

# **From Hasan to Herbert: Name-Giving Patterns of Immigrant Parents between Acculturation and Ethnic Maintenance<sup>1</sup>**

Jürgen Gerhards and Silke Hans  
*Freie Universität Berlin*

Names often indicate belonging to a certain ethnic group. When immigrant parents choose a first name for their child that is common in their host society, they show a high degree of acculturation. In contrast, selecting a name common only in the parents' country of origin indicates ethnic maintenance. Using data from the German Socio-economic Panel for Turkish, Southwest European, and former Yugoslav immigrants, the authors show that acculturation in terms of name giving depends on several factors: the cultural boundary between the country of origin and the host society, the parents' sociostructural integration in terms of education and citizenship, interethnic networks, and religious affiliation.

## **FIRST NAMES AS AN INDICATOR OF ASSIMILATION AND A MARKER OF SOCIAL IDENTITY**

Every newborn child receives a name. The combination of that newborn's first and last names serves as a marker of identity both for the child and for those with whom he or she interacts. Take gender, for example: we assume that a letter or an article by a person named Peter, John, or Doug has been written by a male purely on the basis of our previous experiences, even if we have never met the author face-to-face. Gender classification has far-reaching social consequences, in that certain behavioral expectations are tied to gender that can become possible sources of discrimi-

<sup>1</sup> We would like to thank Nikolai Genov, who helped us code names from the former Yugoslavia, Gert Wagner from the German Institute for Economic Research (DIW) for his helpful commentary, Joanna Schenke for her translation of the manuscript, and above all Denis Huschka, who prepared the data set in a project financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG) (see Huschka, Gerhards, and Wagner 2005). Direct correspondence to Jürgen Gerhards, Institut für Soziologie, Freie Universität Berlin, Garystraße 55, 13195 Berlin, Germany. E-mail: gerhards@zedat.fu-berlin.de

nation. Names can also label someone as belonging to a certain ethnic group within a society. Ethnic groups both segregate themselves by using names unique to their community and acculturate themselves by choosing names typical in the host society. This can occur either voluntarily or by force. There are many examples of all four scenarios throughout history.

An example of *forced acculturation* was when the Bulgarian government forced the Turkish minority to adopt Slavic names in 1986. The Turkish government has also used policies of forced acculturation with its minorities. The Turkish constitution forbade the use of the Kurdish language from 1983 to 2002, which meant that Kurdish parents had to give their children Turkish names. This excluded all names with the letters *q*, *w*, and *x*, which are not part of the Turkish alphabet.

The best-known example of *forced segregation* comes from German history. In a 1937 decree, all ethnic Germans were asked to choose German names for their children (Grethlein 1994). In a 1938 law, Jews were limited to Jewish names only; all Jewish men with German first names were to add "Israel," and all Jewish women with German first names were to add "Sara," so that they could be clearly recognized as Jews.

Oftentimes, ethnic groups voluntarily give up their traditional first names and adopt names of the dominant ethnic group without state intervention. There are multiple examples of such *voluntary acculturation* processes (Weitman 1987; Watkins and London 1994). Jewish names had already been stigmatized in Germany long before the time of National Socialism. Jews who wanted to avoid discrimination and assimilate to the German culture often used German first names and filed applications to formally change their last names (Bering 1987, 1992; Lieberson 2000, p. 211; Beck-Gernsheim 2002). In another example, Kang (1971) shows that 36.2% of the Chinese students at the University of Michigan gave up their original Chinese names and replaced them with American ones. Kang finds that students who anglicized their names were better integrated into American society. Lieberson (2000) analyzes the degree of acculturation in terms of various U.S. immigrant groups' use of typical American names. He finds that Chinese, Japanese, and Korean immigrants, although their languages are not even vaguely related to English, adopt American names at a "stunningly rapid pace." More recently, Sue and Telles (2007) find gender differences in the naming habits of Hispanic parents in California, which they relate to different expectations for sons versus daughters in terms of assimilation and maintaining traditional identity.

In opposition to the standard theory of assimilation, the theory of "segmented assimilation" (Portes and Zhou 1993) starts from the assumption that immigrants today are confronted with a pluralistic, fragmented environment that offers different opportunities for different groups (Portes,

Fernández-Kelly, and Haller 2005). In addition to assimilation to the societal mainstream, ethnic maintenance is another possible trajectory. This also holds true for first names. African-American names provide an example of such *voluntary ethnic maintenance*, or *voluntary segregation*. Since 1960, African-Americans have increasingly chosen names to express their black identity both to themselves and to others. These names have become an expression of a new “African-American nationalism” (Lieberson and Mikelson 1995, p. 933; Fryer and Levitt 2004). Voluntary segregation can also be a strategy of the majority ethnic group. London and Morgan (1994) show that in the early 20th century, whites distanced themselves from African-Americans by choosing particularly “white” names.

In this article, we investigate the names that immigrants living in Germany give to their children. Of the aforementioned four scenarios of acculturation and segregation, the two voluntary types are the only types relevant in present-day Germany, as the state does not force parents to choose certain names.<sup>2</sup> If immigrant parents choose a typical German name for their child, we interpret this as a sign of acculturation. If, on the other hand, they choose a name used only in their country of origin, we interpret this as a sign of ethnic maintenance.

Using data from the German Socio-economic Panel Study (SOEP), we first analyze which option three different immigrant groups (Turks, immigrants from Romanic countries, and former Yugoslavs) have chosen for their children.<sup>3</sup> Our second goal is to explain why some immigrants choose the acculturation path while others stick to their culture of origin. In the second section of this article, various hypotheses are introduced in an attempt to explain these differences in terms of name giving. Next, we explain how we operationalize our hypotheses, and then we present the results. We show that acculturation and ethnic maintenance in terms of name giving depend on the permeability of cultural boundaries between the country of origin and the host society, on sociostructural integration in terms of education and citizenship, and on interethnic networks.

Before we start our analysis, we want to briefly describe why first names are especially well-suited indicators of acculturation processes. Names are chosen freely, and their use is, in comparison to other labels of identity, not associated with any material cost (Lieberson 2000). Living in a villa, wearing expensive clothes, and holding a distinguished talk about the

<sup>2</sup> Unlike in the United States, certain names are not permitted in Germany, such as (a) the same name as a sibling, (b) offensive, ludicrous, or otherwise burdensome names, as well as those taken from consumer items, and (c) names that are not gender-specific.

<sup>3</sup> Romanic immigrants include people from Italy, Spain, and Portugal; former Yugoslavs are immigrants from Serbia and Montenegro, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Macedonia, and Slovenia.

latest exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art all serve to construct social identity. These indicators entail rather high costs, either financial or in terms of time invested to develop cultural capital (Bourdieu 1987). First names, by contrast, are free and available to all parents. The selection of a first name is a so-called low-cost situation and is a pure expression of the parents' preferences, unrestricted by material constraints.<sup>4</sup> Other forms of acculturation and assimilation are generally tied to higher investment costs. Language acquisition is very demanding and requires a long-term effort. Similarly, purchasing a house in a part of town where few immigrants live is often very expensive. These actions are primarily indicators of the opportunities for and restrictions on assimilation rather than of immigrants' actual desire to assimilate. In contrast, giving a first name to a child is an expression of the desired degree of ethnic belonging. An additional noteworthy asset to using first names as an indicator of acculturation is that, in contrast to other commonly used indicators, such as immigrants' system of values or intentions to return to their country of origin, the adoption of a first name is a concluded and concrete social act—not just an idea, attitude, or intention of behavior (Sue and Telles 2007).

