2). Naming for relative was coded (1), naming for other source was coded (0).

Thus, more boys (code 1) were named for relatives (code 1) than for other sources.

The multiple regression analysis suggests that a child is more likely to be named for relatives if the child is a boy whose mother attends church less often than is the norm in this sample, who is also early in birth order, and whose mother is less closer to her children than is the norm for the sample.

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The study of naming practices has captured the interest of researchers in a variety of related disciplines. Studies of names and naming have led to a body of literature suggesting that naming practices are infused with meaning and reflect emotional ties between family members.

The present study examined four research hypotheses related to naming practices in an intergenerational sample of Mormon women. The results of the study indicated that there were no significant differences in naming practices in this group. Although more children were named for relatives than for other sources, the difference was not significant. Naming practices were also found to be similar across generations. That is, the pattern of naming children for relatives or for other sources did not change significantly across the three generations.

The analyses of the relationship between family closeness and naming showed that there was no significant relationship between closeness to the family of origin and naming for family members. However, closeness to the family of procreation was found to be inversely related to naming for relatives. Mothers who reported lesser closeness to their family of procreation were most apt to have children named for relatives.

Both of the religiosity items, level of church activity and frequency of church attendance, for both husbands and wives, were found

to be inversely related to naming children for relatives. Mothers who rated themselves and their husbands as being involved in church activity to a lesser degree and attending church less often were more likely to have children named for relatives.

Further data analyses revealed that child gender was the factor that contributed most heavily to whether children were named for relatives. Boys were more likely than girls to be named for relatives. Other factors were found to be inversely related to naming for relatives. These included the frequency of church attendance by the wife, the child's birth order, and the closeness of the wife to her family of procreation. A discussion of each of the research findings follows.

Discussion

The finding that no difference existed in naming practices was somewhat surprising in view of the naming literature. Both Rossi (1965) and Alford (1988) reported that more children in their samples were named for relatives than were named for other sources. Chi-square tests of significance computed for Rossi's and Alford's total samples indicated that the differences in those samples were indeed significant ($p = .000$ and $.004$, respectively).

Two possible factors may explain the lack of difference in the Mormon sample. The naming literature (Alford, 1988; Rossi, 1965) reported that boys were named for relatives more frequently than were girls. Although neither Rossi (1965) or Alford (1988) reported the gender distributions in their samples, it was assumed that boys and girls were evenly distributed. While boys were also named for relatives

more often in the Mormon sample, there were significantly more girls than boys in two of the three generations. Had there been a more equal gender distribution, the between category difference may have proven significant.

A second factor which may have influenced the results of the first analysis was the lack of middle names given to girls. While only the Rossi (1965) and Alford (1988) studies looked at middle names specifically, both found that naming for relatives occurred most often in the middle name position. Alford (personal communication, 1991) also reported that only 11% of his sample did not have middle names. In the Mormon sample, half of the girls did not receive middle names and thereby lost that opportunity to be named for relatives. Respondents frequently indicated that girls were not given middle names because of the expectation that they would not "need them" when they married. In a sense, girls who were not "given" middle names at birth "received" family names at marriage when they retained their maiden names. If "no middle name" was interpreted as a symbol of a family name, the incidence of naming for relatives would have increased slightly.

The examination of name sources across generations revealed that the proportion of children named for relatives and those named for other sources remained stable from generation to generation in the Mormon sample. This finding was difficult to compare to the naming literature since previous naming studies presented only descriptive information. However, Rossi (1965), Logue (1987, 1988), Smith (1985), Rutman and Rutman (1984), Tebbenhoff (1987), and Cody (1982, 1987) all reported changes in naming practices over time. While the contradictory findings in the Mormon sample suggest that changes in naming practices were not

occurring, the changes may occur too slowly or too subtly to be captured in the analyses that were used.

