

# **WORKING PAPER**

## **SELECTING NAMES FOR EXPERIMENTS ON ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION**

Stijn Baert  
Louis Lippens  
Hannah Van Borm

August 2022  
2022/1051

# Selecting names for experiments on ethnic discrimination

By Stijn Baert,<sup>i</sup> Louis Lippens<sup>ii</sup> and Hannah Van Borm<sup>iii</sup>

## Abstract

In recent decades, researchers have found compelling evidence of discrimination in the labor and housing market toward ethnic minorities based on field experiments using fictitious job applications. However, these findings may be exaggerated as the names used for ethnic minorities in various experiments may have also signaled low socioeconomic class. Therefore, in this study, we perform a name categorization experiment in the United States that yields 56 names associated with six ethnicity groups, which signal different ethnicities and genders but similar social classes. These names should greatly improve the validity of future experiments on ethnic discrimination.

**Keywords:** ethnic discrimination, social class, experiments.

**JEL-codes:** C91, C93, J71.

---

<sup>i</sup> **Corresponding author.** Ghent University, University of Antwerp, Université Catholique de Louvain, IZA and GLO. Stijn.Baert@UGent.be, 003292643481, www.stijnbaert.eu.

<sup>ii</sup> Ghent University and Vrije Universiteit Brussel.

<sup>iii</sup> Ghent University.

# 1. Introduction

In recent decades, researchers have conducted dozens of experiments to measure ethnic discrimination. This has been done through field experiments with fictitious employment or housing applications in which the name of the candidate was randomized. A recent meta-analysis by Lippens et al. (2021) of 143 hiring experiments published between 2005 and 2020 shows that, in these experiments, members of ethnic minority groups worldwide received nearly one-third fewer positive responses to their applications on average than their majority counterparts.

However, Gaddis (2017a, 2017b, 2019) argues that this evidence might be biased as the names used to signal ethnicity in experimental studies are noisy signals. Indeed, in a study in which Amazon Mechanical Turk users had to evaluate whether American names belonged to Black or White individuals, Gaddis (2017a, 2019) found that the names used in many existing experimental studies are inadequate signals for race and gender because (i) they do not signal the race or gender intended, and (ii) they also signal characteristics other than race, such as social class (i.e., Black American names were often associated with being working class or low class, while White American names were more often associated with being middle class or high class).

These studies make clear that, in the future, ethnic discrimination experiments based on the randomization of names should better check the names used for any signals other than ethnicity that they may convey. Gaddis' (2017a, 2019) research is useful in this regard because it produces 'White' and 'Black' names that suggest the same social class. In this study, we run a complementary name experiment that broadens this toolbox in two ways. First, we identify valid names for six ethnic groups: White, Black, Hispanic, Arab, Asian and German Americans.<sup>1</sup> Second, for each group, we distinguish between Anglo-sounding and 'ethnic'-sounding first names.

---

<sup>1</sup> Black Americans and Hispanic Americans are the two largest race–ethnicity minority groups in the U.S., while German Americans are the largest European immigrant group. The number of immigrants from Asia and Middle Eastern and North African (MENA) countries has notably increased over the years (Migration Policy Institute, 2021).

## 2. Methods

The experiment consisted of a simple name categorization task run on Prolific Academic with 190 American users. Prolific Academic is an online crowdsourcing platform where researchers can recruit participants to perform tasks in exchange for financial compensation (Palan & Schitter, 2018). Prolific is particularly attractive because it was specifically designed for researchers and has proven especially suitable for experiments in the social and economic sciences (Palan & Schitter, 2018; Peer et al., 2017). Moreover, Prolific appears superior to other platforms, such as the widely used Amazon Mechanical Turk platform, in terms of data quality (Peer et al., 2017; Peer et al., 2021).

Before running the experiment, we selected 192 potential combinations of first and last names; that is, we selected 16 combinations for each of the 12 gender–ethnicity groups. The first names varied between being Anglo-sounding (e.g., Susan) and ethnic-sounding (e.g., Mei).