Of course, the act of name giving itself does not tell us anything about the motivation that leads to the choice of a particular name. In order to reconstruct parental motives for selecting a name, we conducted several qualitative interviews. We found examples of parents who were motivated to choose a particular name by the anticipation of discrimination, parents who chose a certain name to express belonging to their ethnic group of origin, and parents who were able to combine both intentions. We conducted one interview with a Turkish mother who named her son *Bün-yamin*. Several months ago, however, she stopped calling him by his first name and now only uses his traditional Turkish middle name, *Hassan*. She also instructed his classmates to call him *Hassan* rather than *Bün-yamin*. This change was precipitated by the family's discovery that their son's first name is phonetically similar to the German name *Benjamin*, a name traditionally recognized as Jewish. *Bün-yamin Hassan*'s parents wanted his name to clearly convey his Turkish heritage; a traditional German name, especially one commonly attributed to Jews, was not acceptable for their son. On the opposite end of the spectrum is *Lidija*, the daughter of Serbian guest-worker parents. *Lidija*'s parents wanted to give their daughter a traditional Serbian name, but also did not want *Lidija* to stand out or be disadvantaged compared to German children. They

<sup>4</sup> Using the example of environmental behavior, Diekmann and Preisendörfer (2003) show that personal preferences have a much stronger influence on specific behavior in situations in which costs are low than in high-cost situations.

therefore chose a Serbian name also common in Germany, even though the spelling differs slightly between the two languages. Lidija's parents thus combined their desire to express Lidija's Serbian ethnic belonging with their intention to avoid discrimination on the basis of their daughter's name. This is an example of the strategic choice of a name, rather than a choice based solely on ethnic identity.

#### HYPOTHESES

The term *assimilation* is highly contested in both academic and political discourse, as is *acculturation*, albeit to a lesser degree. Scholars define these terms in different ways, and the terms quite often carry a normative connotation. It would go far beyond the scope of this article to reconstruct the multiple definitions of assimilation found in the literature. Instead, we define our understanding of assimilation and acculturation, with special attention to how the terms relate to first names.

We refer to assimilation as "a multidimensional process of boundary reduction that blurs an ethnic or racial distinction and the social and cultural differences and identities associated with it" (Rumbaut 2001, p. 845). Similarly, Alba and Nee (2003, p. 11) define assimilation as the "decline of an ethnic distinction between two groups." Full assimilation then becomes the opposite of ethnic retention and the maintenance of ethnic distinction. In fact, the two are opposite endpoints of a scale.

Assimilation, understood here as the reduction of ethnic boundaries, occurs in three different ways: boundary crossing, boundary shifting, and boundary blurring (Zolberg and Long 1999; Alba and Nee 2003). In terms of name giving, *boundary crossing* occurs when individuals from the ethnic minority choose names common only in the majority group, given that a clear distinction can be made between the names of the different groups. *Boundary shifting* means that there is still an ethnic distinction, but that some names previously considered foreign have changed status and became normal majority names. This can also mean that some groups formerly considered ethnic minorities have become part of the majority. *Boundary blurring*, on the other hand, implies that there are some names that are common in both the majority and minority groups, so that a clear distinction can no longer be made. Whereas boundary crossing is a behavioral option for individuals, boundary blurring and boundary shifting are aggregate phenomena and may act as constraints that influence the probability of individual boundary crossing. This distinction will become important later when we look at the acculturation options for different ethnic groups in Germany.

One of the best predictors for the level of acculturation is the perme-

ability of the cultural boundary between the host society and the country of origin. The cultural boundary, however, is defined not only by the cultural differences between the host country and the country of origin, but also by the multicultural composition of the host society itself. Countries that have a long history of migration and that are multiculturally organized are characterized by more blurred boundaries than those in countries with a strong ethnocultural understanding of national belonging. Germany has traditionally belonged to the latter group of countries and has only recently changed to become a more multicultural society (Alba 2005). Immigrants in multicultural societies will probably feel less obliged to choose nonethnic names to avoid discrimination.

Boundaries between specific groups are made up of different subdimensions, and assimilation or ethnic maintenance can occur in any or all of the following areas: spatial segregation, economic or occupational separation, and social segregation (e.g., in friendships or marriages). Acculturation and its opposite—cultural ethnic maintenance—constitute an additional subdimension that refers to the symbolic boundary signifying belonging to a certain group.<sup>5</sup> Gordon (1964) included musical taste, dress, recreational patterns, manners, and religion as typical characteristics that might define a group's cultural identity. First names fall very neatly into this category, in that they indicate belonging to a certain ethnic group within society. First names are therefore interpreted here as an indicator of either acculturation or cultural ethnic maintenance. While we understand that acculturation is not a one-way process, the focus of this article is solely on the acculturation of immigrants into German society. The other side, namely, the acculturation of Germans through the giving of foreign first names, has been analyzed elsewhere (Gerhards 2005).

Acculturation and integration in the economic, occupational, social, spatial, and political realms are different dimensions of assimilation processes. The causal relationship between these different dimensions is far from clear. As far as the explanation of acculturation is concerned, most scholars assume that “cultural assimilation, or acculturation, is likely to be the first of the types of assimilation to occur when a minority group arrives on the scene” (Gordon 1964, p. 77). One reason why acculturation

<sup>5</sup> There are numerous attempts to classify these subdimensions in the literature. Gordon (1964), in his seminal book on assimilation, outlines seven dimensions. Yinger (1981) differentiates four subprocesses: acculturation, structural integration, amalgamation (i.e., intermarriage), and psychological identification. Waters and Jiménez (2005) mention acculturation, spatial assimilation, and intermarriage. Esser (2004, p. 46) distinguishes between “cultural assimilation, structural assimilation as it pertains to job training and integration in the labor market, social assimilation, defined as contact with the native population, and emotional or identificational assimilation, which is basically identification with the way of life in the host society” (our translation).

precedes other dimensions of assimilation is the fact that “ethnics can acculturate on their own, but they cannot assimilate unless they are given permission to enter the ‘American’ group or institution” (Gans 1997, p. 877). Hence, acculturation depends on immigrants’ preferences and not so much on the constraints placed on them by the host society. Our empirical analysis does show, however, that acculturation and cultural ethnic maintenance in terms of name giving are strongly influenced by other subdimensions of assimilation, such as sociostructural integration, citizenship, and interethnic networks. We start from the following hypothesis: the degree of acculturation or ethnic maintenance depends on the nature of the boundary between the country of origin and the country of residence. Following Zolberg and Long (1999), Alba and Nee (2003; Alba 2005) differentiate between bright and blurred boundaries. In the case of *bright boundaries*, symbols that signify the distinction between the majority and the minority are unambiguous and clearly defined, whereas *blurred boundaries* include zones of ambiguous attributes that signify membership in both majority and minority groups. The probability of ethnic maintenance is highest when the boundary between the country of origin and the country of residence is bright, whereas the probability of acculturation is highest when the boundary is blurred or does not even exist. Acculturation in a bright-boundary scenario is experienced by the individual as described below:

[Acculturation is] something akin to a conversion, i.e., a departure from one group and a discarding of signs of membership in it, linked to an attempt to enter into another, with all the social and psychic burdens a conversion process entails: growing distance from peers, feelings of disloyalty, and anxieties about acceptance. (Alba 2005, p. 24)

Blurred boundaries, on the other hand, allow for multiple inclusions and therefore facilitate the adoption of cultural elements found in the host society. A boundary’s permeability manifests itself in a number of ways, such as linguistic and religious differences, worldviews, and so forth (Warner and Srole 1945; Esser 1980, 1990, 2006). For example, if immigrants’ native language is similar to the language spoken in their new country of residence, acculturation in the form of language acquisition becomes easier (Carliner 2000; Chiswick and Miller 2001; van Tubergen and Kalmijn 2005). This, in turn, promotes assimilation in other dimensions, such as identification with the country of residence. Cultural boundaries in the case of first names are largely determined by religion, as can be seen in the current widespread use of biblical names in Europe. Common names in Europe often come from the Old and New Testaments and from the names of Christian saints, martyrs, confessors, significant bishops and

religious leaders, ascetics, and virgins (Bieritz 1991).<sup>6</sup> Naming children after saints is a tradition that began in the 10th and 11th centuries, and the world of European names has been continuously Christian-oriented ever since (Kohlheim 1996). Similar traditions and practices hold true for other religions. Therefore, if immigrants come from a country with the same religious tradition as exists in the receiving society, the boundaries between the two countries are blurred. There are more possibilities for choosing a name that is common in both countries, because the names in both countries come from the same original source.

