Nordisk tidskrift för socioonomastik / Nordic Journal of Socio-Onomastics (5–32)

Names as resources for gendering: Trends within the field

Emilia Aldrin

Abstract: This article discusses personal names as a crucial linguistic resource for the construction of gender-related identities. It identifies and discusses trends in research on naming and gender, aiming to highlight key publications, point out changes over time, and suggest fruitful areas for further research. Using a personal name constitutes a categorizing linguistic act that contributes to the construction of gender identities, as well as indexically linking assumptions about gender-related embodiments, roles, and identities to specific types of denominations. Moreover, name usage creates conditions for renegotiating or breaking existing gender-related norms. Research on naming and gender is a well-established international and interdisciplinary field of study. This article particularly emphasizes Nordic studies but does so based on references to a broad international research context.

Keywords: naming, gender, identity, norms, trends, personal names, socio-onomastics

Emilia Aldrin (Halmstad University). Names as resources for gendering: Trends within the field.

NoSo 2025:5 | https://doi.org/10.59589/noso.52025.29248

1. Introduction

The close relationship between names and identity is a well-established fact that many researchers have explored, especially during the 'identity paradigm' of recent decades (Edwards 2009; Aldrin 2016). But what role do names specifically play in the creation of gender-related identities? And how has the research field on names and gender developed over time? These questions will be discussed in this article, which gathers scientific studies on naming and gender. The Nordic countries are of particular interest in this article, although a wider international body of research is none the less included as comparative background. The article aims to provide an overview of the research field, to discuss the field's development over time, as well as to identify key publications and fruitful areas for further research. The article is not based on a systematic literature review, rather on qualitative observations from having followed the research in the field for a longer period of time and includes publications from the 1980s to 2024.[1]

The article is based on fundamental theories about names and identity as well as a social constructivist perspective on gender construction. These are initially presented to the reader. The following sections of the article describe the development of the research field over time, while identifying three overall trends. The article concludes with a summary of movements within the field and some thoughts about future development.

2. Naming and gender

Using a personal name constitutes a categorizing linguistic act (McConnell-Ginet 2003). The assignment of a given name often

[1] This article was developed from a keynote talk presented at the 11th Nordic Conference on Language, gender, and identity at Uppsala University, Sweden in October 2023. Another article version focusing on given names only and my own contributions to this field of research is included in the conference proceedings (see Aldrin, forthcoming).

implies consequently categorizing the name bearer by gender, linking particular types of denomination to assumptions about gender-related embodiments, roles, and identities. Many parents consciously seek a given name that fits into a particular social context, culture, nation – or gender role (Aldrin 2011). Since naming is also a highly performative act (Butler 1993), where the linguistic expression not only refers to, but constitutes, the individual, this means that the moment a given name is used, the individual 'becomes' both her name and an ascribed gender identity. Sociolinguists Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003:15–16) describe the naming of a child as being the starting point for a process in which the child learns to become a certain type of girl or boy: 'These early linguistic acts set up a baby for life, launching a gradual process of learning to be a boy or a girl, a man or a woman, and to see all others as boys or girls, men or women as well'. Naming a child thus entails the creation of an identity foundation for the individual – bringing both possibilities and limitations that all future work on 'doing gender' will need to relate to (cf. West and Zimmerman 1987, see also Aldrin 2011; 2015b).

Philosopher and gender researcher Judith Butler (1993) is one of the scholars to have first recognized the significance of naming for the creation and embodiment of gender – and also pointed to the aspect of power. Naming, Butler stated, is a form of power exertion where someone assumes the right to define someone else, and, to some extent, there is always a risk of being called by a new name and thereby having one's bodily identity redefined (Butler 1997:29–30). Empirical examples showing how this may take form are given in Gustafsson's (2016) study of modern everyday nicknames in Sweden. For example, a woman reports being called *Pelle* after cutting her hair in a style considered to 'resemble a boy' (p. 64), and another female informant reports being nicknamed *Kenneth* after a male film character (pp. 56–57).

Names are expressions of identity often attributed to us by others, but it is the name bearer who must live with the name, develop an attitude towards it, and bear the consequences of the expected identity others perceive on the basis of it. Names contribute to evoke expecta-

tions about gender-related identities, bodies, and behaviours (Pilcher 2017), and individuals – based on their names – can be held accountable for a perceived gender affiliation or deemed as being more or less authentic in their gender identity (Lind 2023). In recent years, studies in psychology have suggested that names may further influence how people develop a specific gender identity. In a large-scale quantitative survey, Alexander et al. (2021) asked individuals about personality traits and behaviours as well as perceptions of gender connotations to their names. The results showed that individuals who perceived their name as strongly gender-coded also preferred gender-stereotypical activities, while those who perceived the name as weakly gender-coded often preferred less gender-stereotypical activities. Although there are clear methodological limitations regarding the validity and generalizability of this kind of study, it does raise interesting questions about the significance that names may carry for personal identity development, which deserves further research.

Against this theoretical backdrop, I will now discuss how the research field on names and gender has evolved over time. I identify three trends that have emerged in recent decades and discuss them more thoroughly below:

1) From stable binary to flexible norm negotiation.
2) The significance of power perspectives on naming and gender.
3) Situated and intersectional perspectives on naming and gender.

3. From stable binary to flexible norm negotiation

The first trend I want to highlight concerns a gradual shift in theoretical focus among scholars, from an assumed stable gender binarity to rather flexible negotiations of gender norms. Early research on naming and gender, during the 1980s and 1990s, largely focused on how naming practices in different language cultures contributed to construct a binary gender perception, by which different given

names conventionally used for 'boys' and 'girls' served as a constant symbol for the binary norm and perceived differences between men and women. For example, Alford (1988) noted that the majority of the world's languages distinguish male from female names. Researchers were also interested in the types of names given to girls and boys, as well as the characteristics and expectations the linguistic form associated with gender roles. Studies from various linguistic areas showed that boys' and girls' names often bear distinct structural, phonetic, or semantic features. Early examples, primarily from the USA and Germany, found that given names used for women tended to be longer (Debus 1985; Barry & Harper 1995; Gerritzen 1999), contain a higher proportion of vowels to consonants (Barry & Harper 1995; Oelkers 2003), and more often end in a vowel than given names used for men (Barry and Harper 1995; Lieberson & Bell 1998). During the 2000s, these varying name structures also came to be linked to theories of sound symbolism. In a seminal study by Whissell (2001a), it was argued that phonological patterns in names can be linked to emotional symbols such as active–passive, pleasant–unpleasant, hard–soft, etc., implying that women's names, through their constituent sound structures, were often associated with pleasantness, softness, and some passivity, while men's names were instead associated with stronger activity, hardness, and to some extent unpleasantness. Oelkers (2003) presented a large quantitative study of German names and also argued that the observed phonological differences between men's and women's given names were related to gender stereotypes. She found that women's names symbolically conveyed a gender identity associated with softness, melodiousness, and vocalic diminutiveness. Nübling (2009) further developed this reasoning by proposing a 'scale of sonority' linked to given names and used this to show that German given names from the 1940s to the early 2000s seem to have undergone a process of degendering. Gustafsson (2017) has also illuminated the sound symbolism of given names in a Swedish study, based on given names in the Swedish nobility calendar 2015. Here it was found that both women's and men's names used by the Swedish

nobility were characterized by a more 'masculine' sound symbolism, separating them from the rest of the population.

