

# **Women's (No) Naming Right under the Shadow of Patronymy: Changes in the Public Attitudes in Taiwan between 2002 and 2012\***

**Chao-ju Chen\*\* , Yen-wen Peng\*\*\*,  
Chin-fen Chang\*\*\*\***

---

**ABSTRACT**

---

Patronymy is the norm by which children's surnames are based on their fathers' surnames; and/or wives' surnames are to follow their husbands'. Taiwan is one of the countries where the practice of patro-

---

\* The three authors contributed equally to the paper. We deeply appreciate the comments and suggestions from the anonymous reviewers and the editorial board. The TSCS data were collected with funding from the Ministry of Science and Technology (NSC 100-2420-H-001-002-SS2). An earlier version of the paper was presented at the 18th ISA World Congress of Sociology on "Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for Global Sociology" (RC-06 and TG-03: Human Rights, Family Roles and Social Justice) held in Yokohama, Japan on July 13-19, 2014. We appreciate the feedbacks from the audience. The authors also wish to thank Yi-ping Chang for research assistance.

\*\* Professor, College of Law, National Taiwan University

\*\*\* Associate Professor, Institute of Public Affairs Management, National Sun Yat-sen University

\*\*\*\* Research Fellow, Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica

nymy prevails. Before 2007, it was legally required that children assume the father's surname, albeit with some exceptions. In 2007, the legislature passed a milestone amendment of family law that permits parents to decide the surname of the child through mutual agreement, but governmental statistics show that on average only 1.7% of all newborns in the past 9 years took their mother's surname. Whether people in Taiwan are indeed overwhelmingly dominated by patronymic thinking despite the legal amendment, or there is a disjuncture between people's attitudes and behavior on nontraditional surnaming as revealed by existing literature, is the main question that we want to probe.

Drawing on data from the 2002 and 2012 Taiwan Social Change Survey, we analyze people's attitudes a decade apart, and the factors that influenced and differentiated people's attitudes. Based on binomial logistic analysis of the two surveys, we find significant impacts of demographic and socio-economic status on the naming practices in the family. While in general Taiwanese endorsement of patronymy declined after the law passed, men are significantly more likely to support patronymic naming than are women. Respondents with higher education and upper non-manual workers seem to be more flexible in bestowing children's last names. We also confirm that when people support gender equality and when women are better educated, families are more likely to accept the taking of mothers' surnames. To change the practice of patronymic surnaming, therefore, we suggest a more radical legal reform approach accompanying continuous feminist activism to empower women and change men's gender ideology, and to encourage the decision to give children the mother's surname.

**Keywords:** patronymy, matronymic naming, gender and family, legal reform, Taiwan Social Change Survey

## 父權陰影下的子女姓氏決定： 比較台灣民眾在 2002 到 2012 年間的態度轉變\*

陳昭如\* 彭滄雯\*\* 張晉芬\*\*\*

### 摘要

父／夫姓常規是指子女應從父姓、妻子應改為夫姓或冠夫姓。在台灣，除了少數法定例外，子女依法須從父姓。歷經多年婦女運動的努力，〈民法〉2007 年廢除子女應從父姓的規定，改由父母自行約定。官方數據顯示，新法實施九年以來，所有新生兒中只有 1.7% 從母姓。台灣人民的態度真與新法大相逕庭、如此支持父姓常規嗎？本文分析 2002 和 2012 年「台灣社會變遷基本調查」資料，以瞭解台灣人對於從父姓或母姓的態度變化及影響態度的因素。二元邏輯迴歸分析結果顯示，父權意識形態與社經地位對於子女從姓態度有顯著影響。儘管民眾對父姓常規的支持度明顯下降，男性仍較支持子女從父姓；教育程度較高者、白領階級、較具性別平權意識者、母親社經地位較高者對從母姓較為認同或開放。但男性社經地位並無影響。因此若要改變父姓常規並縮減態度與實踐上的落差，似乎需採行更基進的法律來回應夫妻協商立足點的不平等，並持續推動女性主義運動以培力女性地位，並提高男性對性別平等的支持。