We first built a database with potentially suitable first names based on a systematic reading of the existing experimental literature on ethnic discrimination in hiring and housing and a thorough internet search for popular male and female first names within each of the six ethnicity groups.<sup>2</sup> From this database, we chose first names that met two predefined criteria. First, they had to be common for people belonging to the target gender–ethnicity group. We used the website MyNameStats.com to confirm this. The website provides, among other statistics, an approximation of the percentage of people in the United States with a specific first name who belong to a particular ethnic group.<sup>3</sup> Second, the names had to be popular between 1985 and 1990 to control for possible age signals. To this end, we ran all potential names through the official USA Social Security Administration database,

---

<sup>2</sup> Because few researchers have investigated the hiring chances of Asian, Arab or German American job applicants, few studies were available as sources of names. To address this lack, we also searched the internet for websites with popular male and female first names within different race–ethnicity minority groups. These websites included Names.org and Germannames.de.

<sup>3</sup> For example, MyNameStats.com reports that about 67% of people with the first name ‘Maria’ are Hispanic. Equivalent information was not available for Arab and German names. However, the website also indicates the etymology of names, and only names that the website categorized as ‘German’ or ‘Arabic’ were considered for this portion of the name experiment.

which records the number of people with a particular first name in a given year or decade and ranks these names by popularity (Social Security Association, 2021). Only names that were among the top 1,000 most popular names were considered for our experiment. In total, we selected 192 first names that met these two criteria (i.e., 16 for each of the 12 gender–ethnicity groups). We ensured that half of the selected first names were Anglo-sounding (e.g., Susan) and the other half were ethnic-sounding (e.g., Mei).

After selecting the first names, we needed 192 last names to pair with them. We used the 2010 U.S. Census database on frequently occurring surnames as a starting point (U.S. Census Bureau, 2021). The U.S. Census database provides an overview of the number of people with a particular last name in the United States by year and ranks these names by the frequency with which they occur. Moreover, the database provides information on the percentage of people belonging to a particular ethnicity group who carry a specific last name. Again, we defined two criteria that the last names had to meet. First, they had to be common in the United States (i.e., have a high rate of occurrence). Second, they had to be common among people belonging to the intended ethnicity group. For each of the different ethnicity groups, we selected the last names that were most commonly carried by that group and high-frequency in the 2010 census.<sup>4</sup> Within ethnicity groups, we then paired the 192 last names with the selected first names.

In the experiment, we randomly assigned 25 out of the 192 possible name combinations to each of the 190 participants, resulting in a sample of 4,750 name evaluations (i.e.,  $190 \times 25$ ). Participants then had to sort these combinations of first and last names into various categories: (i) gender (male or female), (ii) ethnicity<sup>5</sup> (White American, Black American, Hispanic or Latino American, Arab American, Asian American, German American or none of the above), (iii) social class (low class, working class, middle class or high class), (iv) immigrant generation (first-generation or foreign-born, second-generation or having at least one foreign-born parent, or third-or-higher generation or not an immigrant), (v) religious affiliation (Christian, Jewish, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, atheist or none in particular) and

---

<sup>4</sup> For example, about 92% of the people with the last name ‘Garcia’ are Hispanic. Moreover, the last name ‘Garcia’ is ranked number 6, which indicates that it is one of the most common last names in the United States (rank 1 coincides with the most common last name).

<sup>5</sup> We are aware that ‘race–ethnicity’ would have been a more appropriate label.

commonness (sounding common or uncommon). Participants could indicate only one option in each category for each name.

### **3. Results**

Results of the name categorization experiment are displayed in Appendix Table A-2. Specifically, this table shows the percentages of participants who rated the 192 names as (i) the correct gender, (ii) the correct ethnicity, (iii) working or middle class, (iv) not being associated with foreign-born or first-generation migrant status, (v) being associated with Christianity, atheism or no particular religion and (vi) common.

Originally, we intended to select names that scored highly on each of these six facets. This proved impossible because, out of 32 Arabic names, only two were considered to be associated with Christianity, atheism or no particular religion by more than half of the respondents (due to high scores for Islam), which raised questions about their representativeness. This problem also occurred with Asian names using ethnic-sounding first names due to high scores for Buddhism; these names were also considered uncommon names by more than half of the participants. The latter is apparent in the correlation table in Appendix Table A-2. The more a name is perceived as being Asian or Arab, the less it is perceived as being associated with Christianity, atheism or no particular religion.

Because of these findings, we decided, as indicated in Section 1, to focus on the selection of names signaling the intended gender and ethnicity as well as middle or working class membership. The—albeit limited—correlation between the degree to which the names of ethnic minorities were correctly assigned to their race–ethnicity group and perceived social class further underlines the relevance of our exercise. Distinctly White American and Hispanic names were less likely to be assigned to the working and middle classes, while distinctly Black American and Asian male names were more likely to be assigned to these classes.

