The Relationship Between Adult's Personality and Baby Name Preferences

CAREY J. FITZGERALD & JODY A. THOMPSON
University of South Carolina, Beaufort

Baby naming has become a lucrative industry in which individuals can earn income by suggesting appropriate and/or popular baby names to new parents (cf., Wattenberg, 2013 for an example). However, scientific research on names, to date, has not examined whether parents' personalities influence their preferences for more popular, unique, or traditional baby names. The present study investigated potential correlations between individuals' personality traits (Five Factor Model and Dark Triad) and their preferences for popular, unique, and traditional baby names. Conscientiousness and Neuroticism were not correlated with baby name preferences. However, Extraversion and Agreeableness were positively correlated with uniqueness of baby names. Extraversion was also positively correlated with popularity of baby names. Openness was negatively correlated with popularity and positively correlated with traditionality. Narcissism was positively correlated with uniqueness baby names. Exploratory analyses also revealed some noteworthy results.

In recent years, many individuals in popular culture have chosen unique names to give their children (cf., Gwyneth Paltrow naming her daughter Apple; Kim Kardashian and Kanye West naming their child North; Jason Lee naming his son Pilot Inspektor [Cruz, 2011]). Although unique name choice has been previously examined, it has only been studied as a product of race (Fryer & Levitt, 2004), phonetic similarity between preferred names (Berger, Bradlow, Braunstein, & Zhang, 2012), and a reflection of what is culturally popular at the time (Twenge, Adebe, & Campbell, 2010). The current study sought to find links in the personality of namers and potential namers between the factors of Agreeableness, Extraversion, Openness, and Narcissism with baby name popularity, uniqueness, and traditionality.

The few psychological studies regarding baby name preferences have illustrated the importance of research in this area. For example, names influence first impressions. Specifically, people make judgments about other individuals' personality traits based on what that other individuals' name is (Leirer, Hamilton, & Carpenter, 1982; Mehrabian, 2001). In addition, there is currently contradictory evidence regarding whether one's name influences his or her likelihood of being hired by employers (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Darolia, Koedel, Paco, Wilson, & Perez-Arce, 2016). One study found that applicants with stereotypical African-American names were less likely to be hired than applicants with stereotypical Caucasian names (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004) while a more recent study found no such difference (Darolia et al., 2016). Although this data is inconclusive, it potentially means that factors influencing the name a person is given, such as the personality of a namer, could inhibit someone from obtaining a job later in life.

Studies have found links between individuals' racial identity and preferences for unique baby names. Fryer and Levitt (2004) examined the names and demographic information of all children born in California between the years 1961-2000. They found a growing difference between the types of names given to Caucasian children and African-American children. While Caucasian parents were more likely to give their newborns a more common name – such as John, Matthew and David – African-American parents began deviating from those common names and began naming their newborns unique names – e.g. Deshawn, Tyrone, Precious, and Shanice.

Many factors influence individuals' choices in baby names. Research shows that culture and societal norms play a role in baby name preferences (Rentfrow et al., 2013; Varnum & Kitayama, 2011; Zou & Cai, 2016). For example, popular names are less likely to appear in certain regions, e.g. frontier regions (Rentfrow, Gosling, Jokela, Stillwell, Kosinski, & Potter, 2013; Varnum & Kitayama, 2011). Zou and Cai (2016) also showed that there is an increase in individualism in China, which is purported to be causing a shift in Chinese preferences for more unique baby names.

Although studies have found that social, cultural, and racial factors play some role in preferences for unique baby names, to our knowledge, no research has examined if any particular personality traits of parents – such as the Five Factor Model or the Dark Triad – correlate with preferences for unique or popular baby names. This lack of psychological research into baby name preferences may be causing psychological scientists to overlook an important facet of human life – our names. With the baby naming industry consistently growing throughout the world (cf., some companies are even providing baby naming services – one family in Switzerland paid the equivalent of $29,000 for a company to name their baby (Khoo, 2016)), the need for scientific data linking parents' personalities with their preferences for baby names is rising.

