genealogy

MDPI

*Article*

# Canadian Brides'-to-Be Surname Choice: Potential Evidence of Transmitted Bilateral Descent Reckoning

**Melanie MacEacheron**

School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, New College, Arizona State University, Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100, USA; mmaceacheron@gmail.com

**Abstract:** Women's marital surname change is important, in part, because it affects how often only husbands' (fathers') surnames are passed on to offspring: this, in turn, affects the frequency of these "family" names. Brides-to-be, novelly, from across especially western and central Canada ($N$ = 184), were surveyed as to marital surname hyphenation/retention versus change intention, and attitude towards women's such choices in general. Among women engaged to men, the hypothesized predictors of income and number of future children desired were positively predictive of marital surname retention/hyphenation under univariate analysis. Under multiple regression analysis using these and other predictors from the literature, previously found to be predictive of this DV under univariate analysis, only some of these other predictors were predictive. Of greatest predictiveness was the bride-to-be's own mother's marital surname choice (with brides-to-be, more often than would otherwise be predicted, following their mother's such choice), thus suggesting a possible shift to a transmitted manner of bilateral descent reckoning, towards greater bilateral such reckoning, among a portion of the population. Reported, general attitude towards women's marital surname retention was predictive of participant brides-to-be's own reported (imminent) marital surname retention/hyphenation.

**Keywords:** marital surname change; brides-to-be; income; children of marriage; bilateral descent reckoning; Canada



**Citation:** MacEacheron, Melanie. 2024. Canadian Brides'-to-Be Surname Choice: Potential Evidence of Transmitted Bilateral Descent Reckoning. *Genealogy* 8: 13. https://doi.org/10.3390/genealogy8010013

Received: 1 November 2023
Revised: 10 January 2024
Accepted: 11 January 2024
Published: 1 February 2024



## 1. Introduction

Women persist in taking their husbands' names at marriage, despite recent progress toward economic and social equality of the sexes, and despite the fact that the default, and easier, option is to retain one's natal surname.[1] Approximately 79% of U.S. wives in opposite-sex marriages surveyed in 2023, for instance, reported having taken husband's surname (Lin 2023). The persistence of marital name change demands explanation. It is my conjecture that a major piece of the puzzle resides in the fact that marriage is a special institution quite different from other economic and social partnerships. Marriage is to be understood as fundamentally a reproductive union (Daly and Wilson 1988): it is the context in which children tend to be raised, notwithstanding the tremendous historical and cross-cultural variability in the expectations and practices associated with marriage (Murdock 1949).

Social scientists have identified a number of predictors of marital surname change and/or related attitudes, including professional, economic, and educational status, attendance at religious services, age, cultural/ethnic origin, one's mother's marital surname choice, and cohabitation before marriage (Blakemore et al. 2005; Boxer and Gritsenko 2005; Goldin and Shim 2004; Hoffnung 2006; Intons-Peterson and Crawford 1985; Johnson and Scheuble 1995; Kline et al. 1996; Noack and Wiik 2008; Scheuble and Johnson 1993, 2005; Twenge 1997; but see Stefanova et al. 2023 regarding academic professional status among females having undergone marital surname change, and positive perception). However, none of these authors has explicitly addressed the unique status of marriage

as a reproductive partnership that creates bonds not only between a particular man and woman, but also between such man and woman and the natal families of each.

There is some evidence that fathers want children to be surnamed for them and that it has an effect on them. In the U.S., children are overwhelmingly surnamed solely for their fathers (Johnson and Scheuble 2002; see also Duchesne 2006 for data from a Canadian subjurisdiction). That fathers' investment in children surnamed for them is increased thereby is more difficult to evidence. That being said, Furstenberg and Talvitie (1980) found that when young, unmarried, African American mothers named their children for the fathers (first or middle name) of these, these fathers tended to invest more in the children and have more contact with them. It is possible, however, that these mothers named children more often after fathers where these seemed more likely to invest and have contact with the children. Male undergraduates in a Canadian city, on average (in a small study), reported preference for both women's marital surname change, and children of marriage being surnamed for the father (Lockwood et al. 2011). Husbands of women who did not take his surname at marriage have also been rated as less powerful in the relationship (Robnett et al. 2018)—perhaps greater likelihood of children of the union not being surnamed for him is one reason.

It is possible that sharing a name may influence the amount by which someone, even one with whom no other ties are shared, is helped, or another person feels close to him/her. Oates and Wilson (2002) found a small favor was most often bestowed from someone sharing both first and surnames with the requestor, compared with someone sharing only one name (with those sharing neither name least likely to help). When an uncommon surname was shared, helping was greater than when an uncommon first name was shared. It is not inconceivable that a child being surnamed for its (putative) father may lead to some, including even paternal relatives, thinking that father is the child's genetic father more often than would otherwise occur. A shared surname may also make one's patrilineal relatives seem more to be members of one's family, than are other relatives. Indeed, one definition of "surname" is "the name borne in common by members of a family" (Merriam-Webster.com, accessed on 1 January 2024). Schneider and Cottrell (1975) also found, in the U.S., that even though men visit with/are visited by maternal relatives more than paternal ones, they can name more distant paternal than maternal relatives. These authors also found, among both male and female participants, that links to distant, paternal relatives are given more via father's father than via father's mother. It is thus possible this practice is due to or influenced by holding a surname in common.

Substantial evidence exists that children experience more interaction with and receive more nurturance from relatives from their mother's side of the family (matrilineal relatives), than from their father's, when members of both sides of the family are close enough to access. An early report was that of Young and Willmott (1957), who found that East London children spent more time with their maternal than with their paternal grandmothers. Jackson (1971) demonstrated a similar effect controlling for proximity: African American grandparents saw their daughters' children more often than their sons' children, if both son and daughter lived in the same location as the grandparents *or* if both lived elsewhere. Similarly, Smith (1988) reported that Canadian children visited their maternal grandparents more often than their paternal grandparents despite the fact that both sets of grandparents' homes were equidistant from those of the grandchildren. After divorce, the relationship between maternal grandparents and grandchildren in the U.S. often deepens, whereas the frequency of contact with paternal grandparents typically declines (Cherlin and Furstenberg 1986).

The above phenomena have been taken by evolutionists (starting with Smith 1991) to be based at least in part on the different, average pay-offs of investment in (putative) grandchildren to each class of grandparent (mother's mother, mother's father, father's mother, or father's father). Due to the possibility of cuckoldry, not only must putative fathers be uncertain of whether a child is genetically theirs: some putative grandparents must also be uncertain of whether a child is genetically their grandchild. Only the maternal

grandmother can have complete certainty. The paternal grandfather may either have been cuckolded himself, or his son (the grandchild's putative father) may have been. Each of the maternal grandfather and paternal grandmother have one such uncertain genetic relatedness 'link'. Therefore, to the extent it is advantageous to preferentially invest in one's genetic relatives, the only class of grandparent for whom it would always be advantageous to invest would be maternal grandmother. The class of grandparent for whom it would be least advantageous, without more, would be paternal grandfather. It would be of intermediate advantageousness to each of the other two classes of grandparent, without more, to invest. A number of studies' data have been interpreted as consistent with this basis of investment (termed differential grandparental investment: Smith 1991; Euler and Weitzel 1996; and see Shackelford et al. 2004; DeKay 1995).

Social scientists not possessing a Darwinian worldview have also noted the tendency for maternal grandmothers to surpass other grandparents in affection, contact, and investment, followed by maternal grandfathers and paternal grandmothers, and finally by paternal grandfathers (e.g., Hoffman 1980; Hartshorne and Manaster 1983; Hodgson 1992; Kahana and Kahana 1970; Kennedy 1990; Robins and Tomanec 1962; and see Van Ranst et al. 1995; but see Roberto and Stroes 1992; and see also Hill and Hurtado 1996, regarding grandmother presence and grandchild survival). These authors generally interpret the observed sequence as a consequence of close mother-daughter ties rather than of uncertain genetic links. Based only on sociological concepts of "affinity, opportunity structure, and functional exchange", for example, Silverstein and Bengtson (1997) predicted that adults would be closer to their mothers than to their fathers, and that women would be closer to their parents, especially their mothers, than would men; their findings were consistent with the first prediction, and women were indeed closer to their mothers than were men, but adults of both sexes were equally close to their fathers. Irrespective of how this result is interpreted, there clearly seems to exist in the modern West greater average interaction with, resource allocation from, and affection received from one's matrilineal compared with one's patrilineal relatives.

Children may tend to be closer with their maternal relatives, with the likely exception of patrilocal societies in which it would be unfeasible for children to have greater interaction with maternal compared with paternal relatives (see e.g., Pashos 2000). Even in patrilineal societies, however, matrilineal relatives may invest more in grandchildren (Hawkes et al. 1997; Sear et al. 2000, 2002).

### *1.1. Investment Recruitment from Patrilineal Kin*

To the extent the above evidence shows maternal relatives' inputs into children's growth and development are more assured than paternal relatives', might it provide a particular benefit to children for efforts to be made to elicit support for them from the latter group (and especially from the member of that group most related to the child—the child's father)? That is, between two investors, if investment from one is assured but that from the other is not, it may result in the greatest, total investment if efforts (which must be of a limited nature) at eliciting investment are made more to the latter (here, paternal relatives). Perhaps women's marital surname change, which is usually followed by patrilineal surnaming of children, comprises such an effort, and patrilineal family—perhaps especially father's—investment in children increases following it. This would provide an explanation for brides' parents approving of their daughters undergoing marital surname change: something for which no potential motivation has previously been provided in the literature to the author's best knowledge. Any utility of such investment recruitment should vary depending on practices governing resource transfer to younger generation(s) (e.g., in one of the few societies following matrilineal inheritance, children's surnaming is matrilineal (Karthikeyan and Fisher 2023); more educated Chinese women not from a matrilineal ethnic minority, who presumably are less dependent on male partners or the parents of these for financial support, are more likely to surname their children for themselves (Li et al. 2021)). Any utility of

such investment recruitment should also be greater in the case of (wealthier) parents transferring more resources to male than to female offspring (Smith et al. 1987; see also Chagnon 1979; and Dickemann 1979).

### *1.2. Surnaming of Children*

Marital names affect how children are named, and hence whether names persist over generations (and, if the above rule in Schneider and Cottrell 1975, is followed, who is remembered to be a "relative"). In many countries, including Canada and the United States, a large majority of children carry their fathers' surnames (Emens 2007), and this majority approaches 100% in those cases in which the mother took the father's name at marriage (Johnson and Scheuble 2002; Duchesne 2006). Although it is highly unlikely that women, as a group, believe that surnaming the children of their marriages for their husbands (at the time) will necessarily lead to these husbands taking legal responsibility for the children (Intons-Peterson and Crawford 1985), it is not implausible that name-saking increases investment (see, e.g., Furstenberg and Talvitie 1980; Cherlin and Furstenberg 1986). Additionally, the results of three surveys suggest that brides who retain pre-marital surname are more likely to be perceived by third parties as likely to be sexually unfaithful within the marriage, or to leave it (Stafford and Kline 1996; Suter 2004; Robnett et al. 2016). Such actions, if taken, would perhaps lead to lesser investment by husbands in the children of the marriage due to cuckoldry concerns in the former case (see also Tach et al. 2010, regarding lesser involvement with children born out of wedlock, by fathers no longer in romantic relationships with the children's mothers). Husbands in the latter case might be expected to expect lesser marital duration, and, hence, all else being equal, fewer children of the marriage to help support. Data collected from young men, only, show these report viewing women who undergo marital surname change as more committed to marriage (Scheuble et al. 2012). Thus, this traditional practice would seem to be one in which both sexes have an interest.