關鍵詞：父權、從母姓、性別與家庭、法律改革、台灣社會變遷基本調查

---

\* 國立台灣大學法律學系教授。

\*\* 國立中山大學公共事務管理研究所副教授。

\*\*\* 中央研究院社會學研究所研究員。

## Introduction

Naming is personal, but the personal may also be political. The meanings of names are multiple; they are markers of gender, family, privilege, religion, ethnicity, and nationalism (Augustine-Adams 1997: 17-32). As a signifier of the patrilineal family system, patronymy is the norm by which children's surnames are based on their fathers' surnames; and/or wives' surnames are to follow their husbands' (Lebell 1988; Herring 2013). Patronymy asserts men's status as head of household, and is part of the cultural, social and legal mechanism of patriarchy which conveys the notion that "males are more important and therefore superior to females, more deserving, better in every way" (Lebell 1988: 9). Through a systematic suppression of the maternal line, it may also result in "genealogical amnesia," and only paternal relatives are remembered as critical to one's family identity and ancestral heritage.

Practiced in different ways, the patronymic naming system remains dominant in many, if not all, societies. In the United States, the majority of married women change their surname after marriage (Brightman 1994; Twenge 1997; Goldin and Shim 2004; Hoffnung 2006; Gooding and Kreider 2009) and the majority of children share surnames only with fathers (Johnson and Scheuble 2002). Even in Norway, a country highly recognized for its achievement in promoting gender equality, only 20% of married women keep their birth name after marriage (Noack and Wiik 2008). In Korea, most women keep their names after marriage but children are named after their fathers (Yang 2013). In Japan, where a family name system is adopted, the overwhelming majority of families use the husband and father's

surname as their family name (Carroll 2006: 116), and a majority of people continue to follow the custom of passing on the paternal family name as if it were a virtue (Tanaka 2012).

Taiwan is one of these countries where the practice of patronymic surnaming prevails. Although most women retain their birth surnames after marriage—only 10.1% of all women prefix the husband's surname (Ministry of the Interior 2016a: 190, calculated by the authors),<sup>1</sup> the 2016 census shows that 95.5% of all newborns and 97.1% of the whole population are given the father's surname (Ministry of the Interior 2016a: 204, 216, calculated by the authors). It would, however, be over-simplified and misleading to consider this tradition a purely cultural and social one. Before the legal change in 2007, it was legally required that children assume the father's surname, albeit with some exceptions. In 2007, the legislature passed an amendment of family law that permits parents to decide the surname of the child through mutual agreement. There were no official statistics about children's surname patterns before May 2007, but after the change of law, the government began to publish statistics on children's surnaming annually, which revealed that there was slow but steady growth in terms of newborns taking the mother's surname through parents' mutual agreement, from 1.3% in 2007 to 1.9%<sup>2</sup> in 2015 (Ministry of Interior 2016a: 206–217, calculated by the

---

1 The number of women in Taiwan prefixing their husbands' surnames has significantly declined since the 1980s, but is still large compared to the mere .02% of all men who prefix their wife's surname. The majority of married women who prefix their husbands' surname are women above the age of 45.

2 The percentage of newborns taking the mother's surname in 2015 is 4.5%. In addition to the 1.9% of newborns who took the mother's surname through parental agreement, 2.4% took their mother's surname because of single parenthood, and .2% got their surname through drawing of lots when the parents couldn't reach mutual agreement (Ministry of the Interior 2016a: 204–205, calculated by the authors).

authors).

The slight and slow change in this naming practice is an indication of the fact that matronymics remain a rare and marginal phenomenon. However, it does not necessarily indicate that people's attitudes towards children's naming are overwhelmingly supportive of patronymics and remain largely unchanged, because there might be a gap between attitudes and behavior. While law might fail to directly produce social changes (Rosenberg 1991/2008), it is still possible that law raises people's awareness and changes their attitudes to some extent (McCann 1994). Do the majority endorse patronymy irrespective of the change in law, or does the naming practice revealed by official statistics fail to reflect a change in public attitudes? What are the factors that affect people's attitudes toward children's surname taking? Is there a disjuncture between people's attitudes and actual behavior regarding progressive surnaming, as revealed by many surname studies (Eshleman and Halley 2016; Liss and Erchull 2012; Scheuble et al. 2012)?

The data of the 2002 and 2012 Taiwan Social Change Survey provide us a good chance to address the abovementioned questions. Based on findings of the two surveys, as well as their comparison to the officially registered surname statistics, we will explain the changes in people's attitudes toward surnaming and explore the limits of the law.

## **Literature Review: Understanding Patronymy**

Taiwan is a country with a long history of legal endorsement and enforcement of patronymy. In a nutshell, the development of naming laws for children in Taiwan indicates a movement from direct state control to

private negotiation, and has proceeded through three stages: (1) the state's direct enforcement of patronymy (1945–1985); (2) enhancing the chances of giving children the mother's surname (1985–2007); and (3) state endorsement of private negotiation (2007 onward).