The fact that given name phonology is actually perceived as key to information about gender has also been empirically confirmed, both by linguistic and psychologistic studies during the 2000s, with an increasing number of studies from the 2010s onwards. Researchers have conducted experimental studies where participants were asked to guess gender based on invented names (Whissell 2001b; Wright 2006) or attribute traits to names (Pitcher, Mesoudi & McElligott 2013; Sidhu & Pexman 2015), confirming that the phonological properties of given names are used as a basis for drawing various conclusions about gender. Similar results were obtained regarding brand names and their assumed connections to target groups (see, e.g. Klink 2009). A significant study by Cai and Zhao (2019) showed that not only do people use phonological cues to infer gender identities from given names in their own language, they also apply these experiences when encountering names from foreign language cultures that may actually have completely different gender norms. Furthermore, researchers have investigated parents' motivations for choosing names for girls versus boys, where in several cases differences in types of reasoning, values, and ideals related to gender have emerged (Gerritzen 1999; Bambek 2007; Aldrin 2011; Gao 2011; Bechsgaard 2015). Several studies indicate that girls names are more often motivated by fashion or originality while boys names are more often motivated by local tradition or family connections.

During the 2000s, studies from language areas other than the Germanic increased in prominence. With a wide multicultural perspective it becomes clear, as Alford previously articulated in an important theoretical contribution to the field in 1988 (pp. 66–68), that gender in given names can be marked in three different ways: a) structurally – through phonological and morphological structures, b) semantically – through the use of distinct semantic categories, or c) conventionally – through an arbitrarily based but traditionally established set of male and female names. For example, Kim and Obasi (2023) have compared the connection of phonological structures to gender in Korean

and American given names 1940–2020. They conclude that while names ending in *-a*, *-i* or *-e* were connected primarily with women in both countries during the 20th Century, Korean names showed a gradual decline of the connection between these phonetic traits and gender from the 1980s onwards and a rise of men changing to such names during the 21 st Century (which was not the case in America). Zuercher (2007) found that given names in Azerbaijan are characterized by specific semantic patterns: while male names often contain lexical meanings related to things like courage, justice, pride, religious faith, female names instead contain meanings related to nature, beauty, and attractiveness. Similarly, Gao (2011) found that attractive Chinese male names often contain semantic meanings related to strength, hardness, and combativeness, while attractive female names instead contain semantic meanings related to beauty, elegance, and flowers. Thus, it is evident from the existing body of research that the gender-marking structures that recur in several Germanic languages are far from universal. In Japan, for example, it is primarily men who receive long given names (Mutsukawa 2010), and in Korea, almost all names for both men and women are two-syllable (Kim & Obasi 2023), in contrast with the Germanic norm. In a large study covering eight Indo-European languages in Europe and Asia, Ackermann and Zimmer (2021) confirmed that most gender-marking phonological structures among given names differ between various language areas and language families. However, they also noted a recurring pattern of non-palatal vowels (such as [a], [o], [u], excluding the final sound) being linked to masculine names in all studied languages, suggesting a potential existence of certain universalities of sound symbolism. This is an important area for further research, not least including other than Indo-European languages.

Several recent studies have highlighted that the connection between name structures and gender changes over time. Hough (2000) has shown that today's gender-related name structures in many Germanic languages have their explanation in a historical pattern where female and male names have been borrowed from different languages at different times. While female names were often borrowed from Latin

or Romance languages (where the feminine is marked by the ending -a), Germanic names (where both female and male names can have a consonant ending) have mainly been preserved for men, which has led to a phonological discrepancy. Even in contemporary times, gendered patterns are changing. Nübling (2009) found that German boys' and girls' names have phonologically converged over time since the mid-20th century, with mainly by boys' names acquiring more feminine features (becoming longer and more sonorant). Kim and Obasi (2023) found that Korean informants in the early 2000s could not guess whether a name was carried by a boy or a girl in almost 50 per cent of cases, which was seen as linked to sociocultural changes and changing attitudes towards girls, boys, patriarchy, and gender roles. Gustafsson (2020) found that the structural differences between Swedish male and female names has also changed over time from the early 20th century to the early 21st century. However, Gustafsson does not see a clear process of degendering, but instead points to influence of various shifting name trends that fluctuate throughout the century (including shifting preferences for originality, number of syllables and various linguistic origins). Researchers' increased focus on the variability in structural gender patterns in the name inventory, has resulted in a shift in the theoretical approach and understanding of the gender-creating function of names: from seeing names as a stable marker for the reproduction of binary gender coding to perceiving names as a flexible resource for negotiating gender norms.

4. Names as resources for negotiation of gender norms

Both given names, surnames, and nicknames can be used as resources to renegotiate, surpass, or deliberately break existing gender norms, as well as to create new or expanded gender identities. This has been noted in a multitude of studies from the 2010s onwards. In some European countries, it is a legal requirement that a given name clearly signals one of two genders (e.g. Finland, Poland, Germany, see Leibring

2018). In countries where the gender coding of names is unregulated, such as in the United Kingdom and the USA, there is often a certain inventory of names that are used by both women and men. This also applies to most of the Scandinavian countries including Sweden (where *Kim* and *Robin* have been highlighted as two examples of this in the Name Law Inquiry 2013 ahead of the 2017 Swedish Personal Names Act). These 'gender-neutral names' or 'unisex names' have also been subject to inquiries (see Barry & Harper 2014; Leibring 2016; Leibring 2018; Schmuck 2018; Bechsgaard 2023). However, Swedish, American and German researchers have observed that it is often conventional boys' names that have started to be used for girls, rather than vice versa (some Swedish examples of this are *Alex* and *Sam*, see Leibring 2016), and that the names starting to be used in this way gradually become used less frequently in their original function as conventional boys' names (Lieberson, Dumais & Baumann 2000:1282; Barry & Harper 2014; Leibring 2016; Schmuck 2018). Thus, it appears that the starting point for transcending conventional gender boundaries in naming practices, at least within Germanic languages, is often a name lacking feminine marking (although occasional examples of the opposite also exist, see Bechsgaard 2023). In countries such as the USA where there is a relatively long tradition of unisex names, researchers have noted that the number of unisex names has not increased as expected based on the society's extensive changes in gender roles (see Lieberson, Dumais & Baumann 2000). A recent Swedish study of a selection of names that increased significantly in popularity during the years 2004–2018 in Sweden, showed that only one out of over 400 names was used by both men and women (namely *Tintin*, see Leibring 2023a). Whether the same unexpected relationship applies on a larger scale in more countries, and, if so, what this might depend on, remains for researchers to investigate. For example, it is possible that the gender-neutral names increase as a group without each individually ranking particularly high on the lists.