Personality traits are typically measured in terms of the Five Factor Model (often referred to as the Big Five) (Costa & McCrae, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999), which include Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Although the Five Factor Model of personality is a popular theory of personality, many researchers have pointed out that it may not reflect all personality traits that people possess (Eysenck, 1991; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Some researchers have focused on measuring socially aversive personality traits – not incorporated into the Five Factor Model – which some individuals may possess and utilize to benefit themselves over others. Three of these aversive traits – Psychopathy, Narcissism, and Machiavellianism – have become known as the Dark Triad of personality (Paulhus & Williams, 2002).

To examine whether personality traits correlate with baby name preferences, an online survey consisting of items measuring the Big Five and Dark Triad traits, and requesting individuals' top three favorite names for male and female babies (resulting in six names per participant) was administered. Although there is no previous research, to our knowledge, on any correlations between individuals' personality traits and their preferences for specific baby names, we have developed hypotheses based on the descriptions of behaviors associated with each of the Big Five and Dark Triad personality traits.

Popularity
Hypothesis 1a (H1a): The popularity of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly positively correlated with Agreeableness and Extraversion.

Hypothesis 1b (H1b): The popularity of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly negatively correlated with Openness and Narcissism.

Uniqueness
Hypothesis 2a (H2a): The uniqueness of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly positively correlated with Openness, Extraversion, and Narcissism.

Hypothesis 2b (H2b): The uniqueness of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly negatively correlated with Agreeableness.

Traditionality
Hypothesis 3a (H3a): The traditionality of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly positively correlated with Agreeableness.

Hypothesis 3b (H3b): The traditionality of preferred male and female baby names will be significantly negatively correlated with Openness and Narcissism.

General Hypothesis
Hypothesis 4 (H4): The following personality traits will have no significant correlations with baby name uniqueness, traditionality, or popularity: Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Psychopathy, and Machiavellianism.

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of N = 266 participants (177 female, 89 male; M_{age} for females = 26.27, SD = 8.40; M_{age} for males = 26.82, SD = 11.36). The self-reported racial composition of the sample was 75.5% White, 13.8% Black, 3.3% Hispanic, and 1.5% Asian-American. Two people did not report their race. Individuals volunteered to participate in this study by clicking an online link that was posted to Facebook. The Facebook page was a university-sanctioned student organization page that consisted of current undergraduates and alumni from a small university in the Southeastern United States. Although the undergraduate participants reside in the Southeastern United States, it must be noted that the location of all alumni participants is unknown.

Approximately 65% of the sample did not currently have children; 9.7% had one child, 13% had two children, 7.4% had three children, 2.2% had four children, and 1.1% had 5 or more.

Materials and Procedure

The survey contained 84 items – 50 items from the Five Factor measure (Goldberg, 1999), and 27 items from the Short Dark Triad measure (Psychopathy, Narcissism, and Machiavellianism) (Jones & Paulhus, 2014). Two items asked the participants to list their top three preferred names for a baby boy and baby girl respectively, in order from favorite to third-favorite. Four demographic items requested the participants' age, sex, race, and the number of children (if any) that they currently have. The personality items were presented in a random order, followed by the items asking for their preferred baby names, and – lastly – the four demographic items.