While the practice of patronymic naming has always been popular and general, there was no statutory law mandating that children shall assume the father's surname until 1945, when the Civil Code of the Republic of China took effect in Taiwan. Prior to its revision in 1985 and 2007, Article 1059 of the Civil Code provided that a child shall assume the surname of the father, and, where the husband entered into the household of the wife in an uxorilocal marriage, the child assumed the surname of the mother unless another agreement had been reached. By setting up a strict regulation of children's naming that enforced patronymy, the law conveyed the notion that the mother bore children for a man: for her children's father, or for her own father when she was in an uxorilocal marriage. In most cases, it was national law, not private negotiation, which determined children's surnames.

The first amendment of Article 1059 in 1985 was a compromise, in that it permitted a wife in a patrilocal marriage to pass her surname to her child through mutual agreement *only if* she had no brother. The underlying rationale for this revision was still to continue patronymy, treating “taking the mother's surname” as an exceptional measure to continue the patrilineal surname of the mother's natal family. As a result, a child born to a patrilocal marriage might be stopped from continuing the father's family line only when the mother's natal family failed to maintain itself and when the child's father gave his consent. This legal reform opened the possibility of private negotiation, albeit with limits. The definition of “the mother does not have a brother” was then subject to contestation. Those who sought to

give children the mother's surname argued that it should include situations where the mother did not have a brother with the same surname, or the mother's brother was unable to produce offspring, etc.

The revolutionary change in children's surname law took place in 2007 when the law made it a principle that children's surnames be determined by the parents' written mutual agreement. It was a hard-won success for the women's movement, which had advocated the abolishment of patronymy for almost four decades. Celebrated as a landmark achievement of the women's movement, the new name law substitutes the state's direct enforcement of patronymy with "private negotiation." It should be noted that we do not consider this legislation a form of "de-regulation" because (1) private negotiation is made possible by law; (2) in cases where private negotiation fails, it is the law that decides how the child's surname shall be determined. Article 1059 of the Civil Code stipulates that in cases where parents do not or cannot reach an agreement regarding the surname of the child, the child's surname is to be registered with the father or mother's surname upon taking a draw at the household registration office.

This celebration of feminist achievement soon turned into a foreseeable disappointment. Since the new law took effect, official reports consistently show that very few women have exercised this hard-won right and reached an agreement with their husbands to give the child her/his mother's surname. From May 2007 to May 2016, on average only 1.7% of all parents of newborns mutually agreed to give the child the mother's surname (Ministry of the Interior 2016c, calculated by authors). While the extremely low percentage of children taking their mothers' surname is often understood as an unfortunate gap between law and society and demonstrates the incapability of law to effectively change social norms, it is suggested that social norms

favoring paternal surnames are now subject to contestation and that legal change is a necessary component of social change (Lin 2014). It is also argued that the dominance of formal equalitarian thinking has shaped the law in a way that handicaps the exercising of women's hard-earned right (Chen 2014).

The persistence of patronymy is in sharp contrast to the progress of women's status in many aspects since the turn of the 21st century. Several key pieces of gender equality legislation were passed in or after 2002 to ensure women's rights and equality in the family, workplace, education and politics, which include but are not limited to crucial amendments of the Civil Code (2002, 2007), the Act of Gender Equality in Employment (2002), the Gender Equity Education Act (2003), the Sexual Harassment Prevention Act (2005), and the Enforcement Act of Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (2011). Overall, Taiwan's legal system in 2012 demonstrated stronger commitment to gender equality and disapproval of male supremacy than it did in 2002. Accordingly, the percentage of women in the labor market has increased, and exceeded 50% in 2013. The gender gap in the attainment of education has narrowed and become insignificant. Women's participation and visibility in politics has also significantly increased, and female legislators constitute one third of the Legislative Yuan after the 2016 election, accompanying the election of the first female president, Ing-wen Tsai. Apparently, however, the progress of women's legal and social status has not brought about a revolutionary change in child naming practices.