The changes in naming practices described by Logue (1987, 1988) occurred in a historical period of total upheaval for the Mormon people. They dramatically left behind family and traditions in their move to Utah, and, once settled, they concentrated on building new families and establishing new traditions. Changes in naming practices occurred almost overnight and they occurred along with significant changes in family circumstances.

In contrast, Mormon families living in twentieth-century Utah experience a period of relative stability. They live closely surrounded by their families in a culture that reinforces their traditional values. In this atmosphere, changes in naming patterns may occur too slowly to be readily detected over a three-generational research design.

The kinds of changes that occur over time in this population may also be too subtle to measure easily. Logue (1987) described impressive increases over time in the proportion of children, particularly boys, who were named for family members in nineteenth-century St. George. Logue's research, however, was limited to the study of first names. If his findings were compared to the first names found in this Mormon sample, it would be concluded that naming for relatives had decreased in the ensuing century. Actually, while a shift did occur, it was a shift toward using middle names to name children for family members rather than an overall shift away from naming for relatives.

A similar, less noticeable phenomenon may be operating in the present sample. For example, a simple frequency count of maiden names used as name sources in each generation revealed a shift in naming

patterns. Maternal maiden names were given to 17 boys by the grandmothers, to 8 boys by the mothers, and to none of the sons of married daughters. This trend away from naming sons for maternal maiden names was not detected, however, in the overall analysis of naming children across generations. It would not be surprising if other similar subtle changes in naming practices also occurred.

Disappointingly, this study offered little evidence to support a relationship between family naming patterns and intergenerational kinship ties. Previous investigators of family naming practices (Tavuchis, 1971; Rossi, 1965; Furstenburg & Talvitie, 1980) have asserted that naming children for relatives reinforces kinship ties and makes statements about the importance of specific family relationships. In this sample, three generations of Mormon women who predominantly reported close emotional ties with both their families of origin and their families of procreation did not necessarily name their children for relatives.

In the Mormon culture, there is an expectation that children will grow up to marry and have families. There also appears to be an expectation that these families will be happy. Close relationships between family members are expected. It is possible that women reported closer relationships with their families than actually existed because they believed that closer relationships were more desirable. Inflated responses may have obscured the actual relationship between naming for relatives and closeness to family.

The relationship between religiosity and the sources of childrens' names was examined last and produced findings that supported data reported by Smith (1985). Families who rated themselves higher on the

religiosity scales in this Mormon sample tended to report less naming of children for relatives. Smith (1985) found that naming children after family members increased in Hingham, Massachusetts, when religiosity decreased as a social influence.

On the other hand, Logue (1987, 1988, & personal communication, 1988) found that families increasingly named their children for relatives as religious traditions were developed and established in a pioneer Mormon community. Logue suggested that increased naming of children for family members reflected the importance of the family over that of individual family members.

In the present Mormon sample, children, especially boys, typically received first names for aesthetic reasons and middle names for relatives. This practice allowed families to honor the family, respect the values of the Mormon church, and still demonstrate regard for the individual child. The practice of shifting the family name to the secondary position may provide evidence that contemporary Mormon parents are comfortable in balancing the roles of the family and church while encouraging the development of the individual.

Conclusions

Previous naming research has repeatedly stated that the practice of naming children for family members reflects the importance of kinship affiliations. While the findings of this study did little to support those assertions, it may still add some contribution to the study of family naming practices. To date, naming research has relied almost exclusively on the presentation of frequency data to support assertions of the relationship between naming for relatives and family

connectedness. The present study has added the use of tests of statistical significance to examine those relationships.

Limitations

The primary limitations of this study were related to the sample and its selection. Individuals were included in the sample because they met specific criteria. Those criteria insured that certain variables, such as sex and religion, were controlled and allowed for meaningful comparisons to be made within the group. However, the uniformity of the sample means that generalizing the findings from this study to other populations is problematic.