Our data cover three immigrant groups that differ in their degree of cultural distance from German society and, therefore, in the permeability of their boundary with German culture. Taking these cultural distances into account, we can test to see if there are different degrees of acculturation versus ethnic maintenance for the various groups regarding the names they choose. Cultural difference is smallest between Germany and the Romanic countries and greatest between Germany and Turkey, in terms of linguistic distance, religion, and culture. Germanic, Slavic, and Romance languages are all members of the same linguistic family, whereas Turkish is not an Indo-European language. In terms of religion, the German population is mostly Protestant and Catholic. Immigrants from the former Yugoslavia are predominantly Orthodox, but there are quite a large number of Catholics and Muslims as well. Immigrants from Romanic countries are predominantly Catholic, and those from Turkey are predominantly Muslim. Using data from the European Values Survey, Gerhards (2007) shows that cultural distance in terms of values is indeed larger between Germany and Turkey than between Germany and the other countries of origin.

Since their religious and linguistic differences are smaller, or, in the terminology of Alba and Nee, because boundaries for them are blurred rather than bright, we assume that immigrants from Romanic countries will show a higher degree of acculturation than will immigrants from the former Yugoslavia or Turkey. For the same reason, we assume that acculturation in terms of first names will be higher for Protestants and Catholics than for Orthodox Christians and Muslims.

Processes of assimilation are related to gender, and gender differences are certainly relevant when parents choose a name for their child. Lieberson (2000, p. 185) has researched gender differences in naming practices among Mexican Americans, Asians, African-Americans, and Jews. Gerhards (2003) has shown elsewhere that tradition weighs more heavily in the balance for German parents when selecting a name for their son,

<sup>6</sup> Giving a first name that refers to a saint serves a dual purpose: the saint serves as a role model and also, more meaningfully, as a patron saint and intermediary to God.

whereas they are more prepared to experiment with new names from other cultures when naming a girl. More recently, Sue and Telles (2007) have argued that ethnic names are given to male children more often than to female children. First, women are more likely than men to have a favorable attitude toward assimilation and are usually the ones who choose names for their daughters. Fathers are typically the ones who chose names for their sons, and an immigrant father is more likely to give his son a name common in his country of origin. Second, male children are often expected to carry on family and ethnic traditions, and these expectations may be manifested through a family or ethnic name. Accordingly, Sue and Telles find that Hispanic parents in Los Angeles County give American names to daughters more often than to sons, for whom they prefer traditional ethnic names. We will test whether the same is true for immigrants in Germany. Unlike the data Sue and Telles analyzed, ours allow us to compare the names of both first- and second-generation immigrants. If gender differences in the distribution of names were the same for the parents as for their children, this would contradict the assumption that immigrant parents expect their sons rather than their daughters to carry on family traditions. In this case, gender differences in naming practices could simply be traced back to the larger number of female names common in both the country of origin and the host country.

We assume that the more successful an immigrant is in placing him- or herself into the social structure of the host society, the higher his or her degree of acculturation to the host society will be. Labor market integration promotes acculturation especially well, in that it increases interethnic contacts with the native population and increases the probability of using symbols that signify majority-group membership. Educational attainment is another sociostructural aspect that represents both a higher level of cultural capital and cognitive competence. Education also facilitates cultural assimilation in terms of language acquisition, and academic degrees are an important prerequisite for labor market integration. There is an additional, indirect effect of education on acculturation: higher levels of education lead to more interethnic contact, which strengthens ties to the majority group and to majority-group identity. For example, Lieberman and Waters (1990) used U.S. census data to show that the probability of interethnic marriage increases with education levels. Moreover, education, labor market integration, and an adequate income create conditions for immigrants to be satisfied with the host society, which has a direct positive effect on their identification and their probability of taking on cultural elements of the host society (Kalter 2005). Our hypothesis is as follows: immigrants who are better integrated into the social structure—as measured by education level and income—have crossed an

important ethnic boundary in this dimension and are more likely to take on native traits such as first names for their children.

The degree of assimilation in terms of name giving is also determined by immigrants' embeddedness in ethnically heterogeneous networks—that is, by primary group relationships with the native population. Gordon (1964) views this as the “keystone of the arch of assimilation,” which, unlike pure acquisition of knowledge and competence, leads to assimilation in all other dimensions. Immigrants who interact with the native population on a regular basis should be more likely to give their child a name common in the receiving society because of increased familiarity with those names, higher satisfaction with their situation within the host society, feelings of acceptance, and social expectations placed on them by friends and family. If an immigrant is strongly embedded in ethnically homogeneous networks, he or she is much less likely to choose a name from the host society for his or her child. Lieberman (2000) shows that among Chinese immigrants in the United States, mothers living in settlements with low Chinese density give names that are slightly more “American” than do those mothers living in high-density settlements. Of course, interethnic relationships occur in a variety of contexts, such as the workplace, family (in the case of intermarriage), friendship networks, and neighborhoods. We will therefore test two hypotheses: first, immigrants married to German partners are more likely to give their children German names than those who are not. Second, immigrants who have German acquaintances and close friends are also more likely to choose a German name than are those who only have close contacts within their own ethnic group.

In addition to cultural boundaries and sociostructural and social integration, we assume that the degree of acculturation is influenced by immigrants' citizenship. Civic rights that come with citizenship can lead to social and structural assimilation, and German citizenship enables access to certain jobs, such as those in the civil service (Faist and Dörr 1997; Kogan 2002; Verwiebe 2004; see Tucci [2004] for a statistical treatment of this topic using SOEP data). Additionally, many political scientists believe that a straightforward, liberal naturalization policy is a direct factor leading to increased immigrant identification with the receiving society. Naturalization is also an indicator that immigrants are ready to leave behind cultural symbols that signify membership in the ethnic group of origin (Brubaker 1992; Joppke 1999). Take this statistic, for example: 50% of immigrants in Germany identified primarily with Germany, compared to 27.5% who identified with their country of origin. Koopmans and Statham (2001) suggest that this low level of assimilation can be attributed to Germany's restrictive citizenship policy and to the classification of immigrants as foreigners or aliens. In Great Britain and the

Netherlands (countries with fewer barriers to citizenship), the percentages of immigrants who identify primarily with their host country are 83% and 71%, respectively. Wunderlich (2005) shows that the actual process of naturalization strengthens identification with and feelings of belonging to the host society. We will test the hypothesis that the acquisition of German citizenship has a positive effect on acculturation insofar as the choice of first names is concerned.