A few scholars have tried to identify the factors affecting parental decisions regarding the surnames of children in Taiwan since the new surname law took effect. Based on a survey of 779 parents of newborns con-

ducted in 2010, Peng and Hung (2011) found that demographic characteristics (e.g., the father is a foreigner, the mother is an aboriginal, or the mother does not have a brother) are the most important factors that forecast matronymic practice, and attitude characteristics (gender equality and naming autonomy) rank second. Chen (2010) conducted qualitative research of six cases and identified three major factors that contributed to the decision to give the child the mother's surname: (1) the child is a second child; (2) a supportive husband; (3) economic benefits resulting from taking the mother's surname. Both studies targeted parents of newborns to investigate their decisions so as to evaluate the effectiveness of the new law, and identified the significance of demographic and attitude characteristics. Except for the causes that are directly linked with patrilineal needs, i.e. the mother does not have a brother or the child is a second one, these studies have revealed some variables that may contribute to the choice of the mother's surname, including gender equality consciousness, a liberal attitude toward surnaming, and economic benefits.

The issue of parental decisions regarding the surnames of children has also been studied in other national contexts. As the practice of married women taking their husbands' surnames after marriage prevails in many Western countries, it is understandable that, instead of discussing children's surnaming, most articles focus on the choice of marital names and discuss the differences between women as "name-keepers" (married women who maintain their birth surname) and as "name-changers." Research finds that name-keepers are primarily inspired by a wish to preserve identity (Suter 2004; Hoffnung 2006; Scheuble and Johnson 2007), whereas name-changers are often motivated by a desire to create family unity (Kline et al. 1996; Twenge 1997; Hoffnung 2006). In addition, the former are characterized by

higher education, higher-status occupations, less religious belief, and more individualist and feminist attitudes in comparison with the latter (Hoffnung 2006; Lockwood et al. 2011). In a cross-time and cross-region study on US college students' attitudes and plans about marital naming, moreover, Scheuble et al. (2012) found that *attitudes* about marital naming have become more conservative over time without regional differences, but regional differences did emerge in women's *plans* about marital naming, as "women at the Eastern university were significantly more likely to say they planned to keep their birth surname than the women at the Midwestern college" (Scheuble: 290).

We do identify several studies that deal with children's surnames. By studying a sample of 600 married women selected from the staff directory of a university system in the United States, for example, Johnson and Scheuble (2002) examined the choices of children's surnames when parents' last names differ, and found that women with unconventional marital surnames were significantly more likely to pass their birth name on to the children than women who took their husband's last name at marriage, but around 90% of women with unconventional marital surnames still gave their children their husband's surname. Their logistic regression analysis showed that *self-identification on political liberalness* and *husband's education* were the most powerful predictors. Nugent (2010) conducted a content analysis of online accounts of choices of marital and child surnames, and highlighted some "material" resources that are crucial to children's nontraditional surnaming, including supportive friends and in-laws, cooperative partners who actively refuse patronymic surnaming, and institutions that accommodate diverse family forms (Nugent: 520). While studies conducted in Western countries have often associated children's non-traditional

surnaming with a manifestation of individualism and a challenge to patriarchy, a study on children's surnaming in modern Chinese society reported otherwise. Based on 63 semi-structured interviews in China, where the one-child policy has disrupted family lineages and the practice of married women usually retaining their birth surname after marriage is the result of state policy implementation, Qi (2017) found a gender strategy of mother-to-child surnaming that paradoxically enforces patriarchal inheritance and obligation. She concluded that "(P)atriarchy is 'veiled' in this case, as the provision of the mother's surname to her child may be seen as a challenge to patriarchal norms but in fact preserves her father's patrilineal lineage aspirations" (Qi: 2).

Gender, marital status, political liberalness, gender consciousness and parenthood are all identified factors that affect surnaming preferences. Intons-Peterson and Crawford (1985) found that more men than women, and more married men than single men, thought that children should take the father's surname. Lockwood et al. (2011) also found that men were more likely to endorse traditional names than were women, and that men appeared to have a stronger interest than women in preserving the non-egalitarian surname tradition. Nugent (2010) identified the linked nature of the marital and child surnaming processes, and argued that these processes present the classic tension between self and commitment to others as moral dilemmas of self vs. family, children and spouse. Liss and Erchull's research (2012) investigated the impact of parenthood on self-identified feminists' attitudes as well as behaviors on children's surname by comparing the answers from "actual mothers" and "anticipated mothers" (i.e. feminists who didn't have children but planned to have them). They found a small difference in the attitudes between the two groups, but "larger differences in behaviors such

that feminist mothers made considerably more traditional choices than was expected by feminist women who did not yet have children” (Liss and Erchull: 387). Their finding about the gap between attitudes and behaviors among feminist mothers, moreover, is echoed by Eshleman and Halley’s (2016) qualitative study on self-identified feminists, and again exemplifies the value of our research.