As evidenced by studies discussed above, grandparents often invest substantially in grandchildren, aligning in part with degree of likely genetic relatedness. As part of this differential grandparental solicitude, maternal grandparents invest more, on average, than paternal ones. As such, a woman's parents'-in-law (i.e., her future children's putative paternal grandparents') support may be understood as not assured, and therefore also as something which, if valuable, would be advantageous to seek. Assuming her surname change to that of her husband (and his parents) yields greater emotional closeness to and/or perceived solidarity with them, it may achieve the good favor of the in-laws. Assuming it does, such name change may function as a signal that enhances investment by the in-laws in the signaler and her future children. It is not here suggested that women need be consciously aware that marital surname change will function in this way: Women may simply wish to please their in-laws and understand that the act is likely to do so (proximal reason for the act), while being unlikely to offend her own parents, with whom she already has long-time, strong bonds (and one of whom has absolute assurance her investment will be to her genetic grandchild).

The aim of the present study was to test novel hypotheses about predictors of brides'-to-be attitude toward and actual surname retention or change at marriage. The central ideas behind hypotheses were that,

(1) marital name change is one of a number of possible "signals" to a potential groom and/or to his kin that a potential bride is committed to staying within the marital union (see, e.g., MacEacheron 2021), which a potential groom might use to discern such intention, and
(2) by signaling she will change surname, a potential bride can increase the likelihood her husband and his relatives will invest in her well-being and that of the future children of her marriage, to the extent her signal is costly to her (e.g., increasing her identifiability as married and to her particular husband, rendering any infidelity more detectable; costly to revoke in case of marital dissolution [i.e., requiring yet

another surname change]; representing some break with her natal family/joining of her husband's; and perhaps being costly to career (e.g., Goldin and Shim 2004)), and indicates increased likelihood children of the marriage will be genetically those of the husband/his side of the family.

## 2. Methods[2]

The first of the two dependent variables (DV 1) was assessed with a 6-point Likert-scale item: "In general, women should retain their birth names" (presented in the context of questions regarding marital surname change) with anchors of "strongly disagree" (1) and "strongly agree" (6). It is similar (though phrased in reverse compared) to that used in Hamilton et al. (2011) ("It is generally better if a woman changes her last name to her husband's name when she marries.", p. 151). It was chosen on similar grounds to those of these authors: it was thought to tap *general* attitude towards the practice. DV 2, a self-report as to whether the participant (bride-to-be) would be taking her groom's surname, combining the two (e.g., via hyphenation), or retaining her surname, is described in more detail below. Given the second dependent variable (DV 2) was own reported retention/hyphenation versus change of surname at imminent marriage, I deemed asking participants what their attitude toward the practice *for themselves* was, to be less likely to provide additional, meaningful insight as to attitude to the practice than asking their attitude toward the practice generally.

Much of the literature on women's marital surname choice is and was conducted on convenience samples. Hence, it is/was conducted on women (in the West) under average age at first marriage (in Canada, in 2008, 29.1 years: Statistics Canada 2016). Such young women, thus, may be being assessed on ideal wishes/attitudes towards the practice. These may very well differ in those women negotiating an actual marriage and future in-law relations. Only the latter set of participants can provide ecologically valid data (though such women could change their minds as to taking a husband's surname, during later engagement). Additionally, surveying brides-to-be may allow for greater diversity in age, education, and socioeconomic status within the sample.

Searches in *PsycTESTS* on 23 June 2014 of "female-female competition", "female competition", and "husband competition" revealed no measures of perception of level of competitiveness for acquisition of a husband. Given previous research has shown women's local, intrasexual economic competitiveness level might be related to marital surname choice (MacEacheron 2011, 2020), I asked surveyed brides-to-be the question, "How much, if at all, would you say women in your area compete with each other to find the best husband that they can?" (answered on a 7-point Likert-type scale).

I derived the first hypothesis from the supposition that women's marital surname change functions as a commitment signal (MacEacheron 2016b, 2021), and thereby husband and affinal investment enhancer, among those who will most need such support. Such individuals (among brides) were thought to be those wanting and expecting more children. Thus, Hypothesis 1 states: *Endorsement of the view that women should take the husband's surname at marriage will be predicted by the number of children desired*. In this study, brides'-to-be individual incomes, as well as those of their betrotheds, were queried. This provided the opportunity to directly test *hypotheses 2 and 3: (2) that individual women's own income and (3) that of their grooms, are predictive of these women's surname retention/hyphenation.*[3]

Perceived importance to a bride of husband's investment may, however, also be a function of the level of investment she anticipates from her genetic relatives and how dependable she perceives that to be. A bride emotionally close with her family of origin may be concerned that marital surname change would show disregard for them and/or for their cultural group (if she is marrying out of it, as would commonly be expected to be the case for brides in a multicultural country such as Canada). Additionally, if such a bride perceives her family of origin as dependable and adequate investors in herself and her future children, she may be less motivated than other brides to sacrifice her surname, in any attempt to enhance resource recruitment from her husband and/or

future in-laws.[4] Numerous predictors why some women take their husbands' surnames at marriage and others do not have been proposed in diverse research (see, e.g., review in MacEacheron 2016a). Those that were possible to include—ethnic group, religiosity, level of education, income, intended age at marriage, the participant's own mother's taking of her husband's surname at marriage, closeness to each parent, and some items concerning feminist attitude—were tested in the current study.

The Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) was used to measure feminist attitude. It is a brief (10-item), well-validated, reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.89$) scale (see discussion in Fassinger 1994). Concern was expressed by one colleague that it might measure how participants view the state of feminism currently (*viz.* e.g., its questions, all in the present tense, "The leaders of the women's movement may be extreme, but they have the right idea"; "The women's movement is too radical and extreme in its views"), rather than how much they agree with feminism. This colleague thus suggested adding a single question following the other political questions in the survey: "How much do you identify as a feminist?" using the same response scale. This was done. Need for autonomy was also suggested by a colleague as plausibly related to desire to retain surname at marriage. A search of "autonomy" on *PsycTESTS* was conducted on 23 July 2014. Results included several instruments assessing autonomy versus sociotropy within romantic relationships. The shortest of these which was designed for heterosexual couples who were not necessarily already sex partners or cohabitating, and validated, was chosen. This 16-item instrument (Cochran and Peplau 1985) is comprised of Egalitarian Autonomy and Dyadic Attachment sub-scales. Scores on each of these sub-scales were assessed for association with each of the DVs.

Although state-level levels of support for the U.S. Republican and Democratic parties were not predictive of actual state-level surname retention in MacEacheron (2021) when regressed along with state-level women's full-time and salaried income, political orientation was assessed in the present study. This assessment was included in order to allow determination of whether political orientation is predictive at the individual (bride) level, and to allow for potential controlling of this predictor in multiple regressions (assuming it is related to either/both DV(s)), as previously suggested (e.g., MacEacheron 2021). Lambert and Raichle's (2000) Liberal-Conservative Self-Report Scale was used due to its brevity and (some level of) validation.

The following items were also included: (i) sex of fiancé(e), (ii) whether participant and, separately, her fiancé(e), was/were currently students, (iii) current level of education, (iv) whether the wedding was to be a destination wedding[5], and (v) likelihood each of own parents would help with future children (if any). These were added for various reasons. (i) was added since hypotheses related to opposite-sex brides-to-be, thus knowing sex of fiancé(e) was necessary for testing these. (ii) was added so that *future* income after graduation, if applicable, could be used as the income predictor, rather than current income (e.g., within a temporary, part-time position). This was done, since income after graduation would presumably better represent income during most of marriage. (iii) was added as a control variable, because education was assumed to be completed for most brides-to-be (and thus completed education could be measured in this sample), and this has previously been found to predict both DVs. (iv) was added at the suggestion of an anonymous colleague, since part of my reasoning was that investment would be greater from mother's mother compared with mother's father, and I had further posited that closeness felt to each parent would be positively related to investment amount: the addition of this question allowed testing of that.

The 10-item measure Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) was added given some work has indicated such attitude may be predictive of women's marital surname choice (e.g., Kerns 2011; Peters 2018). As the ultimate result of a suggestion from colleagues, Cochran and Peplau's (1985) scale measuring autonomy and sociotropy, was added. This instrument is comprised of Egalitarian Autonomy and Dyadic Attachment sub-scales. Autonomy was thought by the colleague to logically

relate to marital surname choice, so it was deemed prudent to be able to control for. Scores on each of these sub-scales were assessed for association with each of the DVs, as exploratory analyses.

The created item regarding degree, if any, of female-female competition for husbands was included in order to be able to test a hypothesis concerning cross-provincial Gini differences (which, however, could not be found given insufficient data collection from some provinces). Since searches in *PsycTESTS* on 23 June 2014 of "female-female competition", "female competition", and "husband competition" revealed no measures of perception of level of competitiveness for acquisition of a husband, the given item was created.

Greater scores on each (sub-)scale indicates greater endorsement by the participants of the (sub-)scale.

### *2.1. Research Participants*

184 brides-to-be (females) were recruited via the pan-Canadian bridal website "weddingbells.ca", in exchange for a CAD 5 Amazon.com gift certificate said to be usable towards a piece of bridal merchandise, if they submitted an email address. Due to weddingbells.ca's average click-through rate only likely resulting in 57 participants over a three-month period of webpage advertisement per a representative, a direct emailing of the same advertisement to weddingbells.ca registrants was conducted. Doing so provided, additionally, some assurance that participants would actually be Canadian spouses-to-be, as registrants indicate they are such and registration would be of little interest to non-Canadian non-spouses-to-be. Approximately 20 such participants from each Canadian province were sought, in order to attain acceptable statistical power in OLS regression of a province-level predictor. Once-only participation from any given computer was allowed. The survey was presented in the form of a *Qualtrics* web interface.

### *2.2. Dependent Variables*

In the analyses that follow, the principle dependent variable (DV 2) is the participant's answer to the question "Will you change, hyphenate (or otherwise combine), or retain your current surname when you marry? Please do *not* check "Retain", if you will be using your current surname as a middle name after marriage. (Please check one):". Participants answered one of "Change", "Hyphenate (or otherwise combine)", or "Retain". The other dependent variable (DV 1) is conceptualizable as *general* attitude toward women's marital surname retention and, by implication, women's marital surname change. Note its inclusion allowed for assessment of whether endorsement of the general attitude item (DV 1) was related to actual retention/hyphenation/change decision (DV 2).

### *2.3. Statistical Methods*

Analyses were performed using *SPSS* 22.0 or higher. Where not already required in order to test hypotheses, univariate associations between (1) each of the putative predictors and (2) (each of) the DV(s) were also calculated. Where it was significantly associated with a DV, a putative predictor was regressed alongside all other such predictors (except where to do so would introduce multicollinearity of predictors) in a regression predicting that DV. In this way, the relative predictiveness of each such predictor was ascertained. Each regression performed was tested to ensure the standard assumptions justifying the use of that regression model had been met. All Likert-type scales except where otherwise noted were treated as continuous.