More concretely, we standardized the fractions of participants who (i) correctly assessed the name’s ethnicity and (ii) evaluated it as working or middle class within each group

according to gender, ethnicity and Anglo-sounding versus ethnic-sounding first names after which we added up both standardized values.<sup>6</sup> We then selected the names with the highest sums.

<Table 1 about here.>

The results of our analysis are presented in Table 1. More concretely, we selected 16 White American names (eight for women and eight for men) and 40 ethnic minority names (four per gender–ethnicity group, with two each with an Anglo-sounding first name and two with an ethnic-sounding first name).

## 4. Conclusion

We performed a name categorization experiment in the United States that yielded 56 names for various ethnicity groups, which signal different ethnicities and genders but similar social classes. We complemented earlier research by (i) testing names corresponding to six distinct ethnicity groups instead of considering only White, Black or Hispanic names and (ii) identifying names with ethnic-sounding first names as well as names with Anglo-sounding first names. Our analyses indicate that there is a correlation between the degree to which a particular ethnicity is distinctly perceived and other socioeconomic perceptions. Our study reconfirms, therefore, that scholars should be very careful when selecting job and housing applicants' names as signals for gender and ethnicity because they could also signal other attributes. For this reason, we urge researchers to use and further validate the names provided in this study in their experiments or conduct additional name categorizing experiments when conducting future experimental research on ethnic discrimination.

---

<sup>6</sup> That is, we reduced these percentages by the average value within their group and divided the result by the group standard deviation.

## References

Gaddis, S. M. (2017a). How black are Lakisha and Jamal? Racial perceptions from names used in correspondence audit studies. *Sociological Science*, 4, 469–489.

Gaddis, S. M. (2017b). Racial/ethnic perceptions from Hispanic names: Selecting names to test for discrimination. *Socius*, 3, 2378023117737193.

Gaddis, S. M. (2019). Signaling class: An experiment examining social class perceptions from names used in correspondence audit studies. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 3350739.

Lippens, L., Vermeiren, S., & Baert, S. (2021). The state of hiring discrimination: A meta-analysis of (almost) all recent correspondence experiments. *IZA Discussion Paper Series*, 14966.

Migration Policy Institute (2021). Countries of Birth for U.S. Immigrants, 1960–Present. Retrieved from: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/data-hub/charts/immigrants-countries-birth-over-time>

Palan, S. & Schitter, C. (2018). Prolific. ac—A subject pool for online experiments. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, 17, 22–27.

Peer, E., Brandimarte, L., Samat, S., & Acquisti, A. (2017). Beyond the Turk: Alternative platforms for crowdsourcing behavioral research. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 70, 153–163.

Social Security Administration (2021). Popular Baby Names. Retrieved from: <https://www.ssa.gov/OACT/babynames/>

U.S. Census Bureau (2021). Frequently Occurring Surnames from the 2010 Census. Retrieved from: [https://www.census.gov/topics/population/genealogy/data/2010\\_surnames.html](https://www.census.gov/topics/population/genealogy/data/2010_surnames.html)



Table 1. Names signaling intended gender and ethnicity as well as being middle or working class

Associated ethnicity of names	Associated gender of names	
	Female	Male
White American names	Sharon Wood	Gregory Roberts
	Molly Rose	Matthew Owen
	Katie Burns	Neil Morrison
	Megan Stone	Chad Nichols
	Cara O'Connor	Paul Bennett
	Allison Baker	Peter Hughes
	Brooke Bishop	Brad Richards
	Meredith Rogers	Jeffrey Cox
Black American with an Anglo-sounding first name	Natasha Diggs	Marcus McCray
	Monique Rivers	Andre Mosley
Black American with an ethnic-sounding first name	Tyra Cooks	Jermaine Jackson
	Tamika Battle	Darius Mosby
Hispanic names with an Anglo-sounding first name	Vanessa Rodriguez	Jesse Ortiz
	Laura Ramirez	Adrian Ramos
Hispanic names with an ethnic-sounding first name	Maria Garcia	Miguel Fernandez and
	Alejandra Rivera	Alejandro Vasquez
Asian names with an Anglo-sounding first name	Susan Wong	Harry Wu
	Vivian Cheng	David Kobayashi
Asian names with an ethnic-sounding first name	Suni Tran	Pheng Chan
	Meiling Huang	Fong Chang
Arab names with an Anglo-sounding first name	Diana Shadid	Adam Salah
	Sara Alharbi	Sam Hamad
Arab names with an ethnic-sounding first name	Samira Mohammed	Abdullah Malik
	Amira Fouad	Hassan Alsheikh
German names with an Anglo-sounding first name	Erika Schmidt	Kristopher Weiss
	Veronica Klein	Ralph Schumacher
German names with an ethnic-sounding first name	Heidi Schultz	Hans Schubert
	Martha Krueger	Kurt Schroeder