The existing literature is at once enlightening and limiting. These studies show that examining the demographic and attitudinal characteristics of people who endorse non-traditional surnaming or who have given their children the mother’s surname can help us identify the factors affecting people’s attitude towards naming, the possible beneficiaries of the new name law, and the ideological shift that is required to create an environment that supports non-traditional surname choices. In particular, we identify gender, education, marital status, parenthood, occupational status, gender consciousness, political liberalness, religious belief, and support from friends and relatives, as well as wider social culture and institutions as potential factors affecting attitudes towards children’s surnames.

Our study distinguishes itself from previous studies in two aspects. First, many of these studies were conducted in societies where the practice of wives taking their husbands’ surname prevails, which is not the case in Taiwan. In these societies, giving the child the mothers’ maiden name would make the child the only one with a different surname, therefore undermining the “fictional” family unity originally created by the wife taking her husband’s surname upon marriage.<sup>3</sup> Naming the child after the father is thus a

---

3 Herring (2013: 316–317) argues that the family unity argument is based somewhat on fiction, because the wife taking the husband’s name does not reflect an equal unity.

“natural and reasonable” step to reaffirm the “fictional” family unity in which all members share the same surname. In Taiwan, women usually keep their surnames after marriage. The child taking the father’s surname would make the mother the only one with a different surname in the family, therefore creating a paternal family unity that renders the mother an outsider of the family. It makes one wonder whether or not the factors affecting people’s attitudes toward naming the child will be the same or different in these two types of societies.<sup>4</sup> We also note the differences between Taiwan and China. In both societies, married women usually retain their birth surnames, but the case of Taiwan cannot be attributed to top-down state policy. Besides, there is no history of a strict one-child policy in Taiwan. Second, few of these studies use a longitudinal approach to examine the trend of naming attitudes, and all of these survey studies rely on relatively small samples. Our study uses more variables to examine factors affecting people’s attitudes toward children’s surnaming in Taiwan, in particular the degree of their adherence to patronymic surnaming, and examines the difference between 2002 and 2012 by analyzing the results of two nationwide surveys conducted in 2002 and 2012.

---

4 Previous studies have examined whether or not people’s attitude toward marital names is a factor in explaining their attitude toward child’s surnames, and Johnson and Scheuble (2002) have identified this factor while also pointing out that patronymic naming remained the preferred choice for women with non-traditional marital surnames. Due to the unfortunate lack of marital name information in the survey data, our study does not examine the relationship between people’s attitudes toward marital names and children’s surnames. We can, however, assume that the majority of Taiwanese people do not consider it necessary or preferable for the wife to prefix the husband’s surname.

## Data and Variables

We used the data of the Taiwan Social Change Survey (TSCS), specifically the “Gender and Family” module, conducted in 2002 and 2012, and performed a secondary analysis. TSCS is a nationwide random sampling, face-to-face interview survey program started in 1985. There were 1,983 original interviews in the 2002 survey and 2,072 in 2012 (Chang and Fu 2003; Chang et. al 2013). Both surveys included core questions of the International Social Survey Program (ISSP) and several topics with specific local concerns, including women's political participation, arrangements for children's surnames, and gender role attitudes. The attitudes of Taiwanese people toward the issue of children assuming the mother's surname were surveyed in both years. However, the phrasing of questions differs between the two surveys.

In the 2002 survey, the question concerning the attitude toward assuming the mother's surname was phrased directly as “Do you support or oppose it if children take the mother's last name?” There are six answers for this question: strongly support, support, oppose, strongly oppose, no opinion, and it depends.<sup>5</sup> Perhaps due to the straightforward phrasing of the question, results of the 2002 survey showed that 25.8% of respondents answered ‘no opinion’ and another 12.1% answered ‘it depends’ (see Table 1, discussed more below). To reduce the number of cases with neutral answers, the question was phrased more subtly in the 2012 survey: “Regarding the last

---

5 Taiwan Social Change Survey (Survey 2002: Round 4, Year 3; Questionnaire II: Family and Gender), <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/en/datafileE/tscs022.pdf>.

name of a newborn child, some parents may choose to use her/his father's last name, while others may choose to use the mother's. What is your attitude about this issue?" The answer options included: use the father's last name under any circumstances; use the mother's last name under certain circumstances; and use the mother's last name under any circumstances.<sup>6</sup> The 2012 survey still allowed the respondents to reply 'do not know' or 'refuse to answer'. The rephrasing of questions resulted in a significant decrease in respondents who declined to reveal their preferences. Only 1.5% (32 cases) answered 'do not know' and 0.1% (3 cases) refused to answer this question in 2012, which were much lower than the results found in the 2002 survey.