Some gender-neutral names are newly created innovations; those who choose to create a completely new name have a unique opportunity to also create new gender norms. Nevertheless, a Swedish study

(Aldrin 2015a) showed that the majority of new given names registered in Sweden were clearly gender-coded. This was partly due to use of gendered endings (particularly usage of vowel endings in girls' names i.e. often *-a*), partly due to similarity with existing gendered names (such as the new girls' name *Asiri* close to the established girls' name *Siri*). At the same time, there were also examples of clear renegotiation and norm-breakages in relation to conventional gendered naming patterns (such as new boys' names ending with *-a*), underlining that people do use given names as a resource to create gender in new ways. Another interesting question concerns the types of gender-neutral names used in different cultures and how these types relate to gender norms. Bechsgaard (2023), for example, has highlighted Danish gender-neutral names that are linked to weather phenomena and seasons, showing that both semantic meanings, phonology, and existing gender norms in naming practices seem to interact in these. Attitudes towards gender-neutral names are also a factor that is assumed to affect their prevalence and would be suitable for further investigations (cf. Mehrabian 2001).

A gender-neutral naming law has been in place Sweden since 2017, allowing everyone, regardless of legal gender, to bear every name, regardless of its' conventional gender connotations. Similar legislation has been in place in Iceland since 2019, which is particularly interesting considering that the Icelandic language has a case inflection system that traditionally assigns either a feminine or masculine ending to given names (neuter names are relatively uncommon, see Willson 2023). The Icelandic naming act further includes the neuter suffix *-bur* as an alternative for individuals who want to avoid the gendering suffixes *-son* and *-dóttir*. Gender-contrary naming (i.e. using a name that is conventionally associated with another gender) can be utilized as a resource to create gender in new ways (Leibring 2016; Hagren Idevall 2016). However, the extent to which this possibility is grasped is still unclear. Early attitude surveys among adults and youths in Sweden (see Leibring 2016) show that only half of those surveyed are positive about children being given gender-contrary names. So far, there are no signs of changed attitudes between generations, but this may

change over time. In other Nordic countries such as Denmark, Finland and Norway, gender-contrary names are not allowed (i.e. name laws prohibit a name conventionally associated with one gender to be given to a person of another legal gender). Instead, these countries have a separate set of unisex names allowed for everyone.

However, conventionally gender-coded names can also contribute to renegotiating gender norms, when consciously used. Aldrin (2015b) has highlighted that naming motivations among Swedish parents include examples of both maintenance and renegotiations of gender stereotypes. Approximately 5–10 per cent of the motivations could be seen as gender-expanding by linking 'new' or 'non-stereotypical' attributes to conventional girls' and boys' names. Similarly, Bechsgaard (2015; 2023) observed that parents in Denmark sometimes justify the choice of a name for their child in a way that breaks traditional gender norms, noting that both sons and daughters are associated with both 'feminine' and 'masculine' values. This everyday negotiation of what constitutes appropriate names for boys and girls forms an important contribution to (de)gendering and reduced structural differences in naming practices.

5. Names, gender and power

Choice of surname in connection with partnership or marriage is a further area that entails complex gender negotiations – as well as clear power perspectives. This leads us to the second trend that I want to point out in the research on naming and gender: an increased focus on the significance of issues related to power, hierarchies, and distribution of resources. Regarding 'married names' (cf. Sw. 'giftasnamn') couples are forced to negotiate and linguistically solidify their mutual relationships, both in relation to each other and in relation to various family communities: should both parties bear the same surname (if so, whose – or if double surnames, in what order?) or should each retain their own surname (if so, what will future children be called?) or should the couple adopt a new common surname (if so, which type)? The choice of married names also bring consequences for the

establishment of societal hierarchies and power distributions on a societal macro level. Pilcher (2016; 2017) has pointed out that choice of married names can lead to social inequalities. If women, more than men, change surnames several times during their lives (in connection with partnerships, divorces, or deceased partners), this creates greater uncertainty in women's identification, which also has consequences for embodied identity formation, Pilcher argues (2016:769). A similar line of argument has been put forward by Aldrin (2017), who, in a folk onomastic study of lifespan identities connected to names, noticed that primarily women reported narratives regarding changes in the name–identity relation due to changed partnership relations throughout adult life.

In Sweden, Entzenberg (2004) examined the choice of surname after marriage among couples from Uppsala born in the 1960s and 1970s, and found that the vast majority (74 per cent) at that time chose to share the husband's surname. Similarly, most other European countries at this point in time, also showed a strong majority of couples bearing the husband's surname, while only a few countries like Belgium and Italy showed a clear majority of married couples with different surnames (Valetas 2001). However, in recent years, the trend in Sweden has changed significantly. Leibring (2023b) has showed that in 2020, 44 per cent of the couples who entered into marriage in Sweden chose to retain their original surnames, while 33 per cent chose to share the husband's surname, six per cent chose to share the wife's surname, four per cent took a new shared surname, and three per cent took a shared double surname. In Denmark, Bechsgaard (2023; 2024) interviewed couples on their choice of surname and found that regardless of the type of name chosen, it stemmed from different thoughts about 'me-identity' and 'we-identity'. Society's notions of individualism, families, and the relationship between personal identity and 'the common' seem to be important factors affecting marriage names, as well as notions of gender norms within the couple relationship. Similar patterns emerge in Norway (Grønstad 2020; 2024; Ellingsæter 2023) and in Finland (Castrén 2019; 2024). In a unique study focusing on men's perceptions of surname choices in connection with marriage,

Grønstad (2020 see also Grønstad 2024) finds that men who chose to retain their own surname often place great value on the family of origin and being tradition bearers, noting that some perceive changing the surname as a 'betrayal'. Men who chose to change their surname instead often actively resisted patronymy as tradition or emphasized the name's significance for gender equality in various ways. At the same time, the significance of the surname for individual identity was found to be important both for men who kept and for those who changed their surnames in Grønstads study (2020).