## 3. Results

Recruitment of a greater number of participants, based on the number of statistical comparisons planned and anticipated, was called for but was precluded by funding limitations.

### *3.1. Descriptive Statistics*

Brides-to-be primarily from across western and central Canada ($N$ = 184) were surveyed. Usable data were obtained from British Columbia ($n$ = 19: 42.1% retaining/hyphenating), Alberta ($n$ = 23: 21.7% retaining/hyphenating), Saskatchewan ($n$ = 3, 1 woman retaining/hyphenating), Manitoba ($n$ = 26: 19.2% retaining/hyphenating), Ontario ($n$ = 82: 34.1% retaining/hyphenating), Quebec ($n$ = 14: 71.4% retaining/hyphenating), New Brunswick ($n$ = 1: woman not retaining/hyphenating), and Nova Scotia ($n$ = 5: 1 woman retaining/hyphenating). Thus, of the $n$ = 174 answering "Will you change, hyphenate (or otherwise combine), or retain your current surname when you marry?" (DV 1), 115 (62.2%) indicated they would change, 18 (9.7%) indicated they would hyphenate or otherwise combine, and 41 (22.2%) indicated they would retain their surnames. This means a total of 59 participants (33.9%) indicated they would retain/hyphenate. DV 2 consisted of rated agreement with "In general, women should retain their birth names [at marriage]". The range of answers to this item was 1—"Strongly disagree" to 6—"Strongly agree": $M$ = 3.13 ± 1.17. The first DV was associated with the second ($t$ (165) = 4.87, $p < 0.001$, $d$ = 0.76 or moderate to large), with participants who would retain/hyphenate reporting greater agreement with the item ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 3.70 ± 1.18, $n$ = 57: $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 2.83 ± 1.06, $n$ = 110).

Discounting Quebec where legal, marital surname change is not permitted (Civil Code of Québec 1991), as well as provinces from which fewer than 20 brides-to-be hailed, there was not a significant inter-provincial variation overall in retention/hyphenation of surname: $\chi^2$ (3) = 4.10, $n$ = 150, $p$ = ns. Even British Columbia, with the highest rate of retention/hyphenation, did not differ from the other provinces not including Quebec, from which at least 20 brides hailed (data collapsed together), in retention/hyphenation frequency: $\chi^2$ (1) = 1.34, $n$ = 150, $p$ = ns.

### *3.2. Demographic Characteristics of Sample*

In 33.0% of cases ($n$ = 61 out of $N$ = 185, with 1 participant declining to answer) the sex of the fiancé(e) was reported as female. Note that weddingbells.ca, the registrants of which were sampled via the survey, is based on and affiliated with *Weddingbells* magazine. The edition of that magazine published during the time of the survey (Fall and Winter 2015: Toronto and Greater Ontario edition) profiled only one same-sex wedding out of a total of twenty. That wedding was, additionally, of two men. That fact, along with the fact that lesbians and bisexual women comprise less than 33% of the female population (with 5.0% of Canadian women polled citing self-identification as homosexual, bisexual, or transgendered: Blaze Carlson 2012) suggest, however, that at least some participants reporting a female fiancée may actually have had a male fiancé. Thus, the data from these participants is not used further, except to characterize the sample. (Note that of those participants who emailed the author to claim their gift certificate compensation for participation, all either appeared to the author to (1) have female gendered first names and/or (2) be female based on the photograph, if any, that accompanied their email. Thus, it appeared grooms-to-be entering opposite-sex marriages had not completed the survey, and reported their betrotheds as female.)

Brides-to-be ranged in age from 20 to 60 years ($N$ = 184, mean = 30.02 ± 7.10 years). Age participants reported they would be at time of upcoming marriage, ranged from 22 to 62 years ($n$ = 174, mean = 30.81 ± 6.90 years). Reported income of brides-to-be spanned the ranges of "$0–$20,000" to "over $100,000" annually ($n$ = 163, median "$41,000–$60,000"). Reported incomes of fiancé(e)s spanned the same ranges ($n$ = 161, median also "$41,000–$60,000"). In 92 of the $n$ = 159 couples the income data for both members of which were provided, the participant's fiancé(e) was stated to earn (or to be expecting to earn, if a student) a higher bracket of income (from those provided) than the participant. In 17 of these couples, the bride-to-be was stated to earn (or to be expecting to earn, if a student) a higher bracket of income than her fiancé(e).

Each participant was asked her ethnicity/race or ethnicities/races, as well as that/those of her fiancé(e). Responses were categorized using U.S. Census racial designations (e.g., United States Census Bureau 2013), as well as Hispanic/Latino/Latina, and "Canadian" (where this was the sole "ethnicity" cited by the participant). Note that "Caribbean", "West Indian", "Jamaican" and "African" were coded as "African-American/Black", and "Guatamalan" and "Ecuadorian" were coded as "Hispanic/Latino/Latina". Out of 175 participants providing data, the following number reported each of the following ethnicities/races: 2 (1.1%) African-American/Black; 18 (9.7%) Asian; 138 (74.6%) White; 1 (0.50%) Hispanic/Latino/Latina; 10 (5.4%) Bi-/Multi-Racial; and 5 (2.7%) "Canadian". One participant stated she preferred not to answer. Out of the 175 participants providing data concerning their fiancé(e)s' ethnicity/ethnicities, the following number reported each of the following ethnicities: 3 (1.6%) African-American/Black; 15 (8.1%) Asian; 140 (75.7%) White; 1 (0.5%) American Indian; 2 (1.1%) Hispanic/Latino/Latina; 7 (3.8%) Bi-/Multi-Racial; and 6 (3.2%) "Canadian". One participant stated she preferred not to answer. Finally, one participant stated that she and her fiancé(e)'s ethnicity was "Brown": their ethnicities were not coded, due to uncertainty regarding what that meant. (They were, however, coded as having the same ethnicity.)

Participants were coded as to whether each and her fiancé(e) belonged to the same ethnicity/ethnicities or not, where usable ethnicity data was provided for each member of the couple. Where each member belonged (only) to the same racial group or, in the case of Bi-/Multi-Racial individuals, both/all of the same racial groups, they were coded as being of same ethnicity/ethnicities. In all other cases they were coded as being of different ethnicity/ethnicities. Where a participant reported herself and her fiancé(e) both as "Canadian", they were coded as being of the same ethnicity. Of the $n = 175$ participants providing usable data concerning themselves and their fiancé(s)s, 27 (15.4%) were of different ethnicity/ethnicities, and 148 (84.6%) were of the same ethnicity/ethnicities.

Participants provided their highest level of completed education, from a list of options. Of the $n = 176$ providing data, each of the following levels of education was reported as completed by the following number of participants: "some high school", 2 (1.1%); "high school diploma", 13 (7.0%); "some community college/CÉGEP"[6], 14 (7.6%); "community college/CÉGEP diploma", 25 (13.5%); "some university", 12 (6.5%); "Bachelor's degree", 75 (40.5%); "Master's degree", 22 (11.9%); "PhD", 3 (1.6%); and "Professional degree", 10 (5.4%). 18 (9.8%) of the 184 participants reported currently being students. 14 (7.6%) of the 184 participants reported their fiancé(e) as being a student, with one not reporting the fiancé(e)'s student/non-student status.

Participants indicated whether or not each was currently living with her fiancé(e). Out of the $n = 177$ providing data, 41 (22.2%) indicated they were not currently co-residing: 136 (73.5%) indicated they were. One participant providing data on this variable stated she was "Living with family and fiance": She was coded as coresiding with her fiancé(e). Participants reported whether their current engagement was to an individual who would be their first, second, third, or fourth or higher order spouse. Of the $n = 177$ providing data, 169 (91.4%) indicated that this was to be their first marriage, 8 (4.3%) indicated that it was to be their second marriage, and none indicated a higher-order marriage.

Participants entered text in response to the question "What is your religious affiliation?" Of those answering ($n = 171$), 91 reported themselves Christian (49.2%), 3 Buddhist (1.6%), 2 Pagan (1.1%), 1 each Hindu, Muslim, and Jewish (0.5% each), 62 Atheist, Agnostic, no affiliation, or not applicable (33.5%), and 9 something else not implying a denomination (e.g., "spiritual": 4.9%). Participants were asked to choose one of the following four responses as their frequency of attendance at religious services: "weekly or more often", $n = 17$ (9.2%); "monthly", $n = 14$ (7.6%); "once or twice a year", $n = 36$ (19.5%); and "never or almost never", $n = 109$ (58.9%).

### *3.3. The Bride-to-Be's Own Parents*

Level of emotional closeness to father ranged from 1—"Not at all close" to 6—"Very close" (6-point Likert-type scale: $n$ = 182 including 17 who rated the question as not applicable: among those answering, $M$ = 4.57 ± 1.63). Level of emotional closeness to mothers also ranged from 1 to 6, on the same scale ($n$ = 182 including 4 who rated the question as not applicable: among those answering, $M$ = 5.22 ± 1.23). Level of assistance with any future children expected from own father ranged from 1—"Not at all likely" to 6—"Very likely" (anchors on a 6-point Likert-type scale: $n$ = 171 including 25 who rated the question as not applicable: among those answering, $M$ = 4.38 ± 1.85). Level of assistance with any future children expected from own mother was rated using the same scale, and possessed the same range ($n$ = 171 including 13 who rated the question as not applicable: among those answering, $M$ = 5.04 ± 1.50). Participants were asked whether their mothers had taken their (the participants') fathers' surnames. Out of $n$ = 179 answering the question, 34 (18.4%) reported their mother had not, and 145 (78.4%) reported she had.

### *3.4. Attitude Measures*

Overall, $n$ = 176 participants responded to the item "How much, if at all, would you say women in your area compete with each other to find the best husband that they can?", on a 7-point Likert type scale with anchors 1 "Not at all" to 7—"A great deal". Responses represented the full scale range, $M$ = 3.11 ± 1.80. Participants' ratings as to how "conservative" they were, ranged from 0—"not at all conservative" to 10—"extremely conservative" (on an 11-point Likert-type scale: $n$ = 164, $M$ = 3.62 ± 2.36). On a similar Likert-type scale, participants self-rated how "liberal" they were: $M$ = 7.05 + 2.32 ($n$ = 164). Finally, on a similar scale, participants' ratings of feminist identification ranged from 0 to 10 ($n$ = 164, $M$ = 5.52 ± 2.56). Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) scores ranged from 22 to 49 (possible range is from 1 to 50), $n$ = 159, $M$ = 35.24 ± 5.48.

The Cochran and Peplau (1985) Sociotropy scale is comprised of Egalitarian Autonomy and Dyadic Attachment sub-scales. Scores on each of these can range from 8 to 72. Scores on the former sub-scale ranged from 32 to 72, $n$ = 155, $M$ = 35.24 ± 5.48. Scores on the latter ranged from 34 to 72, $n$ = 154, $M$ = 62.45 ± 7.42. These two subscales' correlation with one another was $r$ = 0.46 ($n$ = 154, $p < 0.001$).