#### DATA SET AND VARIABLES

##### Data Set

Our analysis uses data from the SOEP, which longitudinally and systematically surveys the German population. The main method of data collection is a face-to-face multitopic questionnaire (Schupp and Wagner 2002). When the SOEP began in 1984, the sample size was 5,921 households. In that survey, the five largest groups of non-German immigrant workers were overproportionally represented. Over the years, new samples were added to allow for analysis of specific subgroups, such as recent immigrants. First names were collected as part of the SOEP to enable replicability and to provide a continuous link of information for people within any given household. An analysis of first names in and of itself was not intended. Only in a 2005 project did first names become the primary research focus (Huschka et al. 2005).

Our analysis of names includes people who (or whose spouses) were born in a foreign country and who then gave birth to a child after immigrating to Germany. To allow for a sufficient number of cases for each country, we limited our analysis to people from Turkey, the former Yugoslavia, and the Romanic countries Italy, Spain, and Portugal. People with Turkish citizenship, at 1.8 million, make up the largest group of foreigners in Germany, followed by people from former Yugoslavian countries, with over 1 million.<sup>7</sup> At over half a million, Italians are the third-largest group; adding them to immigrants from Spain and Portugal, some 770,000 immigrants from Romanic countries live in Germany. These numbers reflect the outcome of the so-called guest worker program that lasted from 1955 to 1973. During that time, 2.6 million foreign workers came to Germany. Contrary to the intentions of the guest worker policy, many of these predominantly young, low-educated males did not return to their countries of origin, but rather stayed in Germany and brought their families to join them. These workers obtained certain social rights as a result

<sup>7</sup> Federal Statistical Office of Germany: <http://www.destatis.de/basis/d/bevoe/bevoetab10.php>.

of their general long-term participation in the labor market, but could rarely acquire German citizenship because of the *jus sanguinis* principle. Former guest workers and their dependents still make up the largest group of residents with an immigrant background, even after the type of immigration to Germany drastically changed in the 1980s and '90s with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the resultant increase in East–West migration. In regard to immigrants from the former Yugoslavia, there are also civil war refugees who are a more heterogeneous group than the former guest workers.

#### Dependent Variable

When boundaries between the pools of names are blurred, acculturation in terms of name giving is often not an either/or decision. Many names are common to both the countries of origin in question and to Germany, such as Maria—a very common name for girls in Romanic countries as well as in Germany. Furthermore, there are German versions of names that are similar but not identical to those used in immigrants' homelands, such as the German name Paul, which is like the Italian name Paolo. Acculturation processes may occur not only as a complete assimilation into the host society through the total acquisition of formerly foreign cultural elements, but rather through the use of cultural symbols that lie in blurred boundaries. For example, Italian immigrants usually do not choose Nordic names (like Sven or Svea) for their children; rather, they prefer Christian names like Peter or Alexander, because similar names exist in their original language (Pedro, Alessandro). Accordingly, the variable *acculturation to German first names* (*first name* in the tables) is not dichotomous, but has four values:

1. names used in Germany but not common in the respondent's country of origin (*German*);
2. names used in Germany that have phonetically similar versions in the country of origin (*German/native*);
3. names used in the respondent's country of origin that have phonetically similar versions used in Germany (*native/German*); and
4. names only used in the country of origin (*native*).

Categories 2 and 3 contain names that are translatable from German into the language of the country of origin and vice versa, whereas categories 1 and 4 do not. The coding of a name depends on the parents' country of origin. The name Peter, for instance, is assigned a value of 2 for immigrants from Romanic countries and for former Yugoslavs because there are similar versions (Pedro, Pëtr) in the respective native languages. For Turks, on the other hand, the name Peter falls in category 1 because there is no similar Turkish version.

Fortunately, we were able to take advantage of a previous coding of all names contained in the SOEP sample. This coding was part of a larger research project of one of the authors and was undertaken by a professional onomatologist. Names were assigned codes according to their prevalence in different countries and their historical origin. This previous coding enabled us to decide whether a name was German, English, Russian, and so on. Nevertheless, the question of which names are “commonly used in Germany” is difficult to decide because of the fact that what is considered common has changed with the transnationalization of the repertoire of names. Through processes of boundary shifting, names once situated on one side are now included on the other. For example, the names Michelle, Kevin, and Sascha, which became popular in Germany in the 1970s, were of French, English, and Russian origin, respectively, and were not commonly used in Germany up until that point. A second group of coders including the authors categorized these names according to the following test: would a child with the name in question be identified by his or her teacher and classmates as foreign solely on the basis of his or her name? If so, we categorized the name as “not commonly used in Germany.” To ensure the correct categorization of names that are now common in the respondent’s country of origin but originated elsewhere (e.g., in Germany), there was a native from each respective immigrant group among the coders. Although coders worked independently, there was agreement on the categories for the vast majority of names. Controversial cases were then discussed with the help of additional literature and lists of popular baby names for the different countries of origin.

#### Independent Variables

Relevant information for most explanatory variables was collected from the child’s year of birth. For variables that tend to remain constant over time, such as education and religious affiliation, we used information from the years prior to the birth of the child if no information was available for the year of birth. This was the case for only a small number of respondents.

We used the parents’ *country of origin* as a proxy variable for cultural distance from German society in terms of religion and language. Furthermore, the specific *religious affiliation* of the parents (Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox Christian, Muslim, or none) was surveyed and included in the analysis.

As indicators of sociostructural integration, we use the *parents’ level of education* and the gross annual household *income* (in German Marks). For level of education, we count each parent’s highest level of academic attainment, whether it was obtained in Germany or abroad. Our index

of education is based on combined categories of the CASMIN classification system, and includes values 1 (*elementary education* at the most), 2 (*9 or 10 years* of schooling),<sup>8</sup> and 3 (*secondary school diploma*—at least 12 years of schooling).

In contrast to many other studies, we measured ethnic segregation not on the aggregated neighborhood level, but on the individual level. There are two reasons for our choice. First, the percentage of immigrants in a certain residential area may influence primary group relationships between immigrants and natives, but what really matter are the actual relationships themselves. Therefore, when individual assimilation rather than the residential segregation of groups is the subject of interest, it makes more sense to measure explanatory variables on the same level. Of course, if additional context effects are expected, these variables may be added as well; however, the data protection official for the SOEP did not allow us to combine data on names with neighborhood data for reasons of confidentiality. To measure ethnic segregation on the individual level, respondents were asked if they had had any contact with a German for the last 12 months and also if a native German was among their three closest friends. We created a new variable with a value of 1 for those who had *no contact with Germans* at all, 2 for those who had *contact with Germans*, but no German friends, and 3 for those who also had *German friends*. *Intermarriage* is also an important indicator of social assimilation, and we control for families in which one parent is a native German.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to test the additional effect of naturalization. This is due to high correlation with intermarriage as well as to the small number of cases of naturalized first-generation immigrants, which can be traced back to Germany's strict citizenship laws. It is, however, possible to include the *child's citizenship*, which is decided by the parents and therefore a good proxy variable for parents' wishes to assimilate politically to German society.<sup>9</sup> Table 1 provides a summary of the bivariate results for all explanatory variables.

<sup>8</sup> Equivalent to a German *Haupt-* or *Realschulabschluss*.

<sup>9</sup> Motivation for migrating (e.g., economic or political reasons) is an additional factor affecting acculturation processes. Involuntary migrants can be expected to have a lower propensity for acculturation than those who deliberately decide and prepare to immigrate. Our data include items on reasons for migration, and hardly anybody in our sample migrated involuntarily. In the few cases of immigration due to war in the home country (mainly former Yugoslavians), parents do not differ in terms of name giving.