Answers of 'strongly oppose' or 'oppose' in response to the idea of using the maternal surname for children in the 2002 survey represent the support of patronymy. The comparable item is 'use the father's last name under any circumstances' in the 2012 survey. Thus, the dependent variable contains two categories: respondents' support for the traditional surnaming custom of bestowing the father's last name vs. either supporting using the mother's surname or having ambivalent views about it. Because of the binary nature of the dependent variable, we use a binomial logistic model in the analysis.

Based on the findings of previous literature, we include several sets of variables in the analysis: the demographic characteristics and family status of respondents, as well as their socio-economic status and patriarchal ideology. Demographic factors include age and gender. Johnson and Scheuble (1995) found that younger women are more likely to keep their own sur-

---

6 Taiwan Social Change Survey (Survey 2012: Phase 6, Wave 3; Questionnaire II: Family and Gender), <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/en/datafileE/tscs122.pdf>.

names after marriage than older ones. In the present paper, we hypothesize that older people, either male or female, are more likely to support patronymy than the young cohorts, as the elderly have already named their children or even grandchildren in the traditional way and are unlikely to contradict their own practices. We also hypothesize that men are more likely to support naming children after the father's surname, as they 'benefit' from this patronymic naming tradition. This gender gap in choosing surnames has been found to be significant in previous studies (e.g., Intons-Peterson and Crawford 1985; Lockwood et al. 2011; Nugent 2010).

Family status includes marital status and the number of children. Marital status is classified into three categories: never married, married or cohabiting, and once married (divorced, separated, or widowed). We expect that since respondents who remain single and/or childless do not have to face the decision, they tend to be more flexible and open than the married or parents about naming children (Liss and Erchull 2012). Similarly, we expect that single mothers who are divorced or separated from their husbands or widowed would be more likely to support assuming the mother's surname because of their relative disconnection from patrilineal control (Johnson and Scheuble 2002). Indeed, an active women's group in Taiwan which campaigned for the rights of children to assume the mother's surname was formed by divorced single mothers (Peng and Chen 2010). As for the effects of numbers of children on naming attitudes, we expect that respondents with more children would be less likely to support matronymic naming, as previous research has pointed out that "the trend toward traditionalism continued with each additional child" (Liss and Erchull 2012: 381).

We use three variables to represent socio-economic status of respondents: educational level, occupational positions, and household income. The

educational level includes four degrees: university or more advanced degree, senior high school, junior high school, and elementary education or below. Following the finding of Lockwood et al. (2011), we hypothesize that respondents with higher educational achievements would be less likely to support following the father's surname in the family, as they are assumed to have more egalitarian attitudes on gender issues than the less educated.

Occupational status consists of differences in education, class, and employment. It contains five categories: lacking a paid job (e.g., homemakers and the retired), the self-employed (including employers), upper non-manual workers, lower non-manual workers, and manual workers. Kohn (1977) showed that in general the blue-collar working class tends to emphasize values of conformity more than the middle class. The elements of conformity may include traditional gender role attitudes as well as adherence to patriarchal traditions. Lockwood et al. (2011) also pointed out that women with higher-status occupations tend to adopt nontraditional surnames after marriage. We generally follow these arguments and hypothesize that the working class, especially blue collar workers, will be more likely to comply with patronymic naming practice than the upper white-collar. Employers and the self-employed are also expected to support paternal naming, as they are concerned with the inheritance of means of production. As to the effects of income, we hypothesize that the rich would likely support the conventional practice of giving children the father's surname based on the assumption that they tend to endorse the existing social structure and tradition more than the less fortunate.