Rating the Baby Names

Popularity: The two items requesting participants' top three favorite male baby names and top three favorite female baby names resulted in 1,572 listed baby names. The popularity of each name was measured by cross referencing the listed names with the United States Social Security Administration's list of the Top 1,000 most popular baby names for 2015 as this was the most recent year on record for popularity of baby names (https://www.ssa.gov/oact/babynames/). The term "most popular" is used to refer to the baby name that was given to more newborns than any other baby that was born in 2015. The U.S. Social Security Administration's list assigns the number "1" to the most popular baby name of each specific year, followed by a ranking of "2" for the second most popular name of each specific year, and so on. Each baby name in our study was assigned the popularity number that it was given in the government database. For example, if a participant indicated that they preferred the baby name "John," and "John" was assigned the rank of "10" by the U.S. Social Security Administration, then the name "John" was assigned the popularity value of "10" in our study. All baby names that did not appear on this Top 1,000 list were coded as the 1,001 most popular baby name. The popularity rating of the three male baby names exhibited high internal consistency (α = .77) and were thus averaged to produce a single *Male Popularity* variable. Similarly, the popularity rating for the three female baby names also exhibited a high level of internal consistency (α = .85) and were aggregated to produce a single *Female Popularity* variable. This measurement was not recoded in our analysis, so lower numbers represent higher popularity ratings (e.g., 1 = most popular; 1,001 = least popular).

Uniqueness: Four undergraduate research assistants from the university psychology laboratory served as coders to rate the baby names on a series of characteristics. These four independent coders were blind to the hypotheses and the personality scores of the participants. The coders rated the uniqueness of each baby name on a 6-point Likert-type scale adapted from Mehrabian (1992) in which 1 = *Extremely Common* and 6 = *Extremely Unique*. Prior to utilizing this scale, coders were informed to "take into account potential racial and cultural differences that may influence the perception of whether or not a name is common or unique. Just because a name is unique to you do not necessarily mean the name is objectively unique." This resulted in four ratings for each of the 1,572 baby names (786 male names; 786 female names).

After all of the baby names were coded for uniqueness, the four uniqueness ratings for each name (i.e., all three male names and all three female names) were assessed for internal consistency. The four uniqueness scores for each of the male baby names displayed moderately high levels of internal consistency (α range = .67-.77) and were thus aggregated to produce an average uniqueness score for each of the three male baby names. These three uniqueness scores also possessed a high level of internal consistency (α = .72), so they were averaged to produce a single *Male Uniqueness* score. This same coding procedure was followed for female baby names as well. The four uniqueness scores for each female baby name also possessed moderately high levels of internal consistency (α range = .70-.81) and were aggregated to produce an average uniqueness score for each female baby name. These three uniqueness scores (α = .76) were averaged to produce a single *Female Uniqueness* variable.

Traditionality: The same four independent coders also rated how traditional each baby name was by rating each name a 6-point Likert-type scale also adapted from Mehrabian (1992) in which 1 = *Very untraditional* and 6 = *Very traditional.* The production of this variable followed the same process as the uniqueness variable, including a statement requesting the coders to take into account potential racial and cultural differences. All of the ratings for the male baby names exhibited high levels of internal consistency (α range = .75-.85) and were aggregated to produce *the Male Traditionality* variable. Similarly, the ratings for the female baby names also exhibited high internal consistency (α range= .75-.82) and were averaged to produce the *Female Traditionality* variable.

Exploratory Coding - ***Biblical Names***: Although many Biblical names – both Old and New Testaments – are common in the United States (e.g., David, Mark, John, Luke, and many others), many traditional Biblical names may be considered as unique by today's cultural standards – such as when Gwyneth Paltrow named her son after the Old Testament character Moses (Cruz, 2011). Because Biblical names are traditional but may also be unique, the four coders also coded the baby names on whether they were Biblical or not. Language differences and variations in spelling were also taken into account when coding the baby names (e.g., Lucas was considered a variation of Luke, and Marcos was considered a variation of Mark). To our knowledge, there was no literature on the potential correlation between personality and preferences for Biblical names, so this aspect of the study was considered exploratory. The baby names were coded as such: Non-Biblical = 0, Old Testament = 1, and New Testament = 2. Because this examination was exploratory, no hypotheses were developed for the potential relationship between personality traits and preferences for Biblical names.

RESULTS

Pearson correlations were calculated to examine the relationships between personality traits and preferences for popular, unique, and traditional baby names. See Table 1 for the mean ratings, standard deviations, and median ratings of these variables. Race, sex, and age were statistically controlled for. Some of the Five Factor and Dark Triad traits correlated with preferences for popular, unique, and traditional baby names. See Tables 2 and 3 for all correlations.