TABLE 1  
SUMMARY OF BIVARIATE RESULTS: CORRELATION OF NAME  
CATEGORY WITH EXPLANATORY VARIABLES BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN

Explanatory Variable	Former			Overall
	Turkey	Yugoslavia	Romanic	
Country of origin <sup>a</sup> . . . . .				.42**
Sex of child <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	.08*	.17*	.23**	.12**
Religious affiliation <sup>a</sup> . . . . .	.42**	.28**	.12	.36**
Education <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	.16**	.16**	.17**	.17***
Intermarriage <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	.37**	.32**	.27**	.38**
Citizenship <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	.39**	.34**	.26**	.32***
Circle of friends <sup>b</sup> . . . . .	.21**	.33**	.20***	.34**

<sup>a</sup> Cramer's V.  
<sup>b</sup> Spearman's rank order correlation.  
\*  $P < .05$ .  
\*\*  $P < .001$ .

RESULTS

Cultural Boundaries

We expected immigrants from Romanic countries to give their children German names more often than those from the former Yugoslavia, and especially more than those from Turkey, because of their closer cultural proximity. The results displayed in table 2 confirm our hypothesis. While almost 90% of Turkish parents give their children names only used in Turkey, this is true for only 43% of the ex-Yugoslavians and 35% of those from Romanic countries. Noteworthy is the fact that only 6% of parents from Romanic countries give their children names that are not common in their country of origin, as compared to 22% of parents from the former Yugoslavia. This is probably due to the fact that the pool of names common to both Germany and the country of origin is largest for immigrants from Italy, Spain, and Portugal.

We can analyze the nature of the ethnic boundaries between the respective countries of origin and Germany in terms of cultural difference by looking at the distribution of the parents' names. Because parents received their names in their country of origin, there was neither pressure nor need to acculturate to German society by giving a German name influencing the choice of their names. One can assume that the distribution of names among parents corresponds roughly to the general distribution in the respective country of origin, as shown in table 3.

More than 96% of Turkish parents have names that are only used in Turkey; first names commonly used in both countries hardly seem to exist. In contrast, 27% of the ex-Yugoslavians and more than half of the immigrants from Romanic countries have names for which there are at least

Name-Giving Patterns

TABLE 2  
ORIGIN OF FIRST NAMES OF CHILDREN BORN IN GERMANY, BY  
PARENTS' COUNTRY OF ORIGIN (%)

Child's First Name	Turkey	Former Yugoslavia	Romanic	Overall
German .....	5.0	22.4	6.0	8.1
German/native ....	1.7	25.2	38.5	17.6
Native/German ...	4.3	9.0	20.1	10.3
Native .....	89.0	43.4	35.4	64.0
Total <i>n</i> .....	1,272	389	831	2,492

TABLE 3  
ORIGIN OF FIRST NAME BY COUNTRY OF ORIGIN FOR FIRST-  
GENERATION IMMIGRANTS (%)

First Name	Turkey	Former Yugoslavia	Romanic	Overall
German .....	.9	6.2	.9	2.1
German/native ....	.9	9.4	25.7	10.7
Native/German ...	2.0	11.6	25.0	11.4
Native .....	96.2	72.8	48.5	75.8
Total <i>n</i> .....	1,775	890	1,226	3,891

similar versions in Germany. These two groups have the option of giving their children names that sound familiar to them and to Germans. Using the terminology of Alba and Nee (2003), the boundaries between names commonly used in Germany and Romanic and Slavic names are substantially blurred. Turkish immigrants face an entirely different situation, in that they are confronted with what Alba (2005) calls a bright boundary. Names that are identical or similar in both cultures hardly exist, because of the facts that Turkish belongs to a different linguistic family and that Turks belong to a different religious community than Germans (a dominant source of inspiration for name giving). Individual boundary crossing is the only option that Turkish parents have for acculturation when naming their child. In this, they have to overcome the obstacle that their own child's name will sound foreign to them.

Taking this into consideration, it is quite impressive that the number of people with names having at least a similar German version increases from 3.8% for the parental generation to 11% for their children. German or German-sounding names are almost three times more common among the second generation than they are among their parents, and uniquely German names are over five times more common. Although immigrants from Turkey seem less ready to leave their cultural identity behind and

acculturate—*prima facie*—than the other groups, we come to a different interpretation when we take into account the cultural distance that each group has to cover in order to acculturate. Comparing the names of the first generation (born abroad) to the names of the second generation (born in Germany), we see that the *relative* acculturation of Turkish immigrants is at least as high as that of the other groups.

One reason for the overlap in names between Germany and the Romanic countries is their common Christian tradition. We can directly measure the relationship between a cultural boundary's permeability and the giving of first names, owing to the fact that the SOEP asked individual respondents for their religious affiliation. The results, shown in table 4, further confirm our hypothesis. Whereas only 30% of Protestants and Catholics and about half of the Orthodox Christians sampled chose names not common in Germany, this is true for over 90% of Muslim parents. It is striking that only 6% of all Muslim children have names that are common to both Germany and the country of origin, compared to 30% for Orthodox Christians and an astonishing 54% for Catholics and Protestants.

#### Gender

A first look at table 5 seems to confirm our hypothesis that female children are more likely to be given a German or German-sounding name than are male children. Nearly 32% of girls are given a name that is common in both countries, as opposed to 24% of boys. This is in line with Sue and Telles's (2007) findings for Hispanic immigrants in California. It seems that immigrant parents expect their sons to carry on family traditions, rather than their daughters. However, a closer look reveals that the distribution of names across the sexes is precisely the same among first-generation immigrants: women are less likely to have a name common only in the country of origin than are men and are more likely to have a name common in both countries. This gives rise to a different interpretation: contrary to what Sue and Telles interpret as parents' inclination to prefer traditional names for boys, an intergenerational comparison of the name distribution reveals that there are simply more female names common to both countries. In other words, boundaries between ethnic groups in terms of names are more blurred for female names than for male names. This interpretation is supported by the fact that gender differences in naming are much smaller for Turks than for other groups (see table 1). This applies to both generations and can be attributed to the fact that a common pool of German and Turkish names does not exist.

## Name-Giving Patterns

TABLE 4  
ORIGIN OF CHILD'S FIRST NAME BY PARENTS' RELIGIOUS  
AFFILIATION (%)

Child's First Name	Catholic/ Protestant	Orthodox	Muslim	None/ Changed	Overall
German .....	15.9	15.2	1.6	10.2	8.8
German/native ....	36.1	14.1	1.9	17.2	17.3
Native/German ...	17.8	16.2	4.1	9.7	10.6
Native .....	30.2	54.6	92.4	62.9	63.4
Total <i>n</i> .....	676	99	805	186	1,766

TABLE 5  
ORIGIN OF FIRST NAME BY SEX AND GENERATION (%)

FIRST NAME	2D GENERATION		1ST GENERATION	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
German .....	7.7	8.5	2.0	2.3
German/native ....	13.3	22.2	6.4	15.7
Native/German ...	10.9	9.7	13.0	9.6
Native .....	68.1	59.7	78.7	72.4
Total <i>n</i> .....	1,290	1,202	2,091	1,800

### Sociostructural Integration

We assumed that parents who are in a higher social class in Germany are more likely to give their child a German first name. To test this, we compared household income by ethnic group and by type of name given. The differences in naming by income are too marginal to be statistically significant and thus are not reported here. Higher-income immigrant parents from Turkey and the former Yugoslavia tend to give their children German names slightly more often, whereas high-income immigrant parents from Romanic countries tend to use names from their countries of origin. Our hypothesis, which sought to relate average household income with naming habits, was not confirmed.