Recommendations

Several of the findings from this study were particularly intriguing and deserve further attention. First, the inverse relationships between the dependent variable for relatives and the independent variable religiosity and closeness to family of procreation should be explored in greater detail. Based on the previous literature these relationships were somewhat unexpected. Further studies are needed to learn whether these relationships are consistent in other samples and whether there is any causal relationship between these variables. Replicating the study with less homogeneous samples may provide insight into these questions.

A second finding which was only dealt with descriptively in this study concerned the implications of the use of, or lack of, middle names among girls in this sample. Middle names have received scant attention in the naming literature. However, since they are used more often than

first names in naming children after relatives, a clearer understanding of their use and meaning is needed. Finally, a methodological consideration is recommended.

This study employed a fairly structured and lengthy telephone survey to gather information about issues that were identified in the literature as being related to naming patterns. However, in some instances, respondents supplied information that was relevant to the understanding of naming practices, but was not included in the survey and subsequently was not included in the data analyses. Future researchers who study naming practices may consider using a shorter and less structured questionnaire to gather specific information. In short, more emphasis should be placed on obtaining information that the respondents identify as meaningful to them as they select names for their children.

REFERENCES

- Alford, R. D. (1988). Naming and Identity: A cross-cultural study of personal naming practices. New Haven, CT: HRAF Press.
- Antoun, R. T. (1968). On the significance of names in an Arab village. Ethnology, 7, 158-170.
- Bamberger, J. (1974). Naming and the transmission of status in a central Brazilian society. Ethnology, 13, 363-378.
- Beidelman, T. O. (1974). Kaguru names and naming. Journal of Anthropological Research, 30, 281-293.
- Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brewer, J. D. (1981). Bimane personal names: Meaning and use. Ethnology, 20, 203-215.
- Busse, T. V., & Helfrich, J. (1975). Changes in first name popularity across grades. Journal of Psychology, 89, 281-283.
- Chappell, N. (1929). Negro names. American Speech, 4(4), 272-275.
- Cody, C. (1982). Naming, kinship, and estate dispersal: Notes on slave family life on a South Carolina plantation, 1786-1833. William and Mary Quarterly, 39, 192-211.
- Cody, C. A. (1987). The was no "Absalom" on the Ball Plantations: Slave-naming practices in the South Carolina low country, 1720-1865. Journal of Social History, 92, 563-596.
- Colman, A. M., Hargreaves, D. J., & Sluckin, W. (1981). Preferences for Christian names as a function of their experienced familiarity. British Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 3-5.

- Dupaquier, J. (1981). Naming-practices, godparenthood, and kinship in the vexin, 1540-1900. Journal of Family History, 6, 135-155.
- Eagleson, O. W., & Clifford, A. D. (1945). A comparative study of the names of white and negro women college students. Journal of Social Psychology, 21, 57-64.
- Eagleson, O. W. (1946). Students' reactions to their given-names. Journal of Social Psychology, 23, 187-195.
- Ellington, J. E., Marsh, L. A., & Critelli, J. W. (1980). Personality characteristics of women with masculine names. Journal of Social Psychology, 111, 211-218.
- Finch, M., Kilgren, H., & Pratt, K. C. (1944). The relation of first name preference to age of judges or of different although overlapping generations. Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 249-264.
- Furstenberg, F. F., & Talvitie, K. G. (1980). Children's names and paternal claims. Journal of Family Issues, 1(1), 31-57.
- Garwood, S. G. (1976). First-name stereotypes as a factor in self-concept and school achievement. Journal of Educational Psychology, 68, 482-487.
- Garwood, S. G., Baer, S., Levine, D., Carrol, S., & O'Neal, E. (1981). Sex-role expectations of socially desirable first names. Sex Roles 7(3), 257-262.
- Gutman, H. G. (1976). The black family in slavery and freedom, 1750-1925, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Harari, H., & McDavid, J. W. (1973) Name stereotypes and teachers' expectations. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 222-225.
- Hargreaves, D. J., Colman, A. M., & Sluckin, W. (1983). The attractiveness of names. Human Relations, 36, 393-402.