Popularity: *Male Popularity* was significantly positively correlated with *Female Popularity*, $r(265) = .17$, $p < .01$. Openness to experience was negatively correlated with preference for *Male Popularity*, $r(265) = -.20$, $p < .01$, and *Female Popularity*, $r(265) = -.16$, $p < .05$ – indicating that people who are more open to new experiences prefer less popular baby names. Extraversion was positively correlated with *Male Popularity*, $r(265) = .30$, $p < .01$, and *Female Popularity*, $r(265) = .24$, $p < .01$. Agreeableness was also positively correlated with *Male Popularity*, $r(265) = .25$, $p < .01$, and *Female Popularity*, $r(265) = .21$, $p < .05$. Conscientiousness and Neuroticism did not significantly correlate with popularity. None of the Dark Triad traits correlated with popularity.

Table 1. *Mean (SD) and Median Scores for Personality Traits and Preferred Popular, Unique, and Traditional Male and Female Baby Names*

	Mean	(*SD*)	Median
Five Factor Model			
Openness	3.52	(*0.53*)	3.50
Conscientiousness	3.67	(*0.54*)	3.70
Extraversion	3.36	(*0.64*)	3.40
Agreeableness	3.71	(*0.37*)	3.70
Neuroticism	2.63	(*0.68*)	2.50
Dark Triad Model			
Narcissism	3.01	(*0.53*)	3.00
Psychopathy	2.20	(*0.57*)	2.22
Machiavellianism	2.97	(*0.57*)	2.89
Baby Name Preferences			
Male Popularity*	292.88	(*358.79*)	198.00
Female Popularity*	434.53	(*416.31*)	235.00
Male Uniqueness	2.29	(*1.19*)	1.90
Female Uniqueness	2.56	(*1.28*)	2.00
Male Traditionality	4.41	(*1.56*)	4.50
Female Traditionality	4.08	(*1.32*)	4.25

*On a 1 – 1,001 rating scale in which lower numbers indicate more popular names.

Uniqueness: *Male Uniqueness* and *Female Uniqueness* were not significantly correlated with each other. Extraversion was the only trait from the Five Factor model to correlate with uniqueness. Extraversion was significantly positively correlated with *Male Popularity*, $r(265) = .21$, $p < .01$, and *Female Uniqueness*, $r(265) = .18$, $p < .05$. Narcissism was the only Dark Triad trait to correlate with uniqueness. Narcissism was significantly positively correlated with *Male Uniqueness,* $r(265) = .31$, $p < .01$, and *Female Uniqueness*, $r(265) = .29$, $p < .01$.

Traditionality: *Male Traditionality* and *Female Traditionality* were significantly positively correlated with each other, *r*(265) = .25, *p* < .01. Openness to Experience was significantly negatively correlated with *Male Traditionality, r*(265) = -.33, *p* < .01, and *Female Traditionality, r*(265) = -.26, *p* < .01. No other Five Factor trait correlated with traditionality, and none of the Dark Triad traits correlated with traditionality.

Table 2. *The Correlations between the Five Factor Model, Dark Triad, and Preferences for Popular, Unique, and Traditional Male and Female Baby Names*

	Popularity		Uniqueness		Traditionality	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Openness	-.20**	-.18*	.07	-.01	-.33**	-.26**
Conscientiousness	-.06	.00	.09	-.10	.13	.09
Extraversion	.30**	.24**	.21**	.19*	.01	-.10
Agreeableness	.25**	.21**	-.04	.09	.05	.11
Neuroticism	.14	.11	.07	-.02	-.12	-.10
Narcissism	.10	.07	.31**	.29**-.12	-.04	
Psychopathy	.01	.04	.07	-.02	.06	.06
Machiavellianism	-.04	-.08	.10	.13	-.10	-.09