To test the influence of education on name giving, we look at education levels for both the father and the mother. The latter seems to have an especially strong impact. Table 6 reveals that only 37% of children born to mothers with at least a secondary school diploma have names that are not common in Germany, as compared to almost three-quarters of children born to mothers with only an elementary education.<sup>10</sup> The number of

<sup>10</sup> Results for the education level of the father reveal the same relationship, albeit to a lesser degree.

TABLE 6  
ORIGIN OF CHILD'S FIRST NAME BY MOTHER'S EDUCATION LEVEL (%)

Child's First Name	Elementary Education	Intermediate (9 or 10 Years)	Secondary School Diploma
German .....	4.0	9.3	22.6
German/native ....	12.1	19.4	33.3
Native/German ...	10.4	10.4	7.1
Native .....	73.5	60.9	36.9
Total <i>n</i> .....	752	1,500	84

exclusively German names and names common in both countries increases for children whose mothers are more educated. This relationship is stable across all immigrant groups (see table 1) and holds true even after controlling for differences in education levels by immigrant group. This finding confirms our hypothesis that higher levels of education lead to a higher readiness to acculturate. Here, our results are in accordance with Sue and Telles's (2007) finding that Hispanic immigrant children in California are less likely to receive a Spanish name when their parents are more educated.

Social Assimilation and Inter-marriage

Inter-marriage is the strongest indicator of social assimilation, and table 7 reveals that the likelihood of giving a German name to a child increases strongly when one parent is a native German. Again, this concurs with the findings of Sue and Telles (2007): in marriages with a non-Hispanic parent, children are more likely to be given a non-Spanish name. There are also some interesting differences between groups: immigrants from Romanic countries have the highest rate of inter-marriage, but the relationship between inter-marriage and naming for this group is smaller than it is for former Yugoslavs and Turks (see table 1). Romanic immigrant-German couples are much less likely than former Yugoslavs and Turks with a German partner to give their child an exclusively German name. Rather, a large majority of over two-thirds prefer a name common in both countries. In the case of inter-married Yugoslavs, over 40% opt for a name common only in Germany. Surprisingly, this choice is most frequent among Turks married to German partners, more than half of whom give their children exclusively German names. Names common in both countries do not become more widespread among German-Turkish couples, in contrast to the trend seen for children of former-Yugoslav and Romanic immigrants married to Germans. This underscores the point that acculturation opportunities for Turks are quite different, at least in

## Name-Giving Patterns

TABLE 7  
ORIGIN OF CHILD'S FIRST NAME BY PARENTS' SOCIAL ASSIMILATION (%)

CHILD'S FIRST NAME	MOTHER'S CIRCLE OF FRIENDS			INTER- MARRIAGE	
	No Contact with Germans	Contact with Germans	German Friends	No	Yes
German .....	1.4	5.2	15.3	4.5	25.3
German/native ....	7.7	13.0	31.9	13.8	42.2
Native/German ...	8.8	10.5	11.2	10.3	10.7
Native .....	82.1	71.3	41.6	71.4	21.8
Total <i>n</i> .....	442	1,031	633	1,973	289

terms of name giving: the cultural boundary with Germany is much harder to cross, and space for blurred boundaries is very limited.

Table 7 shows that immigrants who are ethnically segregated choose names common in Germany significantly less often than those who have German friends or other interactions with Germans. This relationship holds true for each immigrant group individually, but is strongest when we look at the total for all immigrants (see table 1). Social assimilation partially explains some initial differences in name giving among ethnic groups. In addition to their larger cultural distance from Germany, Turks are more segregated from and interact less with Germans. Once Turkish immigrants do interact with Germans, however, their chances for acculturation increase. This is especially true for intermarriage: a high share of Turks married to German partners adopt naming habits completely in line with ethnic Germans.

### Citizenship

In all three ethnic groups, children with German citizenship are more likely to have names commonly used in Germany than are those with foreign citizenship (see table 8). Almost a quarter of children with German citizenship have exclusively German names, and only 37% have names used exclusively in their parents' native culture. The numbers for children without German citizenship are 4% and 71%, respectively. The relationship between citizenship and name giving is not as strong for immigrants from Romanic countries as it is for the other groups, which may be because immigrants from Italy, Spain, and Portugal hardly ever naturalize. Because these three countries are EU members, Romanic immigrants living in Germany automatically have European citizenship and are accorded more legal rights than are non-EU immigrants.

TABLE 8  
ORIGIN OF CHILD'S FIRST NAME BY CITIZENSHIP OF  
THE CHILD (%)

CHILD'S FIRST NAME	CHILD'S CITIZENSHIP	
	Foreign	German
German .....	4.2	23.8
German/native ....	14.7	29.3
Native/German ...	10.5	9.6
Native .....	70.6	37.3
Total <i>n</i> .....	2,001	491

Multivariate Analysis

We used a multivariate regression analysis to test the influence of our explanatory variables when we control for other variables.<sup>11</sup> Table 9 shows five regression models. In the first model, only the child's sex and the parent's country of origin (as a measurement of the permeability of the cultural boundary) are included as explanatory variables. The results show that immigrants from the former Yugoslavia and from Romanic countries give their children names common in Germany much more often than do those from Turkey. Female children are more likely to have German names than are boys. The coefficients are statistically significant and positive.

In model 2, we add the parents' religious affiliation as a measure of cultural distance on the individual level. Catholics and Protestants tend to give their children German names more often than religiously unaffiliated parents do. Muslim parents tend to use names not common in Germany. The previously strong country effects disappear in this model, which is completely in line with our hypothesis concerning the high correlation between religious affiliation at the individual level and country of origin. Nearly all Turkish immigrants are Muslims, many immigrants from Romanic countries are Catholics, and while there are many different religions in the former Yugoslavia, Orthodox Christianity is only present there. Because many names used in Germany come from the Christian tradition, it is easier for immigrants from various Christian religions to

<sup>11</sup> A commonly used explanatory variable in similar studies is length of stay. Immigrants who have lived in the receiving society for longer periods of time are, on average, more assimilated than are newcomers. We do not consider length of stay to be a theoretically sound variable, because other factors are hidden behind length of stay, such as language acquisition and contact with natives. When we controlled for the mother's length of stay at the time her child was born, we found no effect in the multivariate analysis, nor did it affect other explanatory variables. We therefore decided not to include length of stay in our analysis.

Name-Giving Patterns

TABLE 9  
MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS OF ASSIMILATION TO GERMAN FIRST NAMES

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Sex .....	.48***	.48***	.51***	.58***	.56***
Former Yugoslavia .....	2.51***	.60	.66	.56	.71*
Southwestern Europe ....	2.62***	-.01	.09	-.02	.23
Catholic/Protestant .....		1.25***	1.28***	1.16***	1.14***
Orthodox Christian .....		.09	.005	.08	.08
Muslim .....		-1.92***	-1.91***	-1.83***	-1.74***
Mother's education .....			.63***	.37***	.38***
Father's education .....			.27	.11	.06
Household income .....			$-3.6 \times 10^{-6}$	$-4.2 \times 10^{-6}$ *	$-4.1 \times 10^{-6}$ *
Contact with Germans ...				.45*	.45*
German friends .....				.70***	.63**
Intermarriage .....				1.13***	.49
German citizenship .....					.83***
Cut 1 .....	2.94	1.40	2.91	2.74	2.89
Cut 2 .....	3.65	2.16	3.69	3.57	3.73
Cut 3 .....	5.23	3.82	5.40	5.39	5.56
Pseudo $R^2$ .....	.15	.19	.20	.23	.23

NOTE.—Ordered logit regression.  $N = 1,455$ . The dependent variable is the four-point scale of names. Reference categories are sex—male; country of origin—Turkey; religious affiliation—none or changed; circle of friends—no contact with Germans; intermarriage—no. Unstandardized coefficients.  $P$ -values are based on robust standard errors.