From an international perspective, the choice of surname in couple relationships is a well-researched area, which also includes same-sex couples' choice of surnames (Clarke, Burns & Burgoyne 2008; Underwood & Robnett 2021; Takashino, Davidson & Keeni 2024). Early studies often focused on women and the connection between the married name and more or less stereotypical or reactionary gender roles (Stafford & Kline 1996; Mills 2003), while later studies have emphasized how the choice of surname becomes part of the joint creation of a 'couple identity' (Kerns 2011), as well as a part of negotiating the couple's relationship to other family identities and traditions (Finch 2008). The latest studies in this area, however, increasingly highlight the individual perspective (Pilcher 2016; cf. Grønstad 2020). They underline the importance of surnames for the individual's identity formation, including its importance for maintaining an established professional identity (see also Laskowski 2010) and individual independence (see also Hamilton, Geist & Powell 2011), for maintaining or avoiding a personal identity associated with an unusual surname (see Ellingsaeter 2023), for the establishment of a gender-related mark of status as 'married' (see Thwaites 2020), and for the manifestation of a strong commitment within the relationship (see Kelley 2023). Other studies focus on how the choice of surname is perceived by others, and especially attitude studies from the USA have highlighted how married names may affects the degree to which a woman is perceived as 'loving' or 'dedicated to family life', but also explore how attitudes vary between various socioeconomic groups (Shafer 2017; Kelley 2023).

Another way to renegotiate gender norms while simultaneously asserting control over one's own gender identification is through new self-designations and change of given names on an individual level. In recent years, this has been highlighted in several studies from different countries, particularly focusing on self-chosen names of transgender individuals. In Sweden, Carin Leibring Svedjedal has recently conducted a dissertation project focusing on how transgender individuals use given names and pronouns (including the newly introduced gender-neutral pronoun *hen*) as resources for creating gender identities. Internationally, several studies have been conducted on this topic. In Germany, Lind (formerly Schmidt-Jüngst, 2023) conducted interviews and surveys with transgender people, in a context where legislation is much stricter than in Sweden and is reluctant to allow names that do not explicitly express gender. This piece of research highlights that name change is often part of an individual's process of 'coming out' as a transgender person, claiming and announcing a new gender identity (Schmidt-Jüngst 2018), but also that several problems can arise in connection to this type of name choice, illustrating how names are intertwined with power (Lind 2023) and discussing questions like: Who has sufficient authority to name? What criteria must be met for a name change to be accepted? and How does a name interact with other forms of meaning-making gender markers? Several studies of transgender name usage have also been conducted recently in the USA (Connell 2010; Sinclair Palm 2024), and include name-related challenges for transgender individuals in workplace settings (Dietert and Dentice 2009) as well as in research contexts (Thieme & Saunders 2018). An innovative perspective is presented by Sinclair Palm and Chokly (2023), who examine the narratives of young transgender individuals in relation to the name they were given at birth, sometimes referred to as 'deadnames', and establish that many find it painful to pronounce this name and report additional pain when others use the wrong name, while the youth employ various strategies to manage this. An interesting question for future linguistic research is how name changes are handled by surrounding people in private or professional settings and to what extent people apply various strate-

gies to respect or undermine name changes, acknowledging the role of time, place, recipient and the presence or absence of the name bearer in these practices. Especially important would be to explore if properties of the new name (such as phonetics, originality, fashion, etc.) are assigned value and related to gender expectations.

6. Situated and intersectional perspectives on naming and gender

The third identified trend within the field of research on naming and gender is an increasing interest in situated and intersectional perspectives, noticeable from the 2000s and onwards. Names always arise and will be used within specific social contexts, which also means that they are motivated by specific social and communicative goals and acquire specific local meanings. Sociolinguist McConnel-Ginnet (2003) was one of the first researchers to highlight this fact and demonstrate how the choice of address in everyday interaction (given names, nicknames, surnames, etc.) gains its significance in a particular context based on how gender-forming practices and the creation of relationships based on gender look and change within that context. Pilcher (2016) has also emphasized that name usage interacts with other social and embodied expressions in the creation of gender in a particular context. Name choice is not only about expressing identity, but also about which identity that is seen as appropriate for the situation. The use of nicknames (pet names and diminutives) is an area where the situated perspective becomes particularly clear. Gustafsson (2016) conducted a larger Swedish study examining how nicknames create gender identities. She found that adult women's nicknames were characterized by a higher degree of intimacy than men's nicknames, both because women are more likely than men to have nicknames at all, and because women's nicknames often arose in more intimate contexts. In addition, nicknames may create various situated gender identities, where adult women, for example, can be associated with family identities, childhood memories, and couple

relationships while adult men can be associated with sports identities, peer groups, and solidarity functions (Gustafsson 2016:81–83). Other studies on nicknames and gender formation have examined the use of informal names by teenagers in everyday contexts, through ethnographic approaches focusing on both physical interaction (Haggan 2008; Ping 2021) and digital platforms (Subrahmanyam, Greenfield & Tynes 2004). Here, it is often described how young people, through the use of nicknames, explore, challenge, and negotiate gender-related identities and power relations in everyday life, as well as how the significance of nicknames is mediated by the addressee's instant reaction, for example through reinterpretation or resistance (Ping 2021). Several studies on youth nickname usage (Lytra 2003; Haggan 2008) also highlight how the creation of gender identities and cultural identities can interact in young people's nickname usage, demonstrating how a situated perspective often also leads to an increased focus on intersectionality, i.e. how different expressions of identity interact. Gender formation is rarely an isolated act but normally operates in conjunction with other forms of identity construction.

When it comes to the choice of married names, as discussed more extensively above, in recent years, it has been highlighted that gender formation in this case interacts with identity formation linked to age, class, and ethnicity (see Pilcher 2017:817; cf. Gooding and Kreider 2010; Hamilton, Geist & Powell 2011). Studies on the situated meanings and consequences of surname choices are not yet plentiful, but in an innovative and experimental setup, Wofford and Knotts (2020) examined perceptions of politicians based on married names. They found that female politicians who kept their previous surnames after marriage were sometimes perceived as less honest, ethical, caring and intelligent than those who changed their surname upon marriage, especially in the eyes of less-educated men. Similar studies of, for example, job applications, housing queues, etc., as well as studies acknowledging national variations in marital naming practices would be interesting.