*p < .05
**p < .01

Table 3. *The Correlations between Popularity, Uniqueness, and Traditionality of Male and Female Baby Names*

	Popularity		Uniqueness		Traditionality	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Popularity						
Male		.17**	-.19**	-.14*	.14*	.09
Female	.17**		-.25***	-.29***	.04	.13*
Uniqueness						
Male	-.19**	-.25***		.10	-.67***	-.27**
Female	-.14*	-.29***	.10		-.18***	-.66***
Traditionality						
Male	.14*	.04	-.67***	-.18**		.25**
Female	.09	.13*	-.27**	-.66***	.25**	

*p < .05
**p < .01
*** p < .001

Biblical Names*:* Two one-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to analyze differences in personality traits between individuals who preferred Old Testament, New Testament, and non-Biblical baby names – one ANOVA examined differences based on preferences for male baby names while the other was conducted based on preferences for female baby names.

There was no difference in personality traits between individuals who preferred Old Testament names and individuals who preferred New Testament names. However, people who preferred non-Biblical male names had significantly higher levels of Extraversion, $F(2, 264) = 5.32$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.10$, Agreeableness, $F(2, 264) = 4.37$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.08$, and Openness, $F(2, 264) = 3.99$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = 0.08$. There were no differences in personality traits based on preference for Biblical or non-Biblical female baby names.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine which personality traits correlate with preferences for different types of baby names. Several hypotheses were made prior to the conduction of this study; many of these hypotheses, but not all, were supported by the data. For instance, Extraversion and Agreeableness were both positively correlated with preferences for popular baby names – supporting Hypothesis 1a. This could be explained by the fact that extraverted individuals are more gregarious and more likely to pursue social acceptance (Wilt & Revelle, 2009). It would seem that popular trends would appeal to them for gaining social acceptance, including following popular baby naming trends. Individuals high in Agreeableness tend to be modest of their own abilities and more cooperative with others (Graziano & Tobin, 2009). This lends credence to the argument that these individuals may assume others know better and follow naming practices that others feel are appropriate or popular. The personality trait of Openness was negatively correlated with preferences for popular male and female baby names – partially supporting Hypothesis 1b – but Narcissism did not significantly negatively correlate with preferences for popular baby names – indicating a lack of support for part of Hypothesis 1b. Individuals high in Openness are typically more imaginative and can take unconventional pursuits (McCrae & Sutin, 2009). This would mean they would be less likely to follow popular naming trends and pursue something more unique.

Individuals who scored highly on Narcissism did not reject the popular trends. This was surprising because narcissistic individuals tend to have an unusually high sense of self-importance and need for attention (Rhodewalt & Peterson, 2009). It could be that narcissistic individuals would enjoy having a name that is popular, but could draw more attention if they have a unique spelling of the name (e.g., naming a child "Jough" instead of "Joe") This scenario provides popularity and a sense of uniqueness to draw more attention.

Similarly, only partial support was found Hypothesis 2a. Extraversion and Narcissism were both positively correlated with preferences for unique male and female baby names, but no other trait correlated with this preference. As discussed before, extraverted individuals are gregarious and will seek attention. A popular name shows they are up to date on trends,

while a unique spelling of a popular name can create more attention. While narcissistic individuals may not reject popular names, they did not particular seek them out either. However, they did seek out unique names possibly to draw more attention. This could come in the form of popular or traditional names with unique qualities. The overall findings did show that a lack of correlations, which led to a lack of support for part of Hypothesis 2a and provided no support for Hypothesis 2b. Those high in Agreeableness were shown to have no preference for or against unique names. This could be because some individuals used unique spellings from family or friends.