## Appendix A

Table A-1. Results of the name categorization experiment

Name	Evaluated as...						Selected
	Intended gender	Intended ethnicity	Working or middle class	Not being a first-generation migrant	Being Christian, atheist or having no particular religion	Common name	
<b>A. Names intended to be seen as belonging to White American women</b>							
Sarah Miller	91.7%	83.3%	87.5%	91.7%	100.0%	84.6%	
Kristen Pierce	96.2%	88.5%	88.5%	96.2%	88.0%	76.9%	
Sharon Wood	92.3%	88.5%	92.3%	92.3%	96.0%	70.8%	Yes
Molly Rose	100.0%	100.0%	81.5%	100.0%	96.3%	76.7%	Yes
Kate Murphy	100.0%	87.5%	75.0%	95.8%	100.0%	84.2%	
Emily Hart	100%	88.9%	88.9%	96.3%	100.0%	85.6%	
Katie Burns	96.3%	96.3%	85.2%	100.0%	95.8%	84.4%	Yes
Caitlin Fox	96.0%	88.0%	84.0%	100.0%	96.2%	75.2%	
Karen Stevens	92.6%	88.9%	81.5%	100.0%	96.2%	83.7%	
Megan Stone	100.0%	87.5%	91.7%	100.0%	96.2%	83.3%	Yes
Lauren Reynolds	96.0%	88.0%	80.0%	96.0%	96.3%	80.8%	
Cara O'Connor	96.0%	100.0%	88.0%	100.0%	96.4%	68.0%	Yes
Heather Mills	95.8%	95.8%	79.2%	95.8%	96.3%	78.7%	
Allison Baker	96.2%	92.3%	96.2%	100.0%	92.6%	86.1%	Yes
Brooke Bishop	96.2%	88.5%	92.3%	100.0%	96.3%	74.6%	Yes
Meredith Rogers	100.0%	96.2%	80.8%	96.2%	88.5%	71.5%	Yes
<b>B. Names intended to be seen as belonging to White American men</b>							
Gregory Roberts	100.0%	96.0%	84.0%	100.0%	100.0%	77.2%	Yes
Scott Sullivan	100.0%	92.6%	81.5%	92.6%	96.4%	75.9%	
Matthew Owen	100.0%	88.5%	92.3%	100.0%	96.3%	85.0%	Yes
Neil Morrison	100.0%	87.0%	95.7%	100.0%	88.5%	70.0%	Yes
Thomas Kennedy	100.0%	96.2%	61.5%	100.0%	85.2%	87.7%	
Luke Kelly	100.0%	96.0%	76.0%	96.0%	96.3%	72.8%	
Chad Nichols	100.0%	91.3%	87.0%	95.7%	100.0%	73.0%	Yes
Jake Ryan	92.0%	96.0%	76.0%	100.0%	103.0%	92.0%	
Seth O'Brien	100.0%	80.8%	80.8%	100.0%	83.3%	71.9%	
William Dunn	100.0%	92.3%	73.1%	100.0%	100.0%	82.3%	
Paul Bennett	100.0%	96.0%	96.0%	100.0%	96.2%	76.0%	Yes
Steven Russell	100.0%	87.0%	91.3%	100.0%	85.7%	76.1%	
Peter Hughes	100.0%	100.0%	80.0%	100.0%	95.8%	84.0%	Yes
Gary Walsh	100.0%	96.2%	76.9%	88.5%	91.7%	71.9%	
Brad Richards	96.2%	96.2%	76.9%	100.0%	100.0%	87.7%	Yes
Jeffrey Cox	100.0%	96.0%	96.0%	92.0%	92.9%	84.4%	Yes
<b>C. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Black American women</b>							
<b>C.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name</b>							
Natasha Diggs	100.0%	65.2%	95.7%	95.7%	91.9%	59.6%	Yes
Madison Bolden	95.8%	0.0%	95.8%	95.8%	100.0%	68.7%	
Ava Smalls	92.0%	12.0%	88.0%	92.0%	85.2%	72.0%	
Courtney Bowens	100.0%	22.7%	81.8%	100.0%	96.2%	81.4%	
Michelle Jefferson	91.7%	37.5%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	81.7%	
Kiara Charles	92.6%	51.9%	85.2%	100.0%	92.0%	60.7%	
Brenda Alston	100.0%	11.5%	92.3%	96.2%	88.5%	69.6%	
Monique Rivers	88.0%	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	88.9%	64.4%	Yes
<b>C.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name</b>							
Janae Washington	95.8%	83.3%	91.7%	100.0%	92.9%	56.2%	
Jalisa Mack	95.8%	54.2%	87.5%	100.0%	80.8%	39.2%	