Another area where the interaction between gender and other identity categories has been noted is in the choice of given names in multi-

lingual families, a highly relevant topic for contemporary global society. A larger Norwegian study (Alhaug & Saarelma 2017) examined name choices in families where one or both parents come from Finland. It clearly showed that traditional Finnish names were given more often to boys than to girls. This was interpreted as multilingual boys being ascribed a cultural identity more closely tied to the parents' home country and that the boys were seen as carriers of this culture, while multilingual girls were ascribed a more open or outward-facing cultural identity tied to a more international context. At the same time, it was found that in families where one parent had been born in Norway and one in Finland, daughters more often received a Finnish name if the mother had been born in Finland, while sons more often received a Finnish name if the father had been born in Finland. Thus, the creation of cultural identities interacted with gender formation in several ways. Similar trends have been observed among immigrant groups in several countries, such as Germany (Gerhards & Tuppat 2021), USA (Sue & Telles 2007; Parada 2016), and Sweden (Aldrin 2009). Both situated and intersectional perspectives enable a refined understanding of the complex negotiations and potential meanings activated by gender-forming naming practices.

7. Discussion

This article has presented current research on naming and gender, focusing on Nordic countries. I have observed several developmental trends in the field, as highlighted in the discussion above: firstly, a gradual transition from the name as a symbol of stable binarity to a resource for flexible norm negotiation; secondly, an increased focus on power perspectives in relation to naming practices; and thirdly, an intersectional exploration of how gender interacts with other identities in specific situations.

- Trend 1: From symbol of stable binary to resource for flexible norm negotiation.
- Trend 2: Naming and gender from a power perspective.

- Trend 3: Situated and intersectional identity construction through names.

The development of these trends within the field of naming and gender appears to reflect larger processes of development that are also visible in adjacent fields of study. The first trend – where we have seen a transition from names being perceived as symbols of a stable, gender-binary to flexible resources for people's negotiation of gender norms – aligns with a previously established shift in focus within gender studies (see Risman & Davis 2013). Here, the scholarly focus shifted from paying attention to how gender was socialized through 'gender roles' to paying attention to how individuals 'perfomatively' were *doing* gender through active actions (see Butler 1993; West & Zimmerman 1987). This, in turn, mirror a broader paradigm shift within sociolinguistics, from the 'first wave' to the 'second wave' (see Eckert 2012; Nilsson 2023). While the first wave of sociolinguistic studies was characterized by a quantitative approach correlating linguistic variables with social variables (and therefore considering linguistic expressions to be symbols of social belonging), the second wave studies were characterized by ethnographic approaches focusing on how speakers in a specific environment perform social belonging through linguistic resources. In other words, there was a shift from essentialism to social constructionism. Therefore, it is not surprising that we also see a corresponding change of perspective on names and their relation to gender.

The second trend – identified as an increased focus on power perspectives in relation to issues of name and gender – also resembles a development within the broader field of gender research. However, while early gender research highlighted how the creation of gender is connected to access to social positions, distribution of power, and various forms of oppression, this was acknowledged much later within the field of naming and gender, as well as within sociolinguistics (see Eckert & Wenger 2005). Within gender research, the power perspective was an early starting point that motivated the implementation of research (Risman & Davis 2013), which was intensified when the con-

cept of 'intersectionality' was introduced during the 1980s and 1990s (see e.g. Crenshaw 1989 cf. Block & Corona 2016). At this time, studies emphasized how gender often interacts with other variables and therefore constitutes only one of several power structures that affect people's meaning-making. Within gender research, thus, the general development seems to have shifted from a) an individual focus to b) an institutional focus (including issues of power) and finally to c) an interactional/situated focus (see Risman & Davis 2013). However, the development in the area of naming and gender suggests that the power perspective was brought to the fore at a later stage here, probably inspired by the 'third wave' of sociolinguistics (Eckert 2012; Nilsson 2023). The third wave, which is generally considered to be the current paradigm within sociolinguistics, presented an increasing focus on the context-bound nature of meaning-making, how people create different identities in different contexts, and how linguistic and non-linguistic expressions interact in meaning-making, with power perspectives included as one part of the analysis.

This leads us to the third identified trend in research on name and gender: an acknowledgement of the situated and intersectional aspects of meaning-making surrounding naming and gender. Within sociolinguistics, the development seems to have moved from a) an individual level to c) an interactional/situated level and from there to b) an institutional level (including power perspectives). In research on naming and gender, on the other hand, the development seem to have taken place in different directions simultaneously: we have seen a general development from a) an individual level to either c) an interactional/situated level, or concurrently to b) an institutional/intersectional level (including power perspectives). At the same time, in recent years, especially in research on married names, a reverse direction has been noted from b) the institutional level to a) the individual level, (although being approached in new ways).

To conclude, the development of trends in the field of naming and gender seem to be highly interdependent of developments in other fields, and, until now, especially sociolinguistics. Although there have been occasional studies on the topic from other disciplines for a

long time, the field as such seem to have become more heavily influenced by other disciplines over the last few decades. Today, research on naming and gender is a highly interdisciplinary field, involving sociologists, ethnologists and psychologists – alongside linguists and others. This will undoubtedly impact the future development of the field, where central questions within sociology and social psychology, for example, can be expected to have a significant influence on the choice of topics.

Finally, it can be stated that research on naming and gender is a vibrant, international field, where the Nordic region currently holds a prominent position with numerous influential studies on various topics. From the discussion above, it has become apparent that despite the rather extensive available research thus far, a number of important question still remain to be investigated. This applies particularly to how gender formation through naming is linked to societal changes over time, how legislation affects usage, how names interact with other forms of identity expressions, comparative studies across language barriers, and further exploration of how gender constructions through naming manifests in various situational contexts, including contexts throughout the diversity of contemporary digital platforms, chatbots, and AI tools.

References

Ackermann, Tanja & Zimmer, Christian. 2021. The Sound of Gender-Correlations of Name Phonology and Gender across Languages. *Linguistics* 59(4). 1143–1177. https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2020-0027

Aldrin, Emilia. 2009. The choice of first names as a social resource and act of identity among multilingual families in contemporary Sweden. In *Names in multi-lingual, multi-cultural and multi-ethnic contact. Proceedings of The 23rd International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, August 17–22, 2008, York University, Toronto, Canada*. York university (CD-rom). 86–92.

Aldrin, Emilia, 2011: *Namnval som social handling. Val av förnamn och samtal om förnamn i Göteborg 2007–2009.* (Namn och samhälle 24.) Uppsala universitet.

Aldrin, Emilia. 2015a. Att skapa kön. Könsmönster och könsroller i nyskapade förnamn. In: Aldrin, Emilia m.fl. (red.), *Innovationer i namn och namnmönster. Handlingar från NORNA:s 43e symposium*. Uppsala: NORNA-förlaget. 36–51.

Aldrin, Emilia. 2015b. Förnamnsvalet som resurs för förhandling av könsidentiteter och könsgränser. Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica 32. 169–191.

Aldrin, Emilia. 2016. Names and identity. In Hough (ed.), *Oxford handbook of names and naming*. Oxford University Press. 382–394.