When examining potential correlations between personality traits and preferences for traditional baby names, partial support was found. Specifically, Openness to experiences was negatively correlated with preferences for traditional male and female baby names – indicating partial support for Hypothesis 3b - but no other personality traits correlated with this preference – indicating no support for Hypothesis 3a. Individuals high in Openness, again, prefer novel things. These individuals may desire to try a new baby name or start a new tradition as opposed to following the old traditions. Therefore, traditional baby names would be discarded in favor of something different than previously experienced. Narcissistic individuals were trending towards a negative correlation, showing that they may prefer a non-traditional name. It is possible that changing the spelling of traditional names gives them a unique twist to draw more attention, rather than just creating an entirely new name. Individuals high in Agreeableness were surprisingly non-traditional. This could be that pressure for popular names could be greater than pressure for traditional names. It could be that the culture has more pressure to conform to what is current than a few individuals pressuring to conform to tradition. Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, Psychopathy, and Machiavellianism did not correlate with any baby name preferences – supporting Hypothesis 4.

Ultimately, our results indicated that certain Five Factor traits, such as Openness to Experience, Extraversion, and Agreeableness, are significantly correlated with certain baby name preferences while the other Five Factor traits – Conscientiousness and Neuroticism – were not correlated with baby name preferences. Specifically, individuals higher in Extraversion preferred more popular and unique baby names. This study may reflect the growing trend of individuals wanting to choose a unique baby name, but also causing unique baby names to become more popular (Wattenberg, 2013). Individuals higher in Agreeableness also preferred more popular baby names. Individuals who indicated lower levels of Openness preferred less popular and more traditional names.

Similarly, two of the three Dark Triad traits – Psychopathy and Machiavellianism – displayed no correlation with baby name preferences. However, Narcissism was significantly correlated with the preferences for unique male and female baby names.

The exploratory analysis of preferred Biblical names also yielded some results worth mentioning. Although there was no difference in personality between individuals who preferred Old Testament male names and New Testament male names, those who preferred non-Biblical names are more extraverted, agreeable, and open to new experiences. Given the differences in personality traits between Biblical and non-Biblical male names, it was

surprising to find a lack of differences in personality traits between preferences for non-Biblical and Biblical female names. This may be a phenomenon worth investigating in future research.

There was also an unpredicted negative correlation between unique and popular baby names. It could be that in order for something to be popular, it has to be known and liked. It could be that the mere exposure effect (Zajonc, 1968) has taken place to increase liking of names until they gradually become popular across a culture. Unique names are not necessarily popular. It could be that unique names have not received enough exposure and may take time to reach popularity.

Limitations

There are some methodological limitations that need to be addressed so that future researchers may better investigate this relationship. For example, although sex and race were statistically controlled for, the sample was comprised of mostly White females. It is possible that, even though the four coders were asked to take into account racial and cultural differences in name preferences, having a larger minority sample may yield different results. In addition, although the 6-point Likert-type scales used to measure uniqueness and traditionality of the names had been adapted from previously published peer reviewed research (Mehrabian, 1992), utilizing these scales to code names may be somewhat subjective.

It is also possible that the demographics of the coders may have had an effect. Because all four of the coders were middle-class White female undergraduate students from the Southeastern United States who were approximately 21 years old, utilizing younger coders lacking in diversity may have yielded perceptual biases in what is deemed "unique" or "traditional" by today's cultural standards. Having older coders may yield different perceptions of what is unique or traditional.

Another limitation of the current study is that the primary source of data came from the Southeastern region of the United States. Previous research has shown regional differences in name preferences within the United States (Rentfrow et al., 2013; Varnum & Kitayama, 2011), as well as findings illustrating that an increase in individualism in other countries has been related to an increase in preference for unique names (Zou & Cai, 2016). Follow-up studies should check for not only regional differences within the United States, but global differences in naming and personality.

It should also be noted that this study examined names that individuals would hypothetically like to give to their children. It is possible that these individuals' actual behavior (i.e., name choice) may differ. For example, an individual may wish to name his/her child something unique, such as "Apple," but social factors – social norms, familial influence, one's spouse's opinion regarding the name choice – may cause the individual to choose a more traditional name.