- Holmes, U. T. (1930). A study in Negro omniastics. American Speech, 5, 463-467.
- Jahoda, G. (1954). A note on Ashanti names and their relationship to personality. British Journal of Psychology, 45, 192-195.
- Levi-Strauss, C. (1962). The savage mind. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Logue, L. M. (1987). Modernization arrested: Child naming and the family in a Utah town. Journal of American History, 74, 131-138.
- Logue, L. M. (1988). A sermon in the desert: Belief and behavior in early St. George, Utah. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- McDavid, J. W., & Harari, H. (1966). Stereotyping of names and popularity in grade-school children. Child Development, 37, 453-459.
- Morgan, J., O'Neill, C., & Harre, R. (1979). Nicknames: Their origins and social consequences, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Rossi, A. S. (1965). Naming children in middle-class families. American Sociological Review, 30, 499-513.
- Rutman, D. B., & Rutman, A. H. (1984). A place in time explicatus. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Savage, B. M., & Wells, F. L. (1948). A note on the singularity of names. Journal of Social Psychology, 27, 271-272.
- Schvaneveldt, J. D. (1966a). The nuclear and extended family as reflected in autobiographical dedications: A comparative study. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 495-497.

- Schvaneveldt, J. D. (1966b). The interactional framework in the study of the family. In F. I. Nye, & F. M. Bernardo (Eds.), Emerging conceptual frameworks in family analysis (pp. 97-129). New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Smith, D. S. (1985). Child-naming practices, kinship ties, and change in family attitudes in Hingham, Massachusetts, 1641 to 1880. Journal of Social History, 18(4), 541-564.
- Tavuchis, N. (1971). Naming patterns and kinship among Greeks. Ethnos, 36, 152-162.
- Taylor, R. (1974). John Doe, Jr.: A study of his distribution in space, time, and the social structure. Social Forces, 53, 11-21.
- Tebbenhoff, E. H. (1985). Tacit rules and hidden family structures: Naming practices and Godparentage in Schenectady, New York 1680-1800. Journal of Social History, 18(4), 567-585.
- Troll, L., Bengtson, V., & McFarland, D. (1979). Generations in the family. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family: Vol. 1. Research based theories (pp. 127-161). New York: The Free Press.

APPENDIX
FAMILY NAMING PATTERNS SURVEY

Family Naming Patterns

- _____ ID#
1. What is your name? _____
 2. What year were you born? _____
 3. Where were you born? _____
 City County State
 4. What is your occupation? _____
 5. What is the highest education you have completed? _____
 6. What is your current marital status? Are you:
 1. married
 2. single (never married)
 3. divorced
 4. separated
 5. widowed
 6. other
 7. Where were you married? _____
 City County State
 8. When were you married? _____
 9. If you were to describe the relationships in the family you grew up in, would you say that they were:
 1. extremely distant
 2. distant
 3. average
 4. close
 5. extremely close
 10. If you were to describe the relationships in the family you have now, would you say that they are:
 1. extremely distant
 2. distant
 3. average
 4. close
 5. extremely close
 11. How active are you in church at this time?
 1. inactive
 2. low activity
 3. average activity
 4. high activity
 5. extremely active
 12. About how often do you attend religious services?
 1. never
 2. less than once a month
 3. once or twice a month
 4. once a week
 5. more than once a week

Approximately how far do you live from your:

		Less than 1 mile	1-10 miles	11-50 miles	51-100 miles	101-250 miles	more than 250 miles	Doesn't apply
13.	Children	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
14.	Mother & Father	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
15.	Mother's parents	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Part 2: General Information About Your Children's Father

What is his name? _____

16. What year was he born? _____

17. Where was he born? _____
City County State

18. What is his occupation? _____

19. What is the highest education he has completed? _____

20. What is his current marital status?

1. married
2. single (never married)
3. divorced
4. separated
5. widowed
6. other