Aldrin, Emilia. 2017. Vad säger mitt namn om mig? En folkonomastisk studie av vuxnas syn på relationen mellan namn och identitet. I Schmidt, Tom & Særheim, Inge (red.), *Namn som kjelder. Rapport frå Den sekstande nordiske namneforskarkongressen på Jæren folkehøgskole, Kleppe 8.–11. juni 2016* (NORNA-rapporter 96). 21–34.

Aldrin, Emilia. To appear. Förnamn som resurs för genuskonstruktion: empiriska exempel och några tendenser. Accepted for publication in: *Konferensvolym från den 11e nordiska konferensen om Språk, kön och identitet*.

Alexander, Gerraime M., John, Kendall, Hammond, Tracy & Lahey, Joanna. 2021. Living Up to a Name: Gender Role Behavior Varies with Forename Gender Typicality. *Frontiers in Psychology* 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.604848

Alford, Richard D. 1988. *Naming and identity: a cross cultural study of personal naming practices*. New Haven: HRAF Press.

Alhaug, Gulbrand & Saarelma, Minna. 2017. Naming of children in Finnish and Finnish-Norwegian families in Norway. In Terhi Ainiala & Jan-Ola Östman (eds.), *Socioonomastics: The pragmatics of names*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 69–91.

Bambek, Andrea. 2007. Gesesellschaftliche Bedingungen der nomina propria – am Beispiel der Vornamengebungspraxis der deutschen Minderheit in Ungarn. In Eva Brylla & Mats Wahlberg (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21 st International Congress of Onomastic Sciences, Uppsala 19–24 August 2002. 3*. Uppsala: Institutet för språk och folkminnen. 35–52. https://isof.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1106986/FULLTEXT03.pdf

Barry, Herbert & Harper, Aylene. 1993. Feminization of unisex names. *Names* 4. 228–238.

Barry, Herbert & Harper, Aylene, 1995. Increased choice of female phonetic attributes in first names. *Sex roles* 32. 809–819.

Barry, Herbert & Harper, Aylene. 2014. Unisex names for babies born in Pennsylvania 1990–2010. *Names* 62(1). 13–22.

Bechsgaard, Katrine Kehlet. 2015. *Hvorfor skal barnet hedde sådan? En undersøgelse af motiver bag valg af børnenavne og social variation i forhold til navnevalg*. Københavns Universitet.

Bechsgaard, Katrine Kehlet. 2023. Opblødning af kønsbestemte navnegrænser? Udvikling i normer for brug af fornavne og efternavne. I Väinö Syrjälä, Terhi Ainiala & Pamela Gustavsson. *Namn och gränser. Rapport från den sjuttonde nordiska namnforskarkongressen den 8–11 juni 2021*. (NORNA-rapporter 100.) 23–36. https://norna.org/sites/default/files/rapporter/NORNA100.pdf

Bechsgaard, Katrine Kehlet. 2024. ”Our family came to be with this name”: Family identity and gender roles in surname choices. *NoSo: Nordisk tidskrift för socioonomastik / Nordic Journal of Socio-Onomastics* 4(1). 69–100. https://doi.org/10.59589/noso.42024.17083

Block, David & Corona, Victor. 2016. Intersectionality in language and identity research. In Preece, Sîan (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Identity*. London: Routledge. 507–522.

Brylla, Eva. 2007. “A boy named Sue”. Om flicknamn och pojknamn. I Britt-Louise Gunnarsson, Sonja Entzenberg & Maria Ohlson (eds.), *Språk och kön i ett nutida och historiskt perspektiv. Studier presenterade vid Den sjätte nordiska konferensen om språk och kön*. Uppsala universitet. 191–197.

Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that matter*. London/New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith, 1997: *The psychic life of power. Theories in subjection*. Stanford University Press.

Cai, Zhenguang G. & Zhao, Nan. 2019. The sound of gender: inferring the gender of names in a foreign language. *Journal of Cultural Cognitive Science* 3. 63–73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41809-019-00028-2

Castrén, Anna-Maija. 2019. Becoming “Us”: Marital Name, Gender, and Agentic Work in Transition to Marriage. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 81(1). 248–263. https://doi-org.ezproxy.bib.hh.se/10.1111/jomf.12519

Castrén, Anna-Maija. 2024. ‘The family fight is on!’ Finnish mixed-sex couples, humour and alternatives to patrilineal surnaming. *NoSo: Nordisk tidskrift för socioonomastik / Nordic Journal of Socio-Onomastics* 4(1). 15–40. https://doi.org/10.59589/noso.42024.17605

Clarke, Victoria, Burns, Maree & Burgoyne, Carole. 2008. ‘Who would take whose name?’ Accounts of naming practices in same-sex relationships. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 18(5). 420–439. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.936

Connell, Catherine. 2010. Doing, undoing or redoing gender? Learning from the workplace experiences of transgender people. *Gender & Society* 24. 31–55.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1989. Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. *The University of Chicago Legal Forum.* 139–167.

Debus, Friedhelm. 1985. Zur Pragmatik von Namengebung und Namengebrauch. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung, N.F.* 20. 305–343.

Dietert, Michelle & Dentice, Dianne. 2009. Gender identity issues and workplace discrimination: the transgender experience. *Journal of Workplace Rights* 14(1). 121–140.

Eckert, Penelope. 2012. Three waves of variation study: the emergence of meaning in the study of sociolinguistic variation. *The annual review of anthropology* 41. 87–100.

Eckert, Penelope & Wenger, Étienne. 2005. What is the role of power in sociolinguistic variation? Journal of Sociolinguistics 9(4). 582–589.

Edwards, John. 2009. *Language and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellingsæter, Anne Liese. 2023. Resisting or maintaining gender inequality? Wedding traditions among Norwegian millennials. *Acta Sociologica* 66(1). 44–58. https://doi-org.ezproxy.bib.hh.se/10.1177/00016993221074826

En ny lag om personnamn. Betänkande av namnlagskommittén. (2013). Stockholm. (Statens offentliga utredningar 2013:35.) https://www.regeringen.se/contentassets/0a2cfc6cbdf7433bbd80aa3dbd569f27/sou-2013_35_webb.pdf

Entzenberg, Sonja. 2004. Gemensamt efternamn eller var sitt? En studie av gifta Uppsalapars efternamnsval. In: Strandberg, S, Wahlberg, M. & Heinrici, B. (eds.), *Namn: Hyllningsskrift till Eva Brylla den 1 mars 2004*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet. 35–45.

Finch, Janet. 2008. Naming Names: Kinship, Individuality and Personal Names. *Sociology* 42(4). 709–725.