### *3.5. Childbearing/Childbearing Plans*

Of the $n$ = 173 answering the question, 22 (11.9%) reported being mothers, and 151 (81.6%) reported current childlessness. Among $n$ = 165 answering the question, desiring each of the following number of children is as follows: 0 children, 15 (8.1%); 1 child, 8 (1.4%); 2 children, 93 (50.3%); 3 children, 25 (13.5%); 4 children, 21 (11.4%); 5 children, 2 (1.1%); and 6 children, 1 (0.5%). The average number of children desired was 2.24 ± 1.11. Finally, participants were asked "If you have no children now but want/intend to, at what age would you like to have your first?" Of the $n$ = 140 providing valid data, that age ranged from 20 to 42 years ($M$ = 30.43 ± 2.99). (Two entries of 13 and one of 120 years were considered to be mistaken entries, and thus not used in calculations.)

### *3.6. Testing of Hypotheses*

Note all subsequent values concern only women reporting male fiancés.

Of the $n$ = 117 answering "Will you change, hyphenate (or otherwise combine), or retain your current surname when you marry?" (DV 1), 74 (63.2%) indicated they would change, 12 (10.2%) indicated they would hyphenate or otherwise combine, and 31 (26.5%) indicated they would retain their surnames. Thus, a total of 43 participants (36.8%) indicated they would retain/hyphenate. DV 2 consisted of rated agreement with "In general, women should retain their birth names [at marriage]". $n$ = 114 answered this item. The range of answers to this item was 1—"Strongly disagree" to 6—"Strongly agree": $M$ = 3.15 ± 1.12.

The first DV was associated with the second ($t$ (68) = −4.32, $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.90$ or large), with participants who would retain/hyphenate reporting greater agreement with the item ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}} = 3.74 \pm 1.21$, $n = 42$; $M_{\text{changers}} = 2.81 \pm 0.91$, $n = 72$).

Hypothesis 1: Endorsement of the view that women should take the husband's surname at marriage will be predicted by the number of children desired

As noted, mean number of children desired was 2.24 + 1.11 (range: 0 to 6). Note that a derived variable, number of *future* children desired, was also computed by subtracting number of existing children from total number desired. Its range was 0 to 6, with mean number of children desired 2.05 + 1.14. In order for the above hypothesis to be supported, given that it is based on the idea that brides will particularly try to garner assistance from the future spouse for children shared with the future spouse (and, particularly, with a male spouse), in part via surname change, number of future children desired would need to be associated with degree of agreement with the dependent variable "In general, women should retain their birth names [at marriage]" (i.e., by a negative correlation). This assumes, however, that already-existing children are not those of the participant's fiancé: something not discernible from the data.

If the basis for the above hypothesis is sound, attitude to women's changing of surname at marriage (versus retention/hyphenation) would seem to be better predictable by number of future children desired than by total number of children desired. Indeed, I had intended "number of children desired" to be interpreted as "number of future children desired" in the relevant survey item. Number of children desired was not related to agreement with the given statement when either total number of children desired ($r = -0.10$, $n = 107$, $p$ = ns) or number of future children desired ($r = -0.10$, $n = 107$, $p$ = ns) were considered. Number of (future) children one desires may be a better predictor of one's own marital surname choice, however, than of general attitude to the practice. Thus the predictiveness of surname change versus retention/hyphenation, of number of (future) children desired, was assessed. Number of future children desired was marginally predictive of this choice (for women changing surname, $M_{\text{future children desired}} = 2.19 \pm 0.93$, $n = 69$; for women retaining/hyphenating, $M_{\text{future children desired}} = 1.88 \pm 1.22$, $n = 40$; $t$ (107) = 1.51, $n = 109$, $p = 0.06$, $d = 0.29$ or small). Given that this analysis, however, is only adequately powered to detect large effect sizes, this result must be viewed with caution.[7]

Hypotheses 2 and 3: (2) that individual women's own income and (3) that of their grooms, are predictive of these women's surname retention/hyphenation

Participant income bracket (positively) predicted retention/hyphenation (mean yearly income of those changing of 2.72, mean yearly income of those retaining/hyphenating of 3.14, where 1 = CAD 0–20,000; 2 = CAD 21,000–40,000; 3 = CAD 41,000–60,000; 4 = CAD 61,000–80,000; 5 = CAD 81,000–100,000; and 6 = over CAD 100,000; $t$ (104) = −1.72, $n = 106$, $p = 0.04$, $d = 0.34$ or small). Note this analysis, however, was only adequately powered to detect large effect sizes. Thus hypothesis 2 received partial support. Income of the fiancé (or anticipated income, if he was a student), was not associated with this choice of the bride, under $t$-test: $t$ (102) = −0.52, $n = 104$, $p$ = ns. Thus, hypothesis 3 received no support.

### *3.7. Additional Associations with Surname Retention/Hyphenation versus Change and Attitude Thereto*

As noted, certain variables other than those needed to test Hypotheses 1 to 3 were included in the instrument and tested for predictiveness of the DVs. Only such variables found to be associated with either DV will be cited below, for the sake of brevity. (All variables' associations with both DVs are available upon request from the author.)

Significant Associations with Surname Retention/Hyphenation versus Change (DV 1)

Brides-to-be who reported they would keep/hyphenate their surnames were older (for women changing surname, $M = 28.53 \pm 5.24$, $n = 74$; for women retaining/hyphenating, $M = 32.56 \pm 9.08$, $n = 43$; $t$ (58) = −2.66, $p = 0.010$, $d = 0.58$ or moderate), and would be older as of the date they report they planned to marry (for women changing surname,

$M$ = 29.35 ± 5.05, $n$ = 74; for women retaining/hyphenating, $M$ = 33.28 ± 9.17, $n$ = 43; $t$ (57) = −2.59, $n$ = 107, $p$ = 0.012, $d$ = 0.57 or moderate). These analyses must be interpreted with caution, however, given they were only adequately powered to detect large effect sizes.

Brides-to-be who reported they would keep/hyphenate surname at marriage were emotionally closer to their fathers (for women changing surname, $M$ = 4.38 ± 1.62, $n$ = 68; for women retaining/hyphenating, $M$ = 5.22 ± 1.06, $n$ = 37; $t$ (100) = −3.18, $p$ = 0.002, $d$ = 0.58 or moderate). Brides-to-be reporting they would keep or hyphenate their surnames also rated their fathers as more likely to help with any children (for women changing surname, $M$ = 4.19 ± 1.93, $n$ = 68; for women retaining/hyphenating, $M$ = 5.03 ± 1.51, $n$ = 34; $t$ (82) = −2.40, $p$ = 0.019, $d$ = 0.46 or small to moderate). Mothers of participants were rated as more likely to help with the participants' own children, where applicable, than were fathers of participants ($M_{\text{mother}}$ = 5.09 + 1.42, $M_{\text{father}}$ = 4.46 ± 1.84; $t$ (100) = 4.28, $n$ = 101, mean difference = 0.63 ± 1.49, $p$ < 0.001, $d$ = 0.43 or moderate). Additionally, participants reported being closer to their mothers ($M$ = 5.29 ± 1.05) than to their fathers ($M$ = 4.65 ± 1.50; $t$ (108) = 4.96, $n$ = 109, $p$ < 0.001, $d$ = 0.48 or small to moderate).

In general, brides-to-be who reported they would retain/hyphenate their surnames were less politically conservative ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 3.67 ± 2.23, $n$ = 42: $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 5.23 ± 2.23, $n$ = 70; $t$ (110) = 3.59, $p$ < 0.001, $d$ = 0.70 or moderate). Note, however, the sample size only provided adequate statistical power in this analysis to detect large effect sizes, so this result must be viewed with caution. In general, brides-to-be reporting surname retention/hyphenation were more politically liberal ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 8.19 ± 1.92, $n$ = 42: $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 6.53 ± 2.26, $n$ = 70; $t$ (98) = −4.15, $p$ < 0.001, $d$ = 0.78 or moderate to large). Retainers/hyphenators did not rate as greater, local female-female competition for husbands, compared with changers ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 3.33 ± 1.74, $n$ = 43: $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 2.89 ± 1.92, $n$ = 74; $t$ (115) = −1.22, $p$ = ns). Participants indicating they would retain or hyphenate surname had higher educational attainment ($\chi^2$ (8) = 22.20, $n$ = 117, $p$ = 0.005, w = 0.44 or moderate). Brides-to-be reporting they would retain or hyphenate their surnames identified to a greater degree as feminists ($M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 7.14 ± 1.98, $n$ = 42; $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 4.93 ± 2.60, $n$ = 70: $t$ (110) = −4.75, $p$ < 0.001, $d$ = 0.927 or large), and had higher scores on the Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994: $M_{\text{retainers/hyphenators}}$ = 37.38 ± 4.99, $n$ = 40; $M_{\text{changers}}$ = 34.78 ± 5.47, $n$ = 69: $t$ (107) = −2.46, $p$ = 0.015, $d$ = 0.49 or moderate).

Given a colleague's suggestion of bride ethnicity/race or ethnicities/races and difference in these within the couple as predictors of marital surname change, whether "White" participants did not differ from others (including those of bi-/multi-racial heritage including "White") in retention/hyphenation versus change of surname was tested. (Note that no individual, non-"White" group numbered at least 20, so only the current comparison could be made.) That is, among participants indicating ethnicity, whether she was "White" or not did not predict retention/hyphenation versus change ($\chi^2$ (1) = 2.65, $n$ = 116, $p$ = ns). Whether the participant and her fiancé(e) were of the same ($n$ = 95) versus different ($n$ = 21) ethnicity/race or ethnicities/races, if more than one was cited per participant or fiancé(e), was also non-predictive ($\chi^2$ (1) = 0.79, $n$ = 116, $p$ = ns).

Age at which next child was desired, if applicable, was not predictive of endorsement of DV 2 ($r$ = 0.12, $n$ = 94, $p$ = ns). Greater agreement with this DV was marginally (and weakly) associated with increased emotional closeness of the participant to her father ($r$ = 0.19, $n$ = 102, $p$ = 0.054) and not associated with such closeness to mother ($r$ = 0.05, $n$ = 111, $p$ = ns). Political liberalism and endorsement of DV 2 were unrelated ($r$ = 0.08, $n$ = 112, $p$ = ns). Political conservativism was also uncorrelated with DV 2 ($r$ = −0.11, $n$ = 112, $p$ = ns), while it was negatively related to retention/hyphenation (DV 1). (As would be expected, political conservativism and political liberalism were negatively correlated: $r$ = −0.37 or moderate, $n$ = 112, $p$ < 0.001.) Level of reported, local competition for husbands was not related to DV 2 ($r$ = 0.04, $n$ = 114, $p$ = ns). Analogous to their relationship with DV 1, feminist identification ($r$ = 0.22 or small, $n$ = 112, $p$ = 0.017) and higher Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) scores ($r$ = 0.24 or

small, $n = 109$, $p = 0.011$) were positively associated with DV 2. Note, generally, regarding all correlations computed, statistical power was adequate to detect moderate or greater effect sizes: thus, all small effect sizes from such analyses must be viewed with caution. Educational attainment was not associated with endorsement of DV 2 ($F$ (8, 105) = 0.78, $p$ = ns).

The bride's own mother not having taken her father's surname was marginally related to her endorsing DV 2 more ($t$ (33) = −2.02, $n = 114$, $p = 0.052$, $d = 0.52$ or moderate): this test, however, was adequately powered to detect large effect sizes, only. Analogously, as noted, participants whose own mothers took their fathers' surnames were more likely to retain/hyphenate surname themselves (DV 1). Sameness/difference of ethnicity/ethnicities between participant and her fiancé(e) was unpredictive of DV 2 ($t$ (111) = −0.01, $n = 113$, $p$ = ns).