\*  $P < .05$ .

\*\*  $P < .01$ .

\*\*\*  $P < .001$ .

give a name common in Germany than it is for Muslims. Religious affiliation, on both the individual and collective levels, matters more than linguistic differences in assessing the cultural boundary that the country variable measures.

Model 3 incorporates parents' education level and household income. As was the case for the bivariate analysis, income has no effect. The coefficient is slightly below 0 and not significant. Also in line with the bivariate analysis, the mother's level of education influences the giving of first names, with more educated mothers giving German names more often. As before, the father's education is less important. The coefficient is smaller and not significant, which may be due to the fact that parents' education levels are interrelated.

In model 4, we include social assimilation in terms of intermarriage and the parents' circle of friends. Close interethnic relationships with Germans—in terms of both friendship and intermarriage—increase the likelihood that children are given German names. In this model, the coefficient of household income becomes significant, but the sign goes in an unexpected direction.

The fifth and final model controls for the influence of citizenship. The results show that children with German citizenship tend to have names common in Germany. The effect of intermarriage disappears, which can be attributed to the correlation between intermarriage and German citizenship: German naturalization law automatically accords German citizenship to a child born to a German parent (strictly speaking, to a German father, up to 1975), and it is much harder for children to become German citizens if both parents are foreigners. In other respects, the effects of the explanatory variables from previous models do not change.

Overall, the effects of our explanatory variables remain remarkably constant across all models,<sup>12</sup> and the results of our bivariate analyses are confirmed. The same is true for our hypotheses about possible explanatory factors, such as religious denomination, education, and citizenship. Acculturation in terms of name giving becomes more likely when boundaries between ethnic groups are already blurred—as in the case of a common religious or linguistic heritage—and when individual boundary crossing has occurred in dimensions other than name giving, such as interethnic relationships or upward mobility in the social structure.

#### CONCLUSION

The analysis of first names has only recently become the subject of systematic research in the social sciences. This article interprets first names as a marker of social identity that can express belonging to a particular ethnic group. When immigrant parents choose a first name for their child that is common in the host society, they show a high degree of acculturation, whereas giving a name common only in the country of origin indicates ethnic maintenance. We have attempted to explain acculturation levels in terms of name giving for three different immigrant groups in Germany.

Our hypotheses were generally confirmed by the empirical analysis. Integration into the social structure of the host society (in the form of education and citizenship) and into social networks with natives (through intermarriage and friendships) leads to acculturation. These measures alone do not suffice to explain acculturation, given the important role played by cultural proximity and the nature of ethnic boundaries. A com-

<sup>12</sup> This is true for individual-level explanatory variables across countries. Country-specific regression analyses show that there are no substantial differences in the effects of individual-level variables for Turkish, ex-Yugoslavian, and Romanic immigrants, although the effects tend to be somewhat smaller for Romanic immigrants. This is evident by looking at the percentage of explained variance for Romanic immigrants (6% in model 5) as compared to ex-Yugoslavs (14%) and Turks (23%).

parison of Germany's three largest immigrant groups shows that immigrants from Turkey have the lowest rate of acculturation, former Yugoslavs are in the middle, and immigrants from Romanic countries acculturate most quickly. When interpreting this result, it is important to keep in mind the opportunity structure facing immigrant parents from different backgrounds. Not only are linguistic obstacles much higher for Turks, but the pool of Turkish names is almost entirely different from those in Southern and Western Europe, because of Turkey's Muslim religious heritage.<sup>13</sup> Taking this cultural distance into account allows for a more favorable interpretation of Turkish immigrants' assimilative achievements in Germany.

Our findings contain two arguments with more general implications. Assimilation and acculturation are typically viewed in absolute terms, and immigrants' varying cultural backgrounds have received too little attention in the assimilation debate thus far. A seemingly small degree of assimilation among immigrants from culturally or linguistically distant countries may still represent a high degree of *relative* assimilation. With this more nuanced understanding, we can state that there is a tendency toward acculturation in all three of the immigrant groups we studied. Our second, more widely applicable argument is related to the nature of ethnic boundaries. In the case of blurred boundaries, the first steps toward acculturation are easier, as immigrants have the option of multiple memberships—acculturating while maintaining ethnic ties. However, blurred boundaries between the country of origin and the host society may inhibit further steps toward acculturation, as evidenced by our finding that Turkish immigrants are just as likely as are immigrants from Romanic countries to choose a uniquely German name despite the Turks' bright boundary with German culture.

Our major goal in this article was to explain the degree of acculturation and ethnic maintenance in terms of name giving. However, this analysis is not an end in itself, as first names carry social consequences. Social psychological studies show that people use first names to infer the age, attractiveness, and intelligence of the name's bearer (Kasof 1993; Perfors 2004; Rudolph, Böhm, and Lummer 2007). In an experimental design, Bertrand and Mullainathan (2004) demonstrate that people with typically black names face labor market discrimination. Those authors sent fictitious resumes with white- and black-sounding names to help-wanted ads in the newspapers. Applicants with white-sounding names got 50% more

<sup>13</sup> Surprisingly, obstacles that Muslims face in the acculturation process do not have any effect on name giving. When the regression model 5 in table 9 is run for Muslims and non-Muslims separately, the results are virtually the same. The explained variance differs by less than 1%.

invitations for interviews than did applicants with African-American-sounding names. The study suggests that potential employers interpret names as a sign of ethnic belonging and discriminate against people with names commonly used by African-Americans. Although there are no similar studies on the consequences that typical immigrant names have on the job and life chances of immigrants in Germany, one can assume that the mechanisms Bertrand and Mullainathan describe would also apply. This may explain what we know from a previous study (Gerhards 2005), namely, that German parents completely avoid giving their children typical Turkish names.

#### REFERENCES

- Alba, Richard. 2005. "Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second-Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 20–49.
- Alba, Richard, and Victor Nee. 2003. *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth. 2002. "Namenspolitik: Zwischen Assimilation und Antisemitismus—zur Geschichte jüdischer Namen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert." Pp. 571–84 in *Der Begriff des Politischen: Sonderheft der Sozialen Welt*, edited by Armin Nassehi and Markus Schroer. Baden Baden: Nomos.
- Bering, Dietz. 1987. *Der Name als Stigma: Antisemitismus im Deutschen Alltag, 1812–1933*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- . 1992. *Kampf um Namen: Bernhard Weiss gegen Joseph Goebbels*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Bertrand, Marianne, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "Are Emily and Greg More Employable than Lakisha and Jamal? A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination." *American Economic Review* 94 (4): 991–1013.
- Bieritz, Karl-Heinz. 1991. *Das Kirchenjahr: Feste, Gedenk- und Feiertage in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Munich: Beck.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1987. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Carliner, Geoffrey. 2000. "The Language Abilities of U.S. Immigrants: Assimilation and Cohort Effects." *International Migration Review* 34 (1): 158–82.
- Chiswick, Barry R., and Paul W. Miller. 2001. "A Model of Destination-Language Acquisition: Application to Male Immigrants in Canada." *Demography* 38 (3): 391–409.
- Diekmann, Andreas, and Peter Preisendörfer. 2003. "Green and Greenback: The Behavioral Effects of Environmental Attitudes in Low-Cost and High-Cost Situations." *Rationality and Society* 15:441–72.
- Esser, Hartmut. 1980. *Aspekte der Wanderungssoziologie: Assimilation und Integration von Wanderern, ethnischen Gruppen und Minderheiten; Eine handlungstheoretische Analyse*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.
- . 1990. "Nur eine Frage der Zeit? Zur Frage der Eingliederung von Migranten im Generationen-Zyklus und zu einer Möglichkeit, Unterschiede hierin theoretisch zu erklären." Pp. 73–100 in *Generation und Identität: Theoretische und empirische*