Jada Chatman	85.2%	33.3%	92.6%	96.3%	85.2%	48.9%	
Tyra Cooks	100.0%	84.6%	92.3%	96.2%	100.0%	67.3%	Yes
Savannah Booker	96.2%	42.3%	92.3%	96.2%	92.0%	72.3%	
Tamika Battle	88.5%	76.9%	100.0%	96.2%	100.0%	54.2%	Yes
Symone Joseph	83.3%	58.3%	95.8%	91.7%	81.5%	47.1%	
Keisha Towns	92.6%	85.2%	88.9%	96.3%	91.9%	60.7%	

**D. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Black American men**

**D.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name**

Trevor Dorsey	100.0%	41.7%	95.8%	100.0%	94.3%	72.5%	
Curtis Cobbs	100.0%	24.0%	88.0%	96.0%	100.0%	67.2%	
Charles Williams	100.0%	12.5%	83.3%	100.0%	92.0%	92.1%	
James Samuels	100.0%	46.2%	84.6%	96.2%	96.2%	79.2%	
Samuel Banks	100.0%	30.8%	65.4%	96.2%	82.1%	80.4%	
Marcus McCray	100.0%	46.2%	96.2%	100.0%	96.2%	70.4%	Yes
Miles Winston	96.2%	42.3%	80.8%	100.0%	91.7%	63.1%	
Andre Mosley	100.0%	54.2%	87.5%	95.8%	93.7%	65.1%	Yes

**D.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name**

Denzel Gaines	100.0%	87.5%	87.5%	95.8%	96.0%	53.7%	
Corey Myles	96.0%	12.0%	92.0%	100.0%	96.3%	69.2%	
Darius Drayton	100.0%	74.1%	85.2%	92.6%	94.3%	50.0%	
Terell Mosby	96.3%	63.0%	85.2%	96.3%	94.3%	47.8%	
Darnell Dawkins	100.0%	72.0%	92.0%	96.0%	88.9%	59.2%	
Jermaine Jackson	85.2%	88.9%	92.6%	96.3%	100.0%	67.4%	Yes
Darius Mosby	96.3%	81.5%	100.0%	96.3%	92.6%	44.8%	Yes
Terell Edmond	100.0%	69.6%	87.0%	95.7%	91.3%	48.7%	

**E. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Hispanic women**

**E.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name**

Abigail Castillo	92.6%	77.8%	100.0%	92.6%	95.8%	56.3%	
Vanessa Rodriguez	96.2%	96.2%	100.0%	100.0%	96.3%	71.1%	Yes
Laura Ramirez	100.0%	91.7%	100.0%	95.8%	96.0%	71.7%	Yes
Eva Mendoza	100.0%	88.0%	92.0%	100.0%	96.3%	62.8%	
Alexis Perez	75.0%	87.5%	91.7%	100.0%	96.2%	64.6%	
Victoria Diaz	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	96.3%	100.0%	72.6%	
Olivia Torres	88.9%	77.8%	100.0%	100.0%	96.3%	64.8%	
Alicia Sanchez	100.0%	92.3%	92.3%	96.2%	88.0%	65.8%	

**E.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name**

Maria Garcia	96.3%	96.3%	88.9%	96.3%	92.0%	82.2%	Yes
Gabriela Lopez	100.0%	92.3%	84.6%	92.3%	100.0%	72.7%	
Raquel Jimenez	32.0%	84.0%	76.0%	84.0%	88.5%	48.4%	
Alejandra Rivera	83.3%	100.0%	83.3%	79.2%	92.6%	52.1%	Yes
Sofia Aguilar	100.0%	80.0%	92.0%	92.0%	92.0%	56.4%	
Luisa Gomez	100.0%	95.8%	70.8%	70.8%	92.6%	55.8%	
Marisol Cruz	89.3%	92.9%	92.9%	89.3%	100.0%	50.4%	
Rosa Martinez	95.8%	87.5%	100.0%	87.5%	96.1%	57.9%	