The last group of variables used in the analysis relates to gender role ideology. Research on women's marital name change shows that women wishing to keep their birth surnames (name-keepers) generally have more

individualist and feminist attitudes (Suter 2004, Hoffnung 2006, Scheuble and Johnson 2007). Similarly, Johnson and Scheuble (2002) and Peng and Chen (2010) both point out the role of gender equality attitude in shaping parents' decisions on children's surnaming. We thus hypothesize that people with stronger gender equality consciousness, or weaker patriarchal ideology, will more likely endorse taking the mother's surname. We use two questions asked in both the 2002 and 2012 surveys to represent the respondents' attitudes toward the gender role. The first one relates to the gendered division of labor: *A man's job is to earn money, a women's job is to look after the home and family*. There are six answers in the scale for this question: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree, and it depends or cannot choose. The second question concerns women's role in public affairs: *Politics is for men. It is better for women not to get involved*. The answer scale includes: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and it depends. In the analysis we combine "strongly agree" and "agree" as one group, "strongly disagree" and "disagree" as another group, and use the former as the reference group.

In their study of child-naming of the female faculty and the staff in selected universities in the United States, Johnson and Scheuble (2002) include husband's education in the analysis of naming attitudes of married women. They found that when husbands were more educated, the children were more likely to have the mother's birth name. Their results show the importance of the spouse's socio-economic status on the attitudes toward child surnaming. In addition to analyzing the whole sample, therefore, we conduct separate analyses for married and cohabiting couples in the present paper. Both the 2002 and 2012 surveys collected information on the age, education, and employment status of respondents and their spouses. Based

on the findings from Johnson and Scheuble (2002), we hypothesize that respondents with a highly educated spouse (either husband or wife) would be more accepting of using the wife's surname for their children than those with a less educated spouse. Johnson and Scheuble (2002) did not test the effects of economic status on respondents' attitudes, but we include this test in our study. Similar to what we discussed above concerning the effects of age and occupation, we also hypothesize that the age of the spouse will have negative effects on the respondents' attitudes toward using the mother's surname, and respondents with spouses holding manual occupations would more likely endorse using the father's surname.

Due to the limitation of secondary data, it is not possible to include all the potential variables revealed in previous studies in our research. For example, the number and order of children in a family, the economic benefits of taking the mother's surname, country of origin of the mother (or father), children born outside marriage etc., are all identified factors that affect the actual behavior of matronymic naming (Chen 2010; Peng and Hung 2011), but are not included in the TSCS survey questions. In addition, the rationales and beliefs underlying conventional and unconventional children's surnaming (Nugent 2010) are also themes that have been explored in the existing literature. For example, one study argued that the resistance to giving children the mother's surname is based on avoiding the stigmatization of the child as "illegitimate," because historically only "illegitimate children" (children born out of wedlock) carried mothers' surnames (MacDougall 1985). Almack (2005) interviewed twenty lesbian-parent families in the U.K., and found that the rhetoric of children's needs (avoiding teasing from peers) is employed as a device to support the traditional family unit. The 2012 TSCS Gender Module includes some questions on the

“rationales” underlying the surname decision, but since the questions were not asked in the 2002 survey, we decided not to address them in this paper. Future studies may explore these reasons and strategies.

## Findings

Table 1 lists the distribution of responses concerning the attitude toward surnaming in the two surveys. We found that, in 2002, more than 40% of respondents either opposed or strongly opposed having children take the mother's surname. They are viewed as supporting using the father's surname for children. The support for patronymic naming diminished in 2012, as only 28% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with using the father's surname for children under any circumstances. Through subsequent multi-variate analyses we discern the factors behind the attitudes and changes over time.

The descriptive statistics for the independent variables are listed in Table 2. That Taiwan is moving toward an aging society is demonstrated by the fact that the average age of respondents was over 40 in both surveys and even reached about 46 years old ten years later. Most respondents were married with co-residing partners in the surveys. However, the percentage of respondents remaining single increased from 25% in 2002 to 30% in 2012, and the average number of children was below the replacement rate in 2012. The percentage of people with a university or higher degree increased from 25% in 2002 to 37% in 2012, partly due to the expansion of higher education starting from the mid-1990s. About 27% of respondents were jobless (including the retired, the unemployed, and homemakers in both surveys). The percentage of workers holding lower white-collar jobs increased from

Table 1. Frequency Distributions of the Dependent Variable

Unit: persons (%)