21. What is his religious preference?

1. LDS
2. Protestant
3. Catholic
4. Jewish
5. Other
6. No preference

22. How active is he is church at this time?

1. inactive
2. Low activity
3. average activity
4. high activity
5. extremely active

23. About how often does he attend church services and/or activities?

1. never
2. less than once a month
3. once or twice a month
4. once a week
5. more than once a week

24. Approximately how far do you live from your husband's parents?

1. Less than 1 mile
2. 1-10 miles
3. 11-50 miles
4. 51-100 miles
5. 101-250 miles
6. more than 250 miles

1. In general, do you believe that families are closer when children are named for relatives?

1. strongly no
2. no
3. neutral
4. yes
5. strongly yes

2. Do you know how your name was chosen?

2a. Explanation

1. relative _____
2. maiden name _____
3. friend _____
4. non-related other _____
5. place _____
6. practical reasons _____
7. other reasons _____
8. don't know _____

3. If you were named after a person, what is your relationship to that person?

1. extremely distant
2. distant
3. neutral
4. close
5. extremely close

4. Does your family have any traditions associated with naming children? For example, is there a name that has been passed down for several generations or do all of the children share the mother's maiden name?

1. yes
2. no

If yes, what are those traditions?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Who do you most often share the following holidays or celebrations with?

	Inmed. Family	Hus- band's Family	Wife's Family	Both Families	Daugh- ter's Family	Son's Family	Friends	Other
5. Christmas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Thanksgiving	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Easter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. 4th of July	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Children's B-day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Husband's B-day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Wife's B-day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Mother's Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Father's Day	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Would you like to know about results of this study?

1. yes
2. no

Part 3: List of Children

	First Name	Middle Name	Sex	Year of Birth	If Deceased age at death	Is this child from husband's previous marriage?	Is this child from wife's previous marriage?
Child #1	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #2	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #3	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #4	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #5	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #6	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #7	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #8	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #9	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____
Child #10	_____	_____	___	_____	_____	_____	_____

Section II

Questions in this section ask how and why you chose first and middle names for each of your children.

1. Child # _____
2. Is this child a:
 1. boy
 2. girl
3. How did you choose _____ first name?

3a. Explanation

1. relative _____
 2. maiden name _____
 3. friend _____
 4. non-related other _____
 5. place _____
 6. practical reason _____
 7. other reason _____
4. Which parent suggested the name?
 1. father
 2. mother
 3. both
 5. How did you choose _____ middle name?

5a. Explanation

1. relative _____
 2. maiden name _____
 3. friend _____
 4. non-related other _____
 5. place _____
 6. practical reason _____
 7. other reasons _____
6. Which parent suggested the name?
 1. father
 2. mother
 3. both

Some people are very happy with the names they have chosen their children and some wish they had chosen other names. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied:

		Very Dissatisfied	Not Satisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied
7.	How satisfied are you with this child's first name?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	How satisfied are you with this child's middle name?	1	2	3	4	5
9.	How satisfied is this child with his/her first name?	1	2	3	4	5
10.	How satisfied is this child with his/her middle name?	1	2	3	4	5

		Not At All Close	Not Close	Neutral	Somewhat Close	Very Close	Doesn't Apply
11.	How close is your child to the person he/she was name after?	1	2	3	4	5	6
12.	How close were you to that person at the time of your child's birth?	1	2	3	4	5	6
13.	How close are you to that person now?	1	2	3	4	5	6

14. Does this child exchange special gifts with the person for whom he/she was named?

10a. Explanation

1. Yes _____
2. no _____
3. don't know _____
4. doesn't apply _____

15. Has or will this child receive an special inheritance, money or assistance from the person for whom he/she was named?

11a. Explanation

1. yes _____
2. no _____
3. don't know _____
4. doesn't apply _____

16. Does this child have any special visiting relationship with the person for whom he/she was named?

12a. Explanation

1. yes _____
2. no _____
3. don't know _____
4. doesn't apply _____