Figlio, David N. 2007. Boys Named Sue: Disruptive Children and Their Peers. *Education Finance and Policy* 2(4). 376–394. https://doi.org/10.1162/edfp.2007.2.4.376

Gao, Ge. 2011. Shall I name her "Wisdom" or "Elegance"? Naming in China. *Names: A journal of onomastics* 59(3). 164–174.

Gerhards, Jürgen & Tuppat, Julia. 2021. "Boundary maintenance" or "boundary crossing"? Name giving practices among immigrants in Germany. *Names* 69(3). 28–40. https://doi.org/10.5195/names.2021.2237

Gerritzen, Doreen. 1999. Changes in the naming patterns for girls and boys in the Netherlands against the cultural background (XXth Century). Onoma 34. 181–195.

Gooding, Gretchen E. & Kreider, Rose M. 2020. Women's marital naming choices in a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Family Issues* 31(5). 681–701. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X09344688

Grønstad, Line Førre. 2020. *Fellesskap og individualitet. Kjønna etternamnsval blant norske menn i heterofile parforhold*. University of Bergen. https://hdl.handle.net/11250/2711989

Grønstad, Line Førre. 2024. Tradition and gender. Norwegian men's surnames. *NoSo: Nordisk Tidskrift för socioonomastik / Nordic Journal of Socio-Onomastics* 4(1). 41–67.

Gustafsson, Linnea. 2016. *Moderna vardagliga binamn i Sverige*. (Namn i samhälle 29). Uppsala universitet.

Gustafsson, Linnea. 2017. Förnamn med klass: fonetisk ljudsymbolism i ett intersektionellt perspektiv. I Tom Schmidt & Inge Saerheim (eds.), *Namn som kjelder. Rapport frå Den sekstande nordiske namneforskarkongressen på Jæren folkehøgskule, Kleppe 8.-11. juni 2016*. (NORNA-rapporter 96.) Uppsala: NORNA-förlaget. 83–94.

Gustafsson, Linnea. 2020. Strukturella skillnader mellan svenska kvinno- och mansnamn 1915–2016. *Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica* 35. 159–176.

Haggan, Madeleine. 2008. Nicknames of Kuwaiti teenagers. *Names* 56(2). 81–94. https://doi.org/10.1179/175622708X302368

Hagren Idevall, Karin. 2016. Kön, sexualitet och nationalitet i nordiska namnlagar. En studie av normer och diskriminering. *Studia Anthroponymica Scandinavica* 34. 61–80.

Hamilton, Laura, Geist, Claudia & Powell, Brian. 2011. Marital Name Change as a Window into Gender Attitudes. *Gender & Society* 25(2). 145–175. https://doi-org.ezproxy.bib.hh.se/10.1177/0891243211398653

Holmes, Janet & Meyerhoff, Miriam (eds). 2003. *The Handbook of language and gender*. Malden: Blackwell.

Hough, Carole. 2000. Towards an explanation of phonetic differentiation in masculine and feminine personal names. *Journal of Linguistics* 36(1). 1–11.

Kelley, Kristin. 2023. The Effect of Marital Name Choices on Heterosexual Women's and Men's Perceived Quality as Romantic Partners. *Socius* 9. https://doi.org/10.1177/23780231221148153

Kerns, Myleah. 2011. North American women's surname choice based on ethnicity and self-identification as feminists. *Names* 59(2). 104–117. https://doi.org/10.1179/002777311X12976826704244

Kim, Jong-Mi & Obasi, Sharon N. 2023. Phonological trends of gendered names in Korea and the U.S.A. *Names: A journal of onomastics* 71(3). 37–46. https://doi.org/10.5195/names.2023.2485

Klink, Richard. 2009. Gender differences in new brand name response. *Marketing Letters* 20. 313–326. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11002-008-9066-x

Laskowski, Kara. 2010. Women's post-marital name retention and the communication of identity. *Names* 58(2). 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1179/002777310X12682237915025

Leibring, Katharina. 2016. Namn och namnbärare. Om könsneutrala, könskonträra och könsöverskridande namn. I: Martin Sejer Danielsen m.fl. (red.), Navn og navenbaerer. Rapport fra NORNAs 45. symposium. Uppsala: NORNA-förlaget. 129–152. http://nfi.ku.dk/publikationer/web-publikationer/norna-rapporter-93

Leibring, Katharina. 2018. Swedish teenagers' attitudes on unisex and gender crossing first names. In: Damaris Nübling & Stefan Hirschauer (eds.) Namen und Geschlechter. Studien zum onymischen un/doing gender. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter. 303–326. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110589122

Leibring, Katharina. 2023a. Movements and changes in the forename stock in Sweden between the 1990s and the 2010s. In: Urszula Bijak, Pawel Swoboda & Justyna B. Walkowiak (eds.) *Onomastics in interaction with other branches of science. Volume 2: Anthroponomastics*. Jagiellonian University Press. 279–298. https://doi.org/10.4467/K7446.46/22.23.17282

Leibring, Katharina. 2023b. Vilket eller vilka efternamn väljs i samband med giftermål? Namnbloggen, Institutet för Språk och folkminnen. 24 augusti 2023. https://www.isof.se/lar-dig-mer/bloggar/namnbloggen/inlagg/2023-08-24-vilket-eller-vilka-efternamn-valjs-vid-giftermal

Leibring Svedjedal, Carin. 2025. *Att vara och göra trans. Diskurser om kön och transidentiteter i transpersoners egenvalda självbenämningar och svensk medierapportering 2019–2023*. Uppsala universitet.

Lieberson, Stanley & Bell, Eleanor, 1998. Children's first names. An empirical study of social taste. *American Journal of Sociology* 98. 511–554.

Lieberson, Stanley, Dumais, Susan & Baumann, Shyon. 2000. The Instability of Androgynous Names: The Symbolic Maintenance of Gender Boundaries. American Journal of Sociology 105(5). 1249–1287. https://doi.org/10.1086/210431

Lind, Miriam. 2023. How to do gender with names. The name changes of trans individuals as performative speech acts. *Journal of language and sexuality* 12(1). 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1075/jls.21002.lin

Lag om personnamn 2017. Sveriges riksdag. (SFS 2016:1013).

Lytra, Vasiliki. 2003. Nicknames and Teasing. A Case Study of a Linguistically and Culturally Mixed Peer-Group. In Jannis Androutsopoulos & Alexandra Georgakopoulou (eds.) *Discourse Construction of Youth Identities*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 48–74.

McConnell-Ginet, Sally. 2003. “What’s in a name?” Social labelling and gender practices. In Holmes, Janet & Meyerhoof, Miriam (eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender*. Blackwell Publishing. 69–97. https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470756942.ch3

Mehrabian, Albert. 2001. Characteristics Attributed to Individuals on the Basis of Their First Names. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 127(1). 59–88.