## Name-Giving Patterns

- Beiträge zur Migrationssoziologie*, edited by Hartmut Esser and Jürgen Friedrichs. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- . 2004. “Welche Alternativen zur ‘Assimilation’ gibt es eigentlich?” *IMIS-Beiträge* 23:41–59.
- . 2006. *Sprache und Integration: Die Sozialen Bedingungen des Spracherwerbs von Migranten*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.
- Faist, Thomas, and Silvia Dörr. 1997. “Institutional Conditions for the Integration of Immigrants in Welfare States: A Comparison of Germany, France, Great Britain, and the Netherlands.” *European Journal of Political Research* 31:401–26.
- Fryer, Roland G., and Steven D. Levitt. 2004. “The Causes and Consequences of Distinctively Black Names.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 64:767–805.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1997. “Toward a Reconciliation of ‘Assimilation’ and ‘Pluralism’: The Interplay of Acculturation and Ethnic Retention.” *International Migration Review* 31 (4): 875–92.
- Gerhards, Jürgen. 2003. “Geschlechtsklassifikation durch Vornamen und Geschlechtsrollen im Wandel.” *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 13:59–76.
- . 2005. *The Name Game: Cultural Modernization and First Names*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- . 2007. *Cultural Overstretch? The Enlargement of the European Union and the Cultural Differences between Old and New Member States and Turkey*. New York: Routledge.
- Gordon, Milton M. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion, and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Grethlein, Christian. 1994. “Name/Namengebung—IV: Kirchengeschichtlich.” Pp. 754–58 in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, edited by Gerhard Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Huschka, Denis, Jürgen Gerhards, and Gert Wagner. 2005. “Messung und Analyse des sozialen Wandel anhand der Vergabe von Vornamen: Aufbereitung und Auswertung des SOEP; Dokumentation der Datenbasis und der Vercodung.” Freie Universität Berlin, Institut für Soziologie. [http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/soziologie/arbeitsbereiche/makrosoziologie/projekte/dateien/projekt\\_doku\\_vornamen.pdf](http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/soziologie/arbeitsbereiche/makrosoziologie/projekte/dateien/projekt_doku_vornamen.pdf).
- Joppke, Christian. 1999. *Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kalter, Frank. 2005. “Ethnische Ungleichheit auf dem Arbeitsmarkt.” Pp. 303–32 in *Arbeitsmarktsoziologie: Probleme, Theorien, empirische Befunde*, edited by Martin Abraham and Thomas Hinz. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Kang, Tai S. 1971. “Name Change and Acculturation: Chinese Students on an American Campus.” *Pacific Sociological Review* 14:403–12.
- Kasof, Jan. 1993. “Sex Bias in the Naming of Stimulus Persons.” *Psychological Bulletin* 113:140–63.
- Kogan, Irena. 2002. “Labour Market Inclusion of Immigrants in Austria and Sweden: The Significance of the Period of Migration and the Effect of Citizenship Acquisition.” Working paper no. 44. Mannheimer Zentrum für Europäische Sozialforschung, Mannheim.
- Kohlheim, Volker. 1996. “Die christliche Namengebung.” Pp. 1048–57 in *Namensforschung: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*, vol. 2, edited by Ernst Eichler, Gerold Hilty, Heinrich Löffler, Hugo Steger, and Ladislav Zgusta. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Koopmans, Ruud, and Paul Statham. 2001. “How National Citizenship Shapes Transnationalism: A Comparative Analysis of Migrant Claims-Making in Germany, Great Britain and the Netherlands.” *Revue européenne des migrations internationales* 17:63–100.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 2000. *A Matter of Taste: How Names, Fashions and Culture Change*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.

## American Journal of Sociology

- Lieberson, Stanley, and Kelly S. Mikelson. 1995. "Distinctive African American Names: An Experimental, Historical, and Linguistic Analysis of Innovation." *American Sociological Review* 60:928–46.
- Lieberson, Stanley, and Mary C. Waters. 1990. *From Many Strands: Ethnic and Racial Groups in Contemporary America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- London, Andrew S., and S. Philip Morgan. 1994. "Racial Differences in First Names in 1910." *Journal of Family History* 19:261–84.
- Perfors, Amy. 2004. "What's in a Name? The Effect of Sound Symbolism on Perception of Facial Attractiveness." <http://www.mit.edu/~perfors/hotornot.pdf>. Accessed September 30, 2007.
- Portes, Alejandro, Patricia Fernández-Kelly, and William Haller. 2005. "Segmented Assimilation on the Ground: The New Second Generation in Early Adulthood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28:1000–1040.
- Portes, Alejandro, and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530:74–97.
- Rudolph, Udo, Robert Böhm, and Michael Lummer. 2007. "Ein Vorname sagt mehr als 1000 Worte: Zur sozialen Wahrnehmung von Vornamen." *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* 38:17–31.
- Rumbaut, Rubén G. 2001. "Assimilation of Immigrants." Pp. 845–49 in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 2, edited by Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Schupp, Jürgen, and Gert G. Wagner. 2002. "Maintenance of and Innovation in Long-Term Panel Studies: The Case of the German Socio-economic Panel (SOEP)." *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv* 86 (2): 163–75.
- Sue, Christina A., and Edward E. Telles. 2007. "Assimilation and Gender in Naming." *American Journal of Sociology* 112 (5): 1383–1415.
- Tucci, Ingrid. 2004. "What Are the Effects of Naturalization on the Socioeconomic Integration of Immigrants? The Case of France and Germany." Paper presented at the LIS-Conference "Immigration in a Cross-National Context: What Are the Implications for Europe?" Bourglinster/Luxembourg, June 21–22.
- van Tubergen, Frank, and Matthijs Kalmijn. 2005. "Destination-Language Proficiency in Cross-national Perspective: A Study of Immigrant Groups in Nine Western Countries." *American Journal of Sociology* 110 (5): 1412–57.
- Verwiebe, Roland. 2004. *Transnationale Mobilität innerhalb Europas: Eine Studie zu den sozialstrukturellen Effekten der Europäisierung*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, and Leo Srole. 1945. "The American Ethnic Group." Pp. 283–96 in *The Social Systems of American Ethnic Groups*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Waters, Mary C., and Tomás R. Jiménez. 2005. "Assessing Immigrant Assimilation: New Empirical and Theoretical Challenges." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:105–25.
- Watkins, Susan Cotts, and Andrew S. London. 1994. "Personal Names and Cultural Change: Study of the Naming Patterns of Italians and Jews in the United States in 1910." *Social Science History* 18:169–209.
- Weitman, Sasha. 1987. "Prénoms et orientations nationales en Israël, 1882–1980." *Annales* 42:879–900.
- Wunderlich, Tanja. 2005. *Die neuen Deutschen: Subjektive Dimensionen des Einbürgerungsprozesses*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Yinger, J. Milton. 1981. "Toward a Theory of Assimilation and Dissimilation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4 (3): 249–64.
- Zolberg, Aristide R., and Long Litt Woon. 1999. "Why Islam Is Like Spanish: Cultural Incorporation in Europe and the United States." *Politics and Society* 27 (1): 5–38.