Implications

This study provides – to our knowledge – the first evidence of adults' personality traits being linked to their preferences in baby names. Although limitations exist, the data provide new evidence into the area of baby name preferences – an area that is becoming a fast-growing industry. As mentioned earlier, individuals around the world are already paying experts to choose the perfect name for their unborn child in hopes of giving their child the best life possible or, at the very least, trying to prevent baby name remorse.

This study was exploratory, and our theoretical explanations for the correlations between parents' personality and their baby name preferences were post hoc. However, the present study suggests that parents' personality may play a role in their preferences for certain types of baby names, and this data allows for a theoretical foundation for future researchers in this area. Future research in this area is important, as it may help confirm our theory regarding personality's relationship with baby name preferences, which is necessary before we can have any confidence in our theory.

Further research in this area could also lead to better measurements and improved methods regarding what influences baby name preferences. Specifically, now that we have data supporting the theory that personality traits correlate with baby name preferences, future research could emphasize a true experimental design (as opposed to our correlational design) and find a means of assessing the potential causal relationship between individuals' personality and their preferences for certain baby names.

Conclusion

While this study provides insight into individual differences regarding how parents' personality can affect naming, broader approaches should also be taken into account when researching this particular phenomenon. For instance, race, social norms, and cultural differences (e.g., such as individualistic versus collectivist cultures) should be addressed (Bertrand & Mullainathan, 2004; Darolia et al., 2016; Fryer & Levitt, 2004; Rentfrow et al., 2013; Twenge et al., 2010; Zou & Cai, 2016). However, the data presented in this study may help improve decision-making for parents in regards to choosing their children's names – subsequently decreasing baby name remorse – while also helping improve the quality and success of the lucrative and ever-growing baby naming industry.

REFERENCES

Barber, N. (1998). Sex differences in disposition towards kin, security of adult attachment, and sociosexuality as a function of parental divorce. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 19,* 125-132.
Berger, J., Bradlow, E. T., Braunstein, A., & Zhang, Y. (2012). From Karen to Katie: Using baby name to understand cultural evolution. *Psychological Science, 23,* 1067-1073.

Bertrand, M., & Mullainathan, S. (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.

Costa, P. T., Jr., McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI): Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cruz, G. (2011). Top 10 wacky celebrity baby names. *TIME Magazine.* Retrieved from http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2070329_2070340_2070332,00.html.

Darolia, R., Koedel, C., Martorell, P., Wilson, K., & Perez-Arce, F. (2016). Race and gender effects on employer interest in job applicants: new evidence from a resume field experiment. *Applied Economics Letters*, *23*(12), 853-856.

Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41,* 417-440.

Eysenck, H. J. (1991). Dimensions of personality: 16, 5, or 3? Criteria for a taxonomic paradigm. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12,* 773-790.

Freud, S. (1915/1957). The unconscious. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans*.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (vol. 14, pp. 166-204). London: Hogarth Press.

Fryer, R. G., & Levitt, S. D. (2004). The causes and consequences of distinctively black names. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 119,* 767-805.

Gardner, D. G., Cummings, L. L., Dunham, R. B., & Pierce, J. L. (1998). Single-item versus multiple-item measurement scales: An empirical comparison. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 58,* 898-915.

Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A broad-bandwidth, public-domain, personality inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor models. In I. Mervielde, I. J. Deary, F. De Fruyt, and F. Ostendorf (Eds.), *Personality Psychology in Europe* (Vol. 7, pp. 7–28). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University Press.

Graziano, W. G., & Tubin, R. M. (2009). Agreeablness. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 46-61). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Grossman, A. J. (2008). Baby-name remorse – what do you do? *CNN.com.* Retrieved from: http://www.cnn.com/2008/LIVING/personal/01/01/baby.name.change/index.html?iref=nextin.

Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The Dirty Dozen: A concise measure of the Dark Triad. *Psychological Assessment, 22,* 420-432.

John O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research.* New York Guilford.