### *3.8. Multivariate Analysis of Predictors of Each DV*

To assess relative magnitude of predictiveness of hypothesized predictors with that of other predictors of retention/hyphenation versus name change (DV 1), two models were planned to be tested under multiple, logistic regressions for the sub-sample of women marrying men. Likewise, to assess relative magnitude of predictiveness of hypothesized predictors with that of other predictors of level of agreement with the statement "In general, women should keep their birth names (at marriage)" (DV 2), two models were planned to be tested under multiple OLS regressions. Model 1, if any, for each DV, included only predictor(s) as hypothesized herein, assuming each was found to be associated with the relevant DV, on its own. Then added (to complete Model 2), would be all additional variables found to individually predict that DV. To avoid multicollinearity of predictors, all such predictors were first assessed for moderate or greater relatedness each to the other (e.g., for correlations, $r \geq |0.30|$: see Table 1) and, if deemed conceptually related to any other predictor, all but the strongest of the inter-related predictors discarded.

**Table 1.** Correlations between predictors of DV 1 (surname retention/hyphenation versus change) and predictors of DV 2 (endorsement of statement "In general, women should keep their birth names". † $p < 0.1$; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p \leq 0.001$: $n$'s 88 to 117).

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Participant income | - | −0.22 * | 0.34 *** | 0.36 *** | 0.39 *** | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.15 | −0.21 * | −0.09 | 0.02 | 0.14 |
| Number of future children desired | −0.22 * | - | −0.54 *** | −0.53 *** | −0.14 | 0.06 | 0.18 † | −0.08 | 0.28 ** | −0.04 | −0.02 | −0.33 *** |
| Age | 0.34 *** | −0.54 *** | - | 1.00 *** | 0.83 *** | −0.06 | −0.17 † | −0.13 | −0.14 | −0.08 | −0.02 | 0.09 |
| Age at marriage | 0.36 *** | −0.53 *** | 1.00 *** | - | 0.84 *** | −0.12 | −0.20 * | −0.13 | −0.14 | −0.08 | −0.03 | 0.09 |
| Age next child desired | 0.39 *** | −0.14 | 0.83 *** | 0.84 *** | - | −0.03 | −0.07 | −0.06 | −0.03 | −0.07 | −0.05 | 0.08 |
| Emotional closeness to father | 0.14 | 0.06 | −0.06 | −0.12 | −0.03 | - | 0.60 *** | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.08 | 0.12 |
| Likelihood father help with children | 0.05 | 0.18 | −0.17 † | −0.20 * | −0.07 | 0.60 *** | - | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.22 * | 0.19 † | 0.07 |
| Liberalism | 0.15 | −0.08 | −0.13 | −0.13 | −0.06 | 0.12 | 0.11 | - | −0.37 *** | 0.40 *** | 0.21 * | 0.16 † |
| Conservativism | −0.21 * | 0.28 ** | −0.14 | −0.14 | −0.03 | 0.09 | 0.03 | −0.37 *** | - | −0.29 ** | −0.29 ** | −0.19 * |
| Feminist identification | −0.09 | −0.04 | −0.08 | −0.08 | −0.07 | 0.14 | 0.22 * | 0.40 *** | −0.29 ** | - | 0.60 *** | 0.29 ** |
| Feminism scale | 0.02 | −0.02 | −0.02 | −0.03 | −0.05 | 0.08 | 0.19 † | 0.21 * | −0.29 ** | 0.60 *** | - | 0.28 ** |
| Egalitarianism | 0.14 | −0.33 *** | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.07 | 0.16 † | −0.19 * | 0.29 ** | 0.28 ** | - |

For the first DV of retention/hyphenation versus change, the significant, hypothesized predictors were participant income, and number of future children desired (see Model 1, Table 2). Also found to be predictive were age, age when marriage would take place, age at which next child was desired, closeness to father, rated likelihood of father assisting with children, liberalism, conservativism, feminist identification, Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) score, whether the participant's mother had taken her father's surname, and educational attainment. Within the following groups of the above, conceptually-related variables, intercorrelations of $r \geq |.30|$ were observed: (1) age, age when marriage would take place, and age at which next child was desired; (2) closeness to father, and rated likelihood of father assisting with children; (3) liberal identification, and conservative identification; and (4) feminist identification, and Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale score. Within these groups, the following variables, each on its own, was most predictive of DV 1: (1) age, (2) closeness to father, (3) liberal identification, and (4) feminist identification. These, along with the variables in Model 1 (participant's income, and number of future children desired), whether the participant's mother had taken her father's surname, and educational attainment, were used in the relevant regression (see Model 2, Table 2).

**Table 2.** Predictors of change (versus retention/hyphenation) of surname, addressing two logistic multiple regression models (Model 1, $n$ = 100, Cox & Snell pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.04, Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.05: Model 2, $n$ = 86, Cox & Snell pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.44, Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.61).

| Predictor Variables | Model 1 | | | | | Model 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | b | Std. Error | Wald | *p* | Exp(b) | b | Std. Error | Wald | *p* | Exp(b) |
| Participant income | −0.28 | 0.18 | 2.30 | 0.129 | 0.76 | −0.55 | 0.36 | 2.29 | 0.130 | 0.58 |
| Number of future children desired | 0.18 | 0.22 | 0.65 | 0.422 | 1.19 | −0.26 | 0.35 | 0.55 | 0.458 | 0.77 |
| Age | | | | | | −0.08 | 0.11 | 0.62 | 0.432 | 0.92 |
| Emotional closeness to Father | | | | | | −0.68 | 0.35 | 3.81 | 0.051 | 0.50 |
| Liberalism | | | | | | −0.54 | 0.22 | 6.13 | 0.013 | 0.58 |
| Feminist identification | | | | | | −0.39 | 0.16 | 5.59 | 0.018 | 0.68 |
| Whether mother took father's surname | | | | | | 1.21 | 0.48 | 6.22 | 0.013 | 3.34 |
| Educational attainment | | | | | | −0.42 | 0.27 | 2.31 | 0.128 | 0.66 |

For the second DV of level of agreement with the statement "In general, women should retain their birth names", none of the hypothesized predictors was significant: thus, no Model 1 was tested. DV 2 was predicted by feminist identification, Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale score, whether mother took father's surname, and the Egalitarianism-Autonomy subscale of Cochran and Peplau (1985). Since feminist identification and Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale score were both at least moderately intercorrelated and deemed conceptually related, only that most strongly related to DV 2 in the current sub-sample (Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale score) was used in the relevant regression (along with DV's other two univariate predictors: see Table 3).

**Table 3.** Predictors of level of agreement with "In general, women should retain their birth names", addressing OLS multiple regression model ($n$ = 105, Adjusted-$R^2$ = 0.14).

| Predictor Variable | β | *t* | *p* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Feminism Scale Score | 0.18 | 1.92 | 0.058 |
| Mother Took Father's Surname | −0.26 | −2.86 | 0.005 |
| Egalitarianism | 0.24 | 2.55 | 0.012 |

Summary of Logistic Regression Results (DV 1)

Table 2 contains b and Wald value, significance level, and exponentiated (b) value (or, odds ratio) for the regression for which retention/hyphenation versus surname change was the DV. Note the effect size of Model 2, based on its Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$, might be considered moderate within the social sciences (see generally Ferguson 2009, regarding adjusted-$R^2$ size considered moderate).

Neither participant income nor number of future children desired remained predictive, when both of these were used in the same regression as predictors of surname retention/hyphenation versus change (Table 2, Model 1). When these predictors were used alongside the others in Model 2 (Table 2), the following, only, were predictive of retention/hyphenation: greater reported level of emotional closeness to father (marginally), greater liberalism, greater feminist identification, and the participant's mother not having taken her father's surname. Thus, all of participant income, number of future children desired, age, and educational attainment were unpredictive.

Summary of OLS Regression Results (DV 2)

Table 3 contains beta and *t* values, as well as significance levels, for the regressions the DV of which was level of endorsement of "In general, women should retain their birth names [at marriage]" (DV 2). Shapiro-Wilk testing for normal distribution of DV 2 showed non-normal distribution ($p \leq 0.001$): Thus, this regression does not meet the assumptions of regression analysis and will not be discussed further.

## 4. Discussion

In this study, factors associated with women's marital surname retention/hyphenation versus change from the literature were assessed for relatedness, each on its own as well as together (in multiple regression) if found to be related on its own, with two DVs. The first DV was reported retention/hyphenation versus change of surname at (imminent) marriage: the second was endorsement of the statement "In general, women should retain their surnames [at marriage]". Data were gathered via survey of registrants with the website of the only pan-Canadian bridal magazine to the author's knowledge, *Weddingbells*. Participants were asked to self- exclude if not female, not brides-to-be, and/or not Canadian residents.

### *4.1. Income of the Participant and Her Groom: Hypotheses 1 and 2*

Incomes were investigated in part, due to the expensiveness of raising children, and the 'motherhood penalty/fatherhood bonus' to income, associated with childcare (predominantly by mothers: Cain Miller 2014). Only bride's (participant's), not groom's, income as positively predictive of marital surname retention/hyphenation was supported as a predictor (Hypothesis 1). Effect size was small, yet the analyses producing them only adequately powered to detect moderate effect sizes. Participant's income was not predictive when regressed alongside number of future children desired, only (which was also non-predictive, in the regression: Model 1, Table 2). When these two variables were regressed alongside age, greater emotional closeness to her father on the part of the participant, liberal identification, feminist identification, the participant's mother not having taken her father's surname, and educational attainment to predict retention/hyphenation (Model 2, Table 2), only liberal identification, feminist identification, and the participant's mother not having taken her father's surname were significantly predictive. Perhaps those of greater income within the sub-sample were also higher in liberal and feminist self-identification and tended more often to have mothers who did not take their fathers' surnames. In any case, income being most strongly causal to the decision to retain/hyphenate surname at marriage amongst variables found to be predictive was not supported.

Analogous analyses were also performed with DV 2. Brides-to-be of higher income division were not more likely to endorse this DV. Thus, it cannot be concluded that this predictor bore any relationship to DV 2 endorsement. Therefore, bride-to-be self-reported income should be interpreted as having predicted surname change versus retention/hyphenation

under underpowered univariate analysis (perhaps due to lesser need on the bride's part of eliciting the husband's investment) but not general attitude to the practice. No support was found for the groom-to-be's income (as reported by bride-to-be) as predictive of either DV.