**F. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Hispanic men**

**F.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name**

Daniel Morales	96.4%	75.0%	85.7%	100.0%	92.6%	73.9%	
Christian Hernandez	100.0%	92.3%	88.5%	92.3%	100.0%	70.0%	
Jesse Ortiz	79.2%	87.5%	100.0%	100.0%	92.0%	69.6%	Yes
Joe Alvarez	100.0%	91.3%	82.6%	100.0%	88.5%	62.2%	
Alex Chavez	83.3%	83.3%	87.5%	100.0%	96.4%	64.6%	
Adrian Ramos	90.9%	90.9%	100.0%	86.4%	80.0%	54.5%	Yes
Lucas Ruiz	100.0%	88.5%	92.3%	96.2%	87.5%	52.7%	
Joel Flores	88.5%	76.9%	96.2%	76.9%	89.3%	67.7%	

**F.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name**

Hector Silva	96.0%	80.0%	100.0%	96.0%	84.6%	59.2%	
Miguel Fernandez	100.0%	100.0%	95.8%	91.7%	100.0%	67.1%	Yes
José Gonzalez	95.7%	95.7%	82.6%	56.5%	96.3%	71.7%	
Alejandro Vasquez	88.9%	92.6%	96.3%	77.8%	92.6%	56.7%	Yes
Rodrigo Romero	95.8%	91.7%	87.5%	87.5%	92.6%	47.5%	

Pedro Moreno	96.2%	96.2%	84.6%	69.2%	92.3%	55.0%	
Juan Herrera	100.0%	100.0%	87.5%	66.7%	92.3%	62.1%	
Luis Reyes	96.4%	82.1%	92.9%	92.9%	92.9%	63.2%	

### G. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Asian women

#### G.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name

Susan Wong	96.2%	92.3%	96.2%	88.5%	57.1%	75.0%	Yes
Vivian Cheng	96.2%	96.2%	92.3%	92.3%	46.2%	57.7%	Yes
Christina Wang	100.0%	96.2%	84.6%	96.2%	40.0%	72.7%	
Grace Li	100.0%	96.2%	76.9%	100.0%	29.2%	66.1%	
Alice Watanabe	95.5%	68.2%	90.9%	90.9%	73.1%	56.4%	
Jennifer Matsumoto	96.0%	88.0%	96.0%	96.0%	64.0%	50.0%	
Chloe Kimura	92.6%	74.1%	81.5%	96.3%	64.3%	53.3%	
Amy Saito	90.9%	72.7%	95.5%	95.5%	59.3%	62.3%	

#### G.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name

Mei Lin	96.0%	96.0%	92.0%	56.0%	24.0%	36.8%	
Suni Tran	88.0%	96.0%	100.0%	84.0%	36.0%	32.0%	Yes
Meiling Huang	89.3%	100.0%	92.9%	50.0%	23.1%	31.1%	Yes
Xia Zhang	80.0%	96.0%	100.0%	52.0%	16.0%	25.2%	
Kimiko Takahashi	76.0%	92.0%	88.0%	64.0%	44.4%	26.4%	
Sakura Nakamura	80.0%	88.0%	80.0%	44.0%	38.5%	26.0%	
Yumi Oshiro	92.3%	96.2%	96.2%	53.9%	28.0%	29.6%	
Misa Yamamoto	96.3%	92.6%	74.1%	66.7%	29.6%	24.8%	

### H. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Asian men

#### H.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name

Jason Nguyen	100.0%	84.0%	92.0%	96.0%	36.0%	64.0%	
Harry Wu	95.8%	91.7%	91.7%	100.0%	33.3%	67.1%	Yes
Henry Kim	96.0%	84.0%	88.0%	100.0%	63.0%	68.0%	
George Yang	100.0%	96.0%	84.0%	92.0%	63.0%	74.0%	
David Kobayashi	100.0%	84.6%	96.2%	100.0%	48.2%	50.0%	Yes
Eric Hayashi	100.0%	83.3%	91.7%	100.0%	38.5%	44.2%	
Andrew Tanaka	95.8%	79.2%	90.5%	95.8%	46.2%	63.7%	
Simon Sato	96.0%	52.0%	76.0%	100.0%	50.0%	49.6%	