Mills, Sarah. 2003. Caught between sexism, anti-sexism and ‘political correctness’. Feminist women’s negotiations with naming practices. *Discourse Society* 14. 87–110.

Mutsukawa, Masahiko. 2010. Gender differences in English and Japanese Given Names. *Nanzan Studies on Japanese Language and Culture* 10. 77–89.

Nilsson, Jenny. 2023. Den fjärde vågen – mer variation i variationslingvistiken. I Natalia Ganuza et al. (eds.) *Variationslingvistik i Norden – språkförändringsprocesser i dagens samhälle. Ett symposium till minne av Bengt Nordberg, Uppsala den 31 mars och 1 april 2022*. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet. 157–162. https://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1815600/FULLTEXT01.pdf

Nübling, Damaris, 2009. Von Monika zu Mia, von Norbert zu Noah: Zur Androgynisierung der Rufnamen seit 1945 auf prosodisch-phonologischer Ebene. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 44. 67–110.

Oelkers, Susanne. 2003. *Naming gender. Empirische Untersuchungen zur phonologischen Struktur von Vornamen im Deutschen*. Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang.

Parada, Maryann. 2016. Ethnolinguistic and gender aspects of Latino naming in Chicago: Exploring regional variation. *Names: A journal of onomastics* 64(1). 19–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/00277738.2016.1118858

Pilcher, Jane. 2016. Names, bodies and identities. *Sociology* 50(4). 764–779. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038515582157

Pilcher, Jane. 2017. Names and “doing gender”: How forenames and surnames contribute to gender identities, differences and inequalities. *Sex roles* 77. 812–822. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0805-4

Ping, Yu-Chen. 2021. Nicknames and gender: An ethnographic study of two junior high schools. *Taiwan Journal of Sociology of Education* 21(1). 91–132.

Pitcher, Benjamin, Mesoudi, Alex & McElligott, Alan G. 2013. Sex-biased sound symbolism in English-language first names. *PloS ONE* 8(6):e64825. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0064825

Risman, Barbara & Davis, Georgiann. 2013. From sex roles to gender structure. *Current Sociology* 61(5-6). 733–755. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479315

Schmidt-Jüngst, Miriam. 2018. Der Rufnamenwechsel als performativer Akt der Transgression. In: Damaris Nübling & Stefan Hirschauer (eds.) *Namen und Geschlechter. Studien zum onymischen un/doing gender*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter. 45–72. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110589122

Schmuck, Mirjam. 2018. Deutsche und niederländische Unisexnamen. Entstehung und variable Geschlechtsneutralität. In Damaris Nübling & Stefan Hirschauer (eds.) *Namen und Geschlechter. Studien zum onymischen un/doing gender*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter. 271–302. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110589122

Shafer, Emily Fitzgibbons. 2017. Hillary Rodham Versus Hillary Clinton: Consequences of Surname Choice in Marriage. *Gender Issues* 34. 316–332.

Sidhu, David M. & Pexman, Penny M. 2015. What's in a Name? Sound Symbolism and Gender in First Names. *PLOS one* 10(5) https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0126809

Sinclair Palm, Julia & Chokly, Kit. 2023. 'It's a giant faux pas': exploring young trans people's beliefs about deadnaming and the term deadname. *Journal of LGBT Youth* 20(2). https://doi.org/10.1080/19361653.2022.2076182

Sinclair-Palm, Julia. 2024. Names as a trans technology. Exploring the naming practices of trans youth in Australia, Ireland and Canada. *NoSo: Nordisk tidskrift för socioonomastik / Nordic Journal of Socio-Onomastics* 4(1). 137–161. https://doi.org/10.59589/noso.42024.16669

Stafford, Laura & Kline, Susan L. 1996. Married women's name choices and sense of self. *Communication Reports* 9(1). 85–92

Subrahmanyam, Kaveri, Greenfield, Patricia M. & Tynes, Brendesha. 2004. Sexuality in an Online Teen Chat Room. *Applied Developmental Psychology* 25(6). 651–666.

Sue, Christina A. & Telles, Edward E. 2007. Assimilation and gender in naming. *American Journal of Sociology* 112(5). 1383–1415. https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1086/511801

Takashino, Nina, Davidson, Robert J. & Keeni, Minakshi. 2024. Traditional family system, local government recognition and citizens' perceptions of homosexuality in Japan: an exploratory study. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*. Vol. ahead of print. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2023-0151

Thieme, Katja & Saunders, Mary Ann S. 2018. How do you wish to be cited? Citation practices and a scholarly community of care in trans studies research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 32. 80–90.

Thwaites, Rachel. 2020. *Changing Names and Gendering Identity: Social Organisation in Contemporary Britain*. London: Routledge

Underwood, Carrie R. & Robnett, Rachael D. 2021. "I Would Like Us to Share a Name so That We Can Be Recognized in Society." Marital Surname Preferences in Same-Sex Relationships. *Journal of homosexuality* 68(2). 290–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/00918369.2019.1651110

Valetas, Marie France. 2001. Le nom des femmes mariées dans l'Union européenne. *Population & Sociétés* 4. 1–5.

Walkowiak, Justyna B. 2023. Lithuanian Feminine Surname Debates from a Central European Perspective. *Genealogy* 7(4). 88. https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy7040088

West, Candace & Zimmerman, Don. 1987. Doing gender. *Gender and society* 1. 125–151.

Whissell, Cynthia. 2001a. Sound and emotion in given names. *Names* 49(2). 97–120.

Whissell, Cynthia. 2001b. Cues to referent gender in randomly constructed names. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 93. 856–858.

Wikström, Solveig. 2012. Surnames and identities. *Oslo studies in language* 4(2). 258–272.

Willson, Kendra. 2023. Eru öll Blæ ánægð? Gender-bending Icelandic names. In Väinö Syrjälä, Terhi Ainiala & Pamela Gustavsson (eds.) *Namn och gränser. Rapport från den sjuttonde nordiska namnforskarkongressen den 8–11 juni 2021*. (NORNA-rapporter 100.) 37–55. https://norna.org/sites/default/files/rapporter/NORNA100.pdf

Wofford, Claire B. & Knotts, H. Gibbs. 2020. What's in a name? An experimental test of marital name change on perceptions of female political candidates. *The social science journal* 60(3). 608–625. https://doi.org/10.1080/03623319.2020.1782636

Wright, Saundra K. 2006. Phonological cues influence sex decisions about novel names. *Psychological reports* 99(2). 315–321. https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.99.2.315-321

Zuercher, Kenneth. 2007. Personal names in Azerbaijan. A quantitative analysis. *Names: A journal of onomastics* 55(2). 87–102.