Given that own income (on its own—that is, via univariate analysis) was predictive of brides'-to-be retaining/hyphenating surname, the study's underlying reasoning that lesser need for investment from husband and/or in-laws leads to less need to 'get in good' with these might be seen as somewhat bolstered. There is, however, an alternative interpretation in the literature. Goldin and Shim (2004), for example, discuss the possibility that women who are established in occupations in which they have built up goodwill under their surnames would suffer a professional/economic detriment via surname change. If so, a conscious reasoning process on the part of women, to change surname only where a detriment to earnings and/or professional reputation would not exceed some level, is implicated. Such a possibility cannot be discounted, and the absence of need to 'get in good', as above, cannot be preferred as explanatory, given the current study's data. MacEacheron (2011, 2021), however, found, using large-scale, pan-U.S. data from two different years, that *state-level* average/median women's income (alongside household income inequality expressed by the Gini coefficient, plus their interaction) was positively predictive of surname retention/hyphenation (rather than change to that of the husband) among destination brides to Hawai'i. Note, in arguing for what might be called facultative, costly, commitment signaling, of brides' pre-marital surname 'sacrifice' versus retention choice, MacEacheron (2021, at p. 206) states,

> "... It seems implausible that thousands of brides looked up their state women's full-time/salaried median income, and household-to-household income inequality, and made a surnaming decision influenced by these. It is difficult to imagine how the observed pattern of (uncoordinated) action on the part of thousands could occur, without at least some enabling psychological mechanism of detection or noticing of inequality. Based on the results of this study, I tentatively speculate the women studied tended to at least somewhat accurately perceive local (1) income earning potential for their sex; and (2) levels of resource-level inequality, and that these influenced, via unknown mechanism, many of their marital surnaming decisions..."

Given MacEacheron's (2011, 2021) studies were large-scale, replicated, pan-U.S., and multi-year, and assuming there is indeed no possible mechanism by which such results could have been obtained solely via a conscious reasoning process on the part of brides in making their marital surname choice, it would seem the preponderance of evidence currently favors an in-part *non-conscious*/not-detectable-via-introspection (nor via survey) process, related to own income (potential) and relative income inequality, by which women arrive at a marital surname choice. More research—for instance among brides of lesser income (which those able to pay to travel to Hawai'i from anywhere else in the U.S. would not be, and those registered with a bridal magazine may not be)—in any case, could still be conducted.

Even if a woman's marital surname choice on her wedding day means she has made some sacrifice (costly signal) that bolsters the credibility of her commitment, why should she imagine that sacrifice will be rewarded via her groom's behavior? Her signal would indeed mean her husband's surname group gained at least one member (she), plus, in all likelihood, any children born of the marriage, and her own family surname group would be at least one fewer in number. Her signal would indeed mean she was publicly identifiable whenever and wherever her surname (plus honorific "Mrs.") was spoken, as married, and to her husband, perhaps making her less able to engage in a clandestine, adulterous affair. Her signal might mean she foregoes some business/economic advantage. And she might actually be more committed—that is, under a wider range of circumstances—to staying within the marriage (MacEacheron 2021). But why would she make such a sacrifice if her husband could commit adultery and/or divert resources from her and any children, regardless of the value of her signal? Her husband might be incentivized to invest in

children, who are more assuredly genetically his—of which her signal might persuade him. An additional mechanism preventing potential grooms from accepting their potential brides' marital surname change, yet simply failing to 'reciprocate' during marriage via an analogous level of commitment and investment in her and any children, however, is suggested. Note that by marrying a woman who has signaled she will take his surname (which she then does), such a husband accepts such a wife displaying, whenever and wherever her surname (plus honorific 'Mrs.') is spoken, that he is married and to her. By publicly and repeatedly labelling herself as his wife, that is, a wife who has changed surname also publicly and repeatedly labels him as her husband, in a manner not under his control. Speculatively, in this way, a potential bride, by signaling she will undergo marital surname change/abstain from it, might also facilitate her assortative mating on preferred level of (un)conditionality of remaining within the marriage, while increasing husband's investment in the children of the marriage.

### *4.2. Number of Children Desired (Hypothesis 3)*

Number of children desired was hypothesized to predict endorsement of "In general, it is better for a woman to retain her birth name [at marriage]" (DV 2). It was not significantly associated, however, with that DV. Thus, Hypothesis 2 was not supported. The range of number of children desired, zero to five, would seem to include enough variability to have allowed for detection of such a relationship between this predictor and DV 2. The average number desired ($2.23 \pm 1.06$: average number of *future* children desired, $M = 2.07 \pm 1.05$) may suggest that the large majority of participants wanted few enough children, that they might continue working (and thus not be, presumably, completely dependent on resource investment from the husband and/or other(s)). Future research could assess whether, in countries such as the U.S. in which ability to work may be more jeopardized by motherhood due to the absence of guaranteed, paid, maternity leave, number of children desired might be predictive of such attitude.

As noted in the Results section, number of children desired might better have been hypothesized as a predictor of one's own marital surname change versus retention/hyphenation (DV 1) than of general attitude toward the practice (DV 2). As also noted, however, number of future children desired was only marginally predictive of marital surname change (in the anticipated direction). The given effect size, additionally, was small, with retainers/hyphenators on average desiring 1.88 future children, and changers desiring on average 2.19.

### *4.3. Change/Retention/Hyphenation Decision and/or General Attitude Thereto*

DV 2 consisted of endorsement of a single statement: "In general, women should retain their birth names (at marriage)". As such, it may be considered a less stable measure than a multi-item scale score. No relevant scale, however, existed to my best knowledge (and this one was based on one previously used: Hamilton et al. 2011). DV 1 consisted of reporting one's own (imminent) marital surnaming intention, which was coded as simply 'change' versus 'retain/hyphenate' surname.

Participants reported emotional closeness to each of her parents. Closeness to father, only, was significantly related to retention/hyphenation and approval of women's marital surname retention in general. This is perhaps unsurprising given that it is the father's surname, assuming the bride-to-be was herself surnamed traditionally, that she would be giving up via marital surname change. Closeness to a father may imply his greater willingness to invest in his daughter: This was evidenced in this study, by greater rated likelihood of such fathers helping with their daughter's children.

No such assumption regarding *future* investment, no matter how emotionally close the bride currently is to her future parents-in-law is, however, might be made: A bride's parents-in-law will have ongoing genetic grandparental uncertainty concerning each of her successive, future children while her own father, as long as he detects no new reason to doubt his paternity of her, will not. Future work could query closeness of the bride-to-be to

each of future mother-in-law and future father-in-law, and assess how close the bride tends to be to these two at given levels of closeness to her own father, before she will undergo marital surname change.

### *4.4. Multiple Regression*

The hypothesized predictors of DV 1 (reported change versus hyphenation/retention of surname at imminent marriage) found to be predictive under univariate analysis, were participant income and number of future children desired (see Model 1, Table 2). Also found to be predictive under univariate regression were age, age when marriage would take place, age at which next child was desired, emotional closeness to father, rated likelihood of father assisting with children, liberal identification, conservative identification, feminist identification, Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement Scale (Fassinger 1994) score, whether the participant's mother had taken the participant's father's surname, and educational attainment. Of these latter predictors, as noted, age, emotional closeness to father, liberal identification, feminist identification, whether the participant's mother had taken the participant's father's surname, and educational attainment only, were included in the regression. That was done, since these were at least moderately inter-correlated with one or more other of these variables and also conceptually related (see Table 1), and possessed the strongest correlation among such other variables with DV 1. Of all predictors used (including those hypothesized), only liberal identification, feminist identification, and mother not having taken father's surname were (positively) predictive of retention/hyphenation. This suggests either a more complicated relationship of the hypothesized predictors to retention/hyphenation, or lesser or no such relationship when the predictiveness of these other predictors is taken into account.

Let us take the case of the strongest predictor of participant marital surname change: her reporting that her mother took the participant's father's surname. Since this predictor's exponentiated b value (odds ratio) of 3.34 is greater than zero, the participant reporting her mother took the participant's father's surname, corresponded to greater odds of the participant's own marital surname change (versus retention or hyphenation). Subtracting this value from 1 and multiplying that by 100 (i.e., [1–3.34] $\times$ 100), yields percent change odds that the participant reports she will undergo marital surname change. Here, a participant reporting her mother had taken the participant's father's surname was associated with a 234% increase in odds the participant would report she would undergo marital surname change. The regression's pseudo-$R^2$ values (Cox & Snell pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.44, Nagelkerke pseudo-$R^2$ = 0.61) may each be considered to be moderate (see generally regarding Adjusted-$R^2$ values: Ferguson 2009). At $\alpha$ = 0.05, power = 0.80, for the given regression, however, only large effect sizes are detectable (Cohen 1992). Thus, this result should be taken as suggestive, only.

Given a bride's taking of her groom's surname is an apparently strong predictor of any children of the marriage also having only his surname (e.g., Johnson and Scheuble 2002; Duchesne 2006), the just-noted regression result, if confirmed via replication, would be consistent with familial or sub-cultural transmission of the practice. This would be as speculated in MacEacheron (2016a, at pp. 157–58):

> "... Women's choice to not undergo marital surname change will have been acknowledged as legal for all purposes across the U.S.A. for between 30 and 40 years... Additionally, given the U.S.A.'s cultural influence on Canada, the options of surname retention and hyphenation should have been salient in that country too, for this same amount of time. Even women in states in which it most recently became legal for all purposes to retain pre-marital surname at marriage, who married at that point in time, are now old enough to be grandmothers... Thus, it is possible that North American patrilineal descent reckoning, which may be an ultimate reason for marital surname change, will now have been either reclaimed or subverted in some families. Such reclamation could occur

as a counter-reaction to the bilateral descent reckoning that implicitly occurs via giving children a dual (both mother's and father's) surname. . ."

Interestingly, factors associated with the two DVs differed. That is, while the items liberal identification and (marginally) emotional closeness to father were positively predictive of retention/hyphenation under the relevant multiple regression, they were not predictive of endorsement of the statement "In general, women should retain their birth surname [at marriage]" under univariate analyses. A possible explanation is that the two DVs are not entirely related. This, in turn, might be because women who retain/hyphenate surname may espouse choice in such decisions more than they espouse similar practice for other women: The statement (DV 2) espouses the practice, rather than that it be a choice.

### *4.5. Strengths, Limitations, and Future Directions*

This research was novel in several aspects. First, no rates of women's marital surname change, retention, and hyphenation across various parts of Canada had been previously assessed. The proportions, when all brides-to-be were considered, of each of these options, were as follows within the full sample: retention, 0.22; hyphenation, 0.10; change, 0.62. The second, main, novel aspect of this study: simultaneous assessment of the relative predictiveness of this many variables, previously found in the literature associated with marital name change and attitude thereto in North America, performed on brides-to-be or married women. The final, main novelty of the study: the relationship between brides'-to-be own marital surname choice, and their general attitude to the practice, being assessed.

Brides-to-be, though their marriages are imminent, are still stating intention to retain/hyphenate versus change surname, since the actual change or retention/hyphenation occurs only at time of marriage. Records of women's surname change versus retention/hyphenation on the grounds of marriage, however, if kept by government, are not accessible, and it was not feasible to collect data from brides on their wedding days (when the decision, presumably, is usually finalized).

Participants were registrants on a bridal magazine website. To the extent such magazines include suggestions for purchasing items that will be used for one day only, as well as for purchase of other very time-limited, expensive activities in celebration of a wedding (such as an engagement party and honeymoon), they may disproportionately attract wealthy brides-to-be. (Thay may also tend to attract brides with no perceived need to hurry to marry, given the time required to plan a wedding on the scale of the those featured in the magazine.) Indeed, the median income bracket of participants was CAD 41,000 to CAD 60,000, which was greater than the average yearly earnings for female, Canadian earners in 2011: CAD 32,100 (Milan 2013). At 30.02 (+7.10) years of age on average, these brides may have been, again on average, slightly older than typical Canadian brides-to-be: 29.1, as of 2008 (Statistics Canada 2016). Greater age was found to predict both DVs and, as discussed, greater income was partially supported as a (positive) predictor of retention/hyphenation and positive attitude toward retention. Thus, the actual rate of retention/hyphenation and, to the extent it is related, endorsement of DV 2, may be assumed to not be as great among all Canadian brides-to-be as these were among this study's participants.