#### H.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name

Chong Liu	71.4%	100.0%	92.9%	57.1%	30.8%	34.3%	
Xiong Pham	75.0%	96.4%	89.3%	42.9%	28.0%	23.2%	
Pheng Chan	85.2%	100.0%	100.0%	51.9%	40.7%	27.4%	Yes
Fong Chang	76.9%	100.0%	96.2%	46.2%	34.7%	35.0%	Yes
Matoko Suzuki	76.0%	96.0%	84.0%	40.0%	29.2%	20.0%	
Hiroki Ito	81.5%	96.3%	81.5%	33.3%	40.0%	45.6%	
Neiko Sasaki	45.8%	79.2%	95.8%	70.8%	32.1%	30.8%	
Kenji Yoshida	92.6%	85.2%	96.3%	63.0%	48.0%	33.3%	

### I. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Arab women

#### I.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name

Dina Bashir	96.0%	72.0%	92.0%	92.0%	26.9%	41.2%	
Nora Ahmad	100.0%	88.9%	85.2%	100.0%	14.8%	40.0%	
Hannah Alzahrani	100.0%	88.5%	88.5%	96.2%	24.0%	55.4%	
Amber Hashim	92.0%	68.0%	84.0%	92.0%	7.4%	56.4%	
Nina Mansour	95.8%	29.2%	83.3%	95.8%	74.1%	45.8%	
Diana Shadid	100.0%	92.6%	96.3%	92.6%	30.8%	48.5%	Yes
Jenna Hussain	95.8%	66.7%	83.3%	95.8%	29.6%	42.5%	
Sara Alharbi	91.7%	83.3%	95.8%	95.8%	22.2%	50.0%	Yes

#### I.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name

Leila Kahn	95.8%	25.0%	95.8%	100.0%	56.0%	48.7%	
Nadia Khalil	92.6%	59.3%	92.6%	96.3%	7.7%	45.6%	
Fatima Siddiqui	92.9%	71.4%	89.3%	71.4%	7.7%	26.4%	
Samira Mohammed	100.0%	84.0%	96.0%	88.0%	8.0%	39.6%	Yes
Farrak Kumar	73.1%	73.1%	80.8%	76.9%	10.7%	30.4%	
Amira Fouad	96.2%	73.1%	96.2%	88.5%	19.2%	28.8%	Yes
Maryam Alamri	100.0%	76.9%	84.6%	92.3%	11.5%	35.8%	
Zahra Hassan	92.0%	80.0%	92.0%	72.0%	23.4%	32.4%	