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2011). The role of impulsivity in the Dark Triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51,* 670-682.

Jones, D. L., & Paulhus, K. M. (2014). Introducing the short Dark Triad (SD3): A brief measure of personality traits. *Assessment, 21,* 28-41.

Khoo, I. (2016). Baby name experts: Parents are paying $29,000 for baby names. *The Huffington Post Canada.* Retrieved from: http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2016/04/22/baby-name-experts_n_9742228.html.

Leirer, O., Hamilton, D. L., & Carpenter, S. (1982). Common first names as cues for inferences about personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8*, 712–718.

Lilienfeld, S. O., & Andrews, B. P. (1996). Development and preliminary validation of a self-report measure of psychopathic personality traits in non-criminal populations. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66,* 488-524.

Mahmut, M. K., Menictas, C., Stevenson, R. J., & Homewood, J. (2011). Validating the factor structure of the Self-Report Psychopathy Scale in a community sample. *Psychological Assessment, 23,* 670-678.

McCrae, R. R., & Sutin, A. R. (2009). Openness to experience. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 257-273). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Mehrabian A. (1992). Interrelationships among name desirability, name uniqueness, emotion characteristics connoted by names, and temperament. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22,* 1797-1808.

Mehrabian, A. (2001). Characteristics attributed to individuals on the basis of their first names. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 127*, 59–88.

Miller, J. D., Few, L. R., Seibert, L. A., Watts, A., Zeichner, A., & Lynam, D. R. (2012). An examination of the Dirty Dozen measure: A cautionary tale about the costs of brief measures. *Psychological Assessment, 24,* 1048-1053.

Pappas, S. (2012). Baby-name regret is on the rise, experts say. *LiveScience.* Retrieved from: http://www.livescience.com/19210-baby-naming-regret-choices.html.

Paulhus, D. L., & Vazire, S. (2007). The self-report method. In R.W. Robins, R.C. Fraley, & R.F. Krueger (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in personality psychology* (pp. 224-239). New York: Guilford.

Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: narcissism, Machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36,* 556-563.

Rentfrow, P. J., Gosling, S. D., Jokela, M., Stillwell, D. J., Kosinski, M., & Potter, J. (2013). Divided we stand: Three psychological regions of the United States and their political, economic, social, and health correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*, 996-1012.

Rhodewalt, F., & Peterson, B. (2009). Narcissism. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 547-560). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Twenge, J. M., Abebe, E. M., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Fitting in or standing out: Trends in American parents' choices for children's names 1880-2007. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 1,* 19-25.

Varnum, M. E. W., & Kitayama, S. (2011). What's in a name? Popular names are less common on frontiers. *Psychological Science, 22,* 176-183.

Wattenberg, L. (2013). *The baby name wizard: A magical method for finding the perfect name for your baby.* New York: Three Rivers Press.

Williams, K. M., Paulhus, D. L., & Hare, R. D. (2007). Capturing the four-factor structure of psychopathy in college students via self-report. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 88,* 205-219.

Wilt, J., & Revelle, W. (2009). Extraversion. In M. R. Leary & R. H. Hoyle (Eds.), *Handbook of individual differences in social behavior* (pp. 27-45). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Young, S. M., & Pinsky, D. (2006). Narcissism and celebrity. *Journal of Research in Personality, 40,* 463-471.

Zajonc, R. N. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 9,* 1-27.

Zou, X., & Cai, H. (2016). Charting China's rising individualism in names, songs, and attitudes. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from *https://hbr.org/2016/03/charting-chinas-rising-individualism-in-names-songs-and-attitudes*

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Carey J. Fitzgerald, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of South Carolina – Beaufort. His research focuses on the evolutionary foundations and social influences of cooperation and prosocial behavior. His e-mail is: cfitzger@uscb.edu.

Jody A. Thompson, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of South Carolina – Beaufort. He is a social psychologist whose research focuses on priming and implicit social behavior. His e-mail is jthompso@uscb.edu.