Future Directions for Research

In order to test hypotheses concerning any inter-jurisdictional differences in women's marital surname choice, recruiting greater numbers is generally suggested. Note that the small population size of several provinces (e.g., the smallest, Prince Edward Island, at 146,447: Prince Edward Island Statistics Bureau 2015) might require snowball sampling.

Given that the behavior at issue, women's (opposite-sex) marital surname change, is an intersexual phenomenon, given the dearth of studies on marital surname change of women marrying women, and given the prevalence of heterosexuals, limiting the hypotheses in the current study to women engaged to men seemed justifiable. One of the initial questions on the survey, as to sex of the participant's fiancé(e), was worded "Sex of your fiancé(e):" (followed by tick-box options). It is suggested it be re-worded

for clarity, given it was unlikely a third of the participants actually comprised women marrying women. This would allow all data, including that from women marrying women (whether or not analyzed separately, as is suggested given it is unclear in a female-female marriage which spouse, if any, would change surname), to be used. Placing a graphic of either two brides, or a bride and a groom (each couple perhaps holding hands), next to the relevant tick-box choice might make the question less capable of misinterpretation. Such future work could also include hypotheses and questions that pertain to same-sex marriage brides particularly.

The current research did not address any difference in intended name change or attitude thereto, depending on whether the participant anticipated or desired a change in honorific (especially, changing from "Miss" to "Mrs."), or not (because current honorific would not change, for instance because it was "Dr.", "Professor", "Pastor", etc.) It is possible, for instance, that where a bride-to-be anticipated or desired no change in honorific (e.g., because she used "Ms." previously and planned on continuing doing so), changing surname would hold less appeal. That is possible, in turn, because she might consider the cost to her of surname change (in inconvenience, for instance) less worthwhile, where she could not signal her married status thereby. Thus, future research could investigate this by additionally asking for current, as well as planned post-marital, honorific.

Finally, this study's brides-to-be also cannot be taken as representative of various religious and ethnic groups within Canada. That is, due to low enrollment by brides-to-be who were neither Christian nor without religious affiliation, no conclusions may be drawn concerning them. Comparisons between ethnic groups, also for the same reason, were not possible, except for between "White" and non- "White" participants (between which no differences in either DV was discovered). In general, to the extent the given sample was non-representative, as well as small in size, the results obtained therefrom must be interpreted as potentially non-replicable in a representative sample. Greater sampling, perhaps at bridal shows and events around the country, including any catering to those of minority religious or ethnic groups, could remedy this issue. Also a possibility would be snowball sampling of brides-to-be (see, e.g., Atkinson and Flint 2001). Finally, wedding officiants might be approached to record frequency of women's marital surname change and hyphenation/retention. These may be likely to be aware of such surname choice, since they may announce after the ceremony, "I now present, for the first time, Mr. and Mrs. X", only if applicable.

### Measuring Attitudes and Behavior of Brides-to-Be, Rather Than of Married or Unmarried Women

Brides-to-be to be were chosen as research participants in part due to the fact they have almost certainly, since they are on the eves of their marriages, at least considered marital surname change for themselves, within a given partnership and economic and other contexts. Thus, characteristics of that partnership, of the bride and groom and the bride's parents, and other circumstances which might impact such decision, can be measured, along with the decision itself (and general attitude thereto). On the advice of a colleague, in any subsequent, related survey work, it is suggested that the bride's-to-be perception of the attitude of the groom-to-be and his natal family as to her marital surname choice be queried. This is suggested, since there logically may be variation in the amount of pressure from the groom/his family on brides-to-be to undergo marital surname change, and this potential predictor has not yet been quantitatively studied.

Married women might have been studied in this survey, but brides-to-be were preferred, since marital surname change or retention/hyphenation is decided upon at time of marriage, potentially in part in response to the available cues and circumstances. Memory for such cues and circumstances could erode over time making married women less suitable participants. Also problematic would be the fact there is evidence that surname retention/hyphenation has generally increased over time. As such, a cohort effect, with married women who wed more years ago having chosen surname change at a greater rate, was possible. Brides-to-be in the portion of the dataset comprising women marrying men, were of varying age

(ranging from 20 to 60 years: $M = 29.93 + 7.03$), allowing for comparison of the effect of age without possible confounding by the above, predicted, cohort effect.

## 5. Conclusions

Participant's income and (marginally) future number of children desired, as predicted, as well as age, were positively predictive of reported intention to hyphenate/retain surname at imminent marriage among participants engaged to men. This is consistent with brides-to-be who could be expected to, on average and without more, need fewer resources during marriage (to help fund children) also being more likely to state they would not undergo marital surname change. This was investigated, in part, due to my conjecture that marriage, uniquely, comprises a *reproductive* partnership. Groom's income was not predictive of participants reporting they would retain or hyphenate surname at marriage, contrary to prediction. This calls into question the idea that women are, in part, competing for higher-income grooms via marital surname change.

Under multiple regression analyses, non-intercorrelated variables found to be individually predictive of retention/hyphenation were assessed alongside each other for their relative predictiveness of that DV. Among women engaged to men, all of the participant's own income, number of future children desired, age, educational attainment, and emotional closeness to father were not significantly predictive when regressed alongside liberal identification, feminist identification, and the participant's mother not having taken her father's surname. Thus, the relative importance of the hypothesized, univariate predictors of participant income and number of future children desired, compared with these other predictors, is called into question, unless perhaps the significant predictors are associated with higher income and/or fewer children desired.

The other DV (DV 2: endorsement of "In general, women should retain their birth surname [at marriage]") was positively related to reported (imminent) intention to retain/hyphenate versus change own surname at marriage (DV 1).

Participant's own mother's marital surnaming decision was most predictive of the participant's own such choice. This may point to a new sub-culture utilizing greater bilateral descent reckoning, or of such reckoning becoming entrenched as tradition within some families. This study comprised the first instance of such finding in Canada. The other significant predictors, under regression, were liberal identification, and feminist identification.

Results of analyses noted in this Conclusion were only adequately powered to detect large effect sizes: significant results found, however, except for relationship of DV 1 with DV 2, were of less than large effect size. Thus, those results must be interpreted with caution.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Ethical approval, Western University's Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (file number 105612).

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all participants involved in the study.

**Data Availability Statement:** Data unavailable due to privacy/ethical restrictions.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

## Notes

[1] Based closely on a chapter of author's Ph.D. thesis, available at https://www.proquest.com/docview/2714866063?pq-origsite=gscholar&fromopenview=true accessed on 1 January 2024, some wording is identical to previously unpublished portions, and/or identical to previously unpublished portions of M.Sc. thesis, available at https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/21048 accessed on 1 January 2024.

[2] The aim of the present study was to re-test several hypotheses created as part of the author's 2009 MSc thesis, which surveyed Canadian undergraduate women none of whom had ever been married, on actual, Canadian, brides-to-be.

[3] Note additional hypotheses were initially created, in case sufficient data from all Canadian provinces had been collected to allow their testing: not enough such data were collected. One additional hypothesis, beyond the scope of this paper, was also created: details are available on request from author.

[4] Previous, unpublished work (MacEacheron 2009), however, showed that closeness to mother was *not* predictive of negative attitude to women's marital surname change when used as a predictor alongside motivation to avoid in-laws, plus other predictors from the literature, within a linear regression (closeness to father was, however, a marginally significant predictor of such attitude within the regression).

[5] Not discussed further, at a reviewer's request: details available on request from author.

[6] *CÉGEP*, or *Collège d'enseignement general et professionnel*, is a Quebec-only education level preparatory for university, similar to that of community college elsewhere in Canada (e.g., Quebec General and Vocational Colleges Act, c-29, as amended).

[7] Bride's age and, separately, (state-level, median women's) income were strong predictors of retention/hyphenation in (MacEacheron 2011, 2021), and income as a predictor received partial support under Hypothesis 1a. Since age in women predicts number of future children expectable, and such number might in turn predict attitude to or actual retention/hyphenation, whether number of children desired might act as a mediator between age and each of the two DVs was assessed. Such mediation, however, did not occur (for DV 2 [own marital surname decision]; $n = 109$, C.I. of indirect effect of age on DV was $-0.135$ to 0.005: for DV 1 [general attitude toward practice], $n = 107$, C.I. of indirect effect was $-0.018$ to 0.054).

## References


Atkinson, Rowland, and John Flint. 2001. Accessing hidden and hard-to-reach populations: Snowball research strategies. *Social Research Update* 33: 1–4.

Blakemore, Judith E. O., Carol A. Lawton, and Lesa R. Vartanian. 2005. I Can't Wait to Get Married: Gender Differences in Drive to Marry. *Sex Roles* 53: 327–35. [CrossRef]

Blaze Carlson, Kathryn. 2012. The True North LGBT: New poll reveals landscape of gay Canada. *National Post*. July 6. Available online: http://news.nationalpost.com/news/canada/the-true-north-lgbt-new-poll-reveals-landscape-of-gay-canada#anchor (accessed on 9 March 2017).

Boxer, Diana, and Elena Gritsenko. 2005. Women and surnames across cultures: Reconstituting identity in marriage. *Women and Language* 28: 1–11.

Cain Miller, Claire. 2014. The Motherhood Penalty vs, the Fatherhood Bonus. *New York Times*. Available online: https://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/07/upshot/a-child-helps-your-career-if-you%E2%80%99re-a-man.html (accessed on 24 December 2020).

Chagnon, Napoleon A. 1979. Is reproductive success equal in egalitarian societies? In *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior: An Anthropological Perspective*. Edited by Napoleon A. Chagnon and William G. Irons. London: Duxbury Press.

Cherlin, Andrew J., and Frank F. Furstenberg. 1986. *The New American Grandparent: A Place in the Family, A Life Apart*. New York: Basic.

Civil Code of Québec (CCQ). 1991. c. 64, a. 58 & 393. Available online: https://www.legisquebec.gouv.qc.ca/en/document/cs/ccq-1991 (accessed on 1 January 2024).

Cochran, Susan D., and Letitia A. Peplau. 1985. Value orientations in heterosexual relationships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 9: 477–88. [CrossRef]

Cohen, Jacob. 1992. A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin* 112: 155. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Daly, Martin, and Margo Wilson. 1988. *Homicide*. Berlin: Aldine de Gruyter.

DeKay, W. Todd. 1995. Grandparental investment and the uncertainty of kinship. Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Human Behavior and Evolution Society, Santa Barbara, CA, USA, June 28–July 2.

Dickemann, Mildred. 1979. Female Infanticide, Reproductive Strategies, and Social Stratification: A Preliminary Model. In *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior: An Anthropological Perspective*. Edited by Napoleon A. Chagnon and William G. Irons. London: Duxbury Press.

Duchesne, Louis. 2006. *La situation démographique au Québec: Bilan 2006*; Government of Quebec. Available online: www.stat.gouv.qc.ca/statistiques/population-demographie/bilan2006.pdf (accessed on 10 March 2016).

Emens, Elizabeth F. 2007. Changing Name Changing: Framing Rules and the Future of Marital Names. *The University of Chicago Law Review* 74: 761–63.