<b>J. Names intended to be seen as belonging to Arab men</b>							
<b>J.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name</b>							
Michael Abdullah	95.7%	78.3%	95.7%	87.0%	14.8%	47.0%	
John Khalifa	100.0%	40.7%	81.5%	100.0%	55.6%	58.1%	
Adam Salah	100.0%	80.8%	100.0%	100.0%	22.2%	47.7%	Yes
Sam Hamad	100.0%	81.8%	100.0%	95.5%	7.7%	51.8%	Yes
Harris Alghamdi	100.0%	82.6%	91.3%	78.3%	24.0%	34.3%	
Aiden Mustafa	100.0%	64.0%	92.0%	92.0%	11.5%	43.2%	
Zane Shaikh	88.9%	70.4%	96.3%	96.3%	26.9%	38.5%	
Elias Abdulmalik	92.3%	80.8%	84.6%	92.3%	14.8%	36.9%	
<b>J.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name</b>							
Abdullah Malik	96.3%	100.0%	100.0%	66.7%	11.1%	41.1%	Yes
Ahmad Hakim	96.0%	96.0%	84.0%	72.0%	8.0%	38.8%	
Amir Yousef	92.0%	84.0%	88.0%	68.0%	0.0%	34.0%	
Hamza Soliman	83.3%	91.7%	79.2%	58.3%	23.1%	20.0%	
Hassan Alsheikh	100.0%	100.0%	92.0%	68.0%	7.7%	35.6%	Yes
Ibrahim Mousa	100.0%	82.6%	78.3%	69.6%	3.7%	34.3%	
Khalid Naimi	96.0%	80.0%	96.0%	60.0%	3.7%	28.4%	
Yusuf Mahmood	95.8%	100.0%	91.7%	70.8%	3.9%	28.7%	
<b>K. Names intended to be seen as belonging to German women</b>							
<b>K.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name</b>							
Jessica Schneider	88.9%	33.3%	70.4%	100.0%	68.0%	73.7%	
Amanda Ziegler	95.5%	50.0%	77.3%	100.0%	73.9%	60.4%	
Erika Schmidt	100.0%	37.5%	91.7%	91.7%	77.8%	75.0%	Yes
Alexandra Grossman	96.2%	19.2%	92.3%	96.2%	61.5%	68.8%	
Anna Weber	95.7%	17.4%	87.0%	91.3%	88.9%	80.0%	
Monica Fuchs	92.3%	34.6%	88.5%	100.0%	78.6%	58.1%	
Leah Schwartz	95.7%	43.5%	73.9%	100.0%	44.4%	65.2%	
Veronica Klein	100.0%	46.2%	88.5%	96.2%	77.8%	62.3%	Yes
<b>K.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name</b>							
Andrea Mueller	88.9%	25.9%	92.6%	100.0%	85.2%	64.8%	
Angela Neumann	92.0%	24.0%	80.0%	96.0%	80.0%	68.4%	
Claudia Meyer	100.0%	4.0%	72.0%	100.0%	61.5%	72.0%	
Heidi Schultz	95.7%	60.9%	87.0%	95.7%	59.3%	57.0%	Yes
Lydia Braun	96.0%	24.0%	88.0%	100.0%	76.0%	59.6%	
Martha Krueger	92.9%	60.7%	85.7%	100.0%	76.0%	55.4%	Yes
Johanna Baumann	92.0%	40.0%	88.0%	92.0%	88.5%	51.6%	
Esther Schwab	84.6%	23.1%	69.2%	92.3%	40.7%	41.9%	
<b>L. Names intended to be seen as belonging to German men</b>							
<b>L.1. With an Anglo-sounding first name</b>							
Kristopher Weiss	100.0%	56.0%	80.0%	88.0%	75.0%	56.8%	Yes
Joseph Bauer	100.0%	20.0%	92.0%	100.0%	68.0%	71.6%	
Alexander Lehmann	100.0%	29.2%	75.0%	91.7%	67.9%	56.7%	
Aaron Zimmermann	96.3%	22.2%	92.6%	96.3%	66.7%	67.0%	
Frederick Bergman	100.0%	52.0%	80.0%	96.0%	70.4%	57.2%	
Ralph Schumacher	100.0%	50.0%	88.5%	96.2%	50.0%	56.5%	Yes
Walter Weissman	100.0%	37.0%	81.5%	96.3%	45.8%	69.6%	
Frank Berger	95.8%	33.3%	83.3%	95.9%	67.9%	59.6%	
<b>L.2. With an ethnic-sounding first name</b>							
Karl Weber	100.0%	32.0%	96.0%	92.0%	88.9%	63.2%	
Hans Schubert	100.0%	83.3%	91.7%	58.3%	73.9%	30.8%	Yes
Jakob Fischer	100.0%	41.7%	91.7%	83.3%	42.3%	56.2%	
Stefan Schreiber	100.0%	56.5%	87.0%	82.6%	66.7%	47.0%	
Kurt Schroeder	95.7%	47.8%	100.0%	91.3%	91.7%	56.1%	Yes
Arnold Eisenberg	100.0%	30.8%	73.1%	92.3%	34.6%	56.1%	
August Wagner	80.0%	28.0%	88.0%	92.0%	85.7%	50.4%	
Herman Koch	100.0%	51.9%	88.9%	88.9%	64.3%	40.0%	

Table A-2. Correlation between perceived ethnicity and other factors

Group of names: intended to be seen as...	Correlation between evaluated as intended ethnicity and evaluated as...			
	Working or middle class	Not being a first- generation migrant	Being Christian, atheist or having no particular religion	Common name
White American women	-0.175	0.433	-0.282	-0.412
White American men	-0.318	-0.225	<b>0.533</b>	0.451
Black American women	0.309	0.251	0.067	-0.422
Black American men	0.327	<b>-0.596</b>	0.142	<b>-0.716</b>
Hispanic women	-0.336	-0.316	-0.017	0.240
Hispanic men	-0.222	-0.480	0.329	-0.246
Asian women	0.138	-0.405	<b>-0.805</b>	-0.284
Asian men	0.427	<b>-0.623</b>	-0.323	-0.292
Arab women	0.102	-0.191	<b>-0.703</b>	-0.095
Arab men	0.144	<b>-0.658</b>	<b>-0.689</b>	<b>-0.558</b>
German women	0.093	0.042	-0.116	<b>-0.616</b>
German men	0.085	<b>-0.790</b>	0.099	<b>-0.787</b>

Note: correlation coefficients above 0.500 are in bold.