Euler, Harald A., and Barbara Weitzel. 1996. Discriminative Grandparental Solicitude as Reproductive Strategy. *Human Nature* 7: 39–59. [CrossRef]

Fassinger, Ruth E. 1994. Development and testing of the Attitudes Toward Feminism and the Women's Movement (FWN) Scale. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 18: 389–402. [CrossRef]

Ferguson, Christopher J. 2009. An effect size primer: A guide for clinicians and researchers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 40: 532–38. [CrossRef]

Furstenberg, Frank F., and Kathy G. Talvitie. 1980. Children's Names and Paternal Claims. *Journal of Family Issues* 1: 31–57. [CrossRef]

Goldin, Claudia, and Maria Shim. 2004. Making a Name: Women's Surnames at Marriage and Beyond. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18: 143–60. [CrossRef]

Hamilton, Laura, Claudia Geist, and Brian Powell. 2011. Marital name change as a window into gender attitudes. *Gender & Society* 25: 145–75.

Hartshorne, Timothy S., and Guy J. Manaster. 1983. The relationship with grandparents: Contact, importance, role conception. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 15: 233–45. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
Hawkes, Kristen, James F. O'Connell, and Nicholas G. Blurton Jones. 1997. Hadza women's time allocation, offspring provisioning, and the evolution of long postmenopausal life spans. *Current Anthropology* 38: 551–77. [CrossRef]
Hill, Kim, and A. Magdalena Hurtado. 1996. *Ache Life History. The Ecology and Demography of a Foraging People*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Hodgson, Lynne G. 1992. Adult grandchildren and their grandparents: The enduring bond. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 34: 209–25. [CrossRef]
Hoffman, Edward. 1980. Young adults' relations with their grandparents. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 10: 299–310. [CrossRef]
Hoffnung, Michele. 2006. What's In a Name? Marital Name Choice Revisited. *Sex Roles* 55: 817–25. [CrossRef]
Intons-Peterson, Margaret J., and Jill Crawford. 1985. The Meanings of Marital Surnames. *Sex Roles* 12: 1163–71. [CrossRef]
Jackson, Jacquelyne J. 1971. Aged blacks: A potpourri in the direction of the reduction of inequities. *Phylon* 32: 260–80. [CrossRef]
Johnson, David R., and Laurie K. Scheuble. 1995. Women's Marital Naming in Two Generations: A National Study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57: 724–32. [CrossRef]
Johnson, David R., and Laurie K. Scheuble. 2002. What should we call our kids? Choosing children's surnames when parents' last names differ. *The Social Science Journal* 39: 419–29. [CrossRef]
Kahana, Boaz, and Eva Kahana. 1970. Grandparenthood from the perspective of the developing grandchild. *Developmental Psychology* 3: 98–105. [CrossRef]
Karthikeyan, Sethu, and Maryanne L. Fisher. 2023. A case study of a historical matrilineal community from an evolutionary perspective. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences* 17: 61–82. [CrossRef]
Kennedy, Gregory E. 1990. College Students' Expectations of Grandparent and Grandchild Role Behaviors. *The Gerontologist* 30: 43–48. [CrossRef]
Kerns, Myleah Y. 2011. North American women's surname choice based on ethnicity and self-identification as feminists. *Names* 59: 104–17. [CrossRef]
Kline, Susan L., Laura Stafford, and Jill C. Miklosovic. 1996. Women's surnames: Decisions, interpretations and associations with relational qualities. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 13: 593–17. [CrossRef]
Lambert, Alan J., and Katherine Raichle. 2000. The role of political ideology in mediating judgments of blame in rape victims and their assailants: A test of the just world, personal responsibility, and legitimization hypotheses. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26: 853–63. [CrossRef]
Li, Lixing, Xiaoyu Wu, and Yi Zhou. 2021. Intra-household bargaining power, surname inheritance, and human capital accumulation. *Journal of Population Economics* 34: 35–61. [CrossRef]
Lin, Luona. 2023. About 8 in 10 Women in Opposite-Sex Marriages Say They Took Their Husband's Last Name. *Pew Research Center*. Available online: https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2023/09/07/about-eight-in-ten-women-in-opposite-sex-marriages-say-they-took-their-husbands-last-name/#:~:text=Most%20women%20in%20opposite-sex,they%20kept%20their%20last%20name (accessed on 11 December 2023).
Lockwood, Penelope, Caitlin Burton, and Katelyn Boersma. 2011. Tampering with tradition: Rationales concerning women's married names and children's surnames. *Sex Roles* 65: 827–39. [CrossRef]
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2009. Factors Associated with Hamilton, Ontario Women's Marital Surname Change Attitudes, McMaster University Thode Library Thesis Repository. Available online: https://macsphere.mcmaster.ca/handle/11375/21048 (accessed on 1 January 2024).
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2011. Hawaii Data: Women's Marital Surname Change by Bride's Age and Jurisdiction of Residence. *Names* 59: 4–11. [CrossRef]
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2016a. North American women's marital surname change: Practices, law, and patrilineal descent reckoning. *Evolutionary Psychological Science* 2: 149–61. [CrossRef]
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2016b. Novel Predictors of Women's Surname Retention at Marriage. *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository* 4534. Available online: https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/4534 (accessed on 1 January 2024).
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2020. Women's marital surname change by bride's age and jurisdiction of residence: A replication. *Names* 68: 193–209. [CrossRef]
MacEacheron, Melanie. 2021. Marital Surname Change and Marital Duration Among Divorcées in a Canadian County. *Frontiers in Psychology* 12: 647942. [CrossRef]
Milan, Anne. 2013. Marital Status: Overview, 2011. Statistics Canada. Available online: http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/91-209-x/2013001/article/11788-eng.pdf (accessed on 28 February 2017).
Murdock, George Peter. 1949. *Social Structure*. New York: Macmillan Co.
Noack, Turid, and Kenneth A. Wiik. 2008. Women's Choice of Surname Upon Marriage in Norway. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70: 507–18. [CrossRef]
Oates, Kerris, and Margo Wilson. 2002. Nominal kinship cues facilitate altruism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 269: 105–9. [CrossRef]

Pashos, Alexander. 2000. Does paternal uncertainty explain discriminative grandparental solicitude? A cross-cultural study in Greece and Germany. *Evolution and Human Behavior* 21: 97–109. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
Peters, Eleanor. 2018. The influence of choice feminism on women's and men's attitudes towards name changing at marriage: An analysis of online comments on UK social media. *Names* 66: 176–85. [CrossRef]
Prince Edward Island Statistics Bureau. 2015. Prince Edward Island Population Report 2015. Available online: http://www.gov.pe.ca/photos/original/pt_pop_rep.pdf (accessed on 20 June 2016).
Roberto, Karen A., and Johanna Stroes. 1992. Grandchildren and grandparents: Roles, influences, and relationships. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 34: 227–39. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
Robins, Lee N., and Miroda Tomanec. 1962. Closeness to blood relatives outside the immediate family. *Marriage and Family Living* 24: 340–46. [CrossRef]
Robnett, Rachael D., Carrie R. Underwood, Paul A. Nelson, and Kristin J. Anderson. 2016. "She Might be Afraid of Commitment": Perceptions of Women Who Retain Their Surname After Marriage. *Sex Roles* 75: 500–13. [CrossRef]
Robnett, Rachael D., Marielle Wertheimer, and Harriet R. Tenenbaum. 2018. Does a woman's marital surname choice influence perceptions of her husband? An analysis focusing on gender-typed traits and relationship power dynamics. *Sex Roles* 79: 59–71. [CrossRef]
Scheuble, Laurie K., and David R. Johnson. 1993. Marital Name Change: Plans and Attitudes of College Students. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 55: 747–54. [CrossRef]
Scheuble, Laurie K., and David R. Johnson. 2005. Married Women's Situational Use of Last Names: An Empirical Study. *Sex Rules* 53: 143–51. [CrossRef]
Scheuble, Laurie K., David R. Johnson, and Katherine M. Johnson. 2012. Marital name changing attitudes and plans of college students: Comparing change over time and across regions. *Sex Roles* 66: 282–92. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
Schneider, David M., and Calvert B. Cottrell. 1975. *The American Kin Universe: A Geneologicol Study*. The University of Chicago Studies in Anthropology Series in Social, Cultural, and Linguistic Anthropology, No.3. Chicago: Department uf Anthropology, University of Chicago.
Sear, Rebecca, Fiona Steele, Ian A. McGregor, and Ruth Mace. 2002. The effects of kin on child mortality in rural Gambia. *Demography* 39: 43–63. [CrossRef]
Sear, Rebecca, Ruth Mace, and Ian A. McGregor. 2000. Maternal grandmothers improve nutritional status and survival of children in rural Gambia. *Proceedings of the Biological Sciences* 267: 1641–47. [CrossRef]
Shackelford, Todd K., Richard L. Michalski, and David P. Schmitt. 2004. Upset in response to a child's partner's infidelities. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 34: 489–97. [CrossRef]
Silverstein, Merril, and Vern L. Bengtson. 1997. Intergenerational Solidarity and the Structure of Adult Child-Parent Relationships in American Families. *The American Journal of Sociology* 103: 429–60. [CrossRef]
Smith, Martin S. 1988. Research in Developmental Sociobiology: Parenting and Family Behavior. In *Sociobiological Perspectives on Human Development*. Edited by Kevin MacDonald. New York: Springer.
Smith, Martin S. 1991. An Evolutionary Perspective on grandparent grandchild relationships. In *The Psychology of Grandparenthood: An International Perspective*. Edited by Peter K. Smith. London: Routledge, pp. 155–75.
Smith, Martin S., Bradley J. Kish, and Charles B. Crawford. 1987. Inheritance of Wealth as Human Kin Investment. *Ethology and Sociobiology* 8: 171–82. [CrossRef]
Stafford, Laura, and Susan L. Kline. 1996. Women's Surnames and Titles: Men's and Women's Views. *Communication Research Reports* 13: 214–24. [CrossRef]
Statistics Canada. 2016. *Family Life–Marriage*. Available online: http://well-being.esdc.gc.ca/misme-iowb/.3ndic.1t.4r@-eng.jsp?iid=78 (accessed on 20 June 2016).
Stefanova, Vasilena, Ioana Latu, and Laura Taylor. 2023. What Is in a Name? Exploring Perceptions of Surname Change in Hiring Evaluations in Academia. *Social Sciences* 12: 95. [CrossRef]
Suter, Elizabeth A. 2004. Tradition Never Goes Out of Style: The Role of Tradition in Women's Naming Practices. *The Communication Review* 7: 57–87. [CrossRef]
Tach, Laura, Ronald Mincy, and Kathryn Edin. 2010. Parenting as a "package deal": Relationships, fertility, and nonresident father involvement among unmarried parents. *Demography* 47: 181–204. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
Twenge, Jean M. 1997. "Mrs. His Name" Women's Preferences for Married Names. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21: 417–29. [CrossRef]
United States Census Bureau. 2013. Race. Available online: http://www.census.gov/topics/population/race/about.html (accessed on 18 June 2016).
Van Ranst, Nancy, Karine Verschueren, and Alfons Marcoen. 1995. The meaning of grandparents as viewed by adolescent grandchildren: An empirical study in Belgium. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development* 41: 311–24. [CrossRef]
Young, Michael, and Peter Willmott. 1957. *Family and Kinship in East London*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.