2002 Do you support or oppose it if children take the <u>mother's</u> last name? (您贊不贊成「子女和媽媽同姓」?)	2012 Regarding the last name of a newborn child, some parents may choose to follow her/his father's last name, while others may choose to use the mother's. What is your attitude about this issue? (關於子女的姓氏, 有些人認為應該從父姓, 也有人認為可以從母姓。您的看法是: )
trongly oppose (很不贊成)	Use the <u>father's</u> last name under any circumstances (不論在什麼情況下, 都應該從父姓)
Oppose (不贊成)	Use the mother's last name under certain circumstances (在有些狀況下可以從母姓)
Support (贊成)	Use the mother's last name under any circumstances (不論在什麼情況下, 都應該從母姓)
Strongly support (很贊成)	
No opinion	
It depends	
Don't know	Don't know
<b>Sample size</b>	Refuse to answer
<b>1,983</b>	<b>Sample size</b>
	<b>2,072</b>

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Independent Variables

	Unit: % (persons)	
Independent variables	2002	2012
<b>Demographic factors</b>		
<b>Age</b>	<b>(1,981)</b>	<b>(2,037)</b>
Mean	43.9	45.8
S.D.	16.6	17.2
<b>Gender</b>	<b>(1,982)</b>	<b>(2,037)</b>
Female	51	49
Male	49	51
<b>Family status</b>		
<b>Marital status</b>	<b>(1,982)</b>	<b>(2,036)</b>
Never married	25	30
Married or cohabiting	64	58
Divorced, separated or widowed	11	12
<b>Number of children</b>	<b>(1,982)</b>	<b>(2,036)</b>
Mean	2.1	1.8
S.D.	1.8	1.7
<b>Socio-economic status</b>		
<b>Education level</b>	<b>(1,980)</b>	<b>(2,037)</b>
Elementary or lower	29	20
Junior high school	13	13
Senior high school	32	30
University or higher	25	37
<b>Occupational status</b>	<b>(1,958)</b>	<b>(2,028)</b>
Upper white-collar employee	10	9
Lower white-collar employee	22	28
Blue-collar employee	21	18
Employer, self-employed or family business worker	21	19
No job	27	27
<b>Household income (unit: NT\$)</b>	<b>(1,875)</b>	<b>(1,563)</b>
Mean	64,883	81,859
S.D.	60,299	92,876

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Independent Variables (Continued)

Independent variables	Unit: % (persons)	
	2002	2012
<b>Gender role ideology</b>		
<b>A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family.</b>	<b>(1,981)</b>	<b>(2,033)</b>
Strongly agree	8	7
Agree	37	34
Neither agree nor disagree	9	10
Disagree	31	42
Strongly disagree	3	7
It depends <sup>†</sup>	13	1
<b>Politics is for men. It is better for a woman not to get involved.</b>	<b>(1,976)</b>	<b>(1,990)</b>
Strongly agree	2	2
Agree	16	13
Disagree	56	61
Strongly disagree	12	22
It depends	14	2

<sup>†</sup>2002: "it depends"; 2012: "cannot choose".

22% in 2002 to 28% in 2012, which coincides with the increasing share of workers employed in the service sector in Taiwan (DGBAS 2016). In contrast, the percentage of blue-collar workers decreased from 21% in 2002 to 18% in 2012. The average household income was NTD 65,883 in the 2002 survey. The amount increased to about NTD 81,859 ten years later.

As to attitudes of gender role, Taiwanese generally became more liberal ten years later compared to 2002. About 49% of respondents in 2012 either disagreed or strongly disagreed that women should stay at home and let men take paid jobs, which is higher than the level in 2002 (34%). Even more impressive are the results of political participation. About 83% of respon-

dents disagreed or strongly disagreed that women should not get involved in politics, up from 68% in 2002. The change may be related to the fact that female legislators have become a common part of the scene in the Legislative Yuan as well in mass media in Taiwan. One of the two largest political parties—the Democratic Progressive Party—had nominated a woman as their presidential candidate several months before the survey started in July 2102.<sup>7</sup>

The results of binomial regression analyses are listed in Table 3. The first two columns show results after combining the data of the two surveys. Column 1 includes only background and objective variables, while column 2 adds variables of gender role attitudes into the equation. We then analyze the data collected in 2002 and 2012, which are listed in the last two columns. Generally most of our hypotheses are supported by the findings.<sup>8</sup>

Column 1 shows that respondents interviewed in 2012 were significantly more liberal in bestowing children's last names than those surveyed ten years earlier. In contrast to our hypothesis, we found that older people were less likely to support the patronymic practice than the younger generation. It is possible that the elderly were aware of the benefits of having matronymic names in their experience (e.g., Chen 2010). As for gender differences, men were more likely to support naming children after the father's surname than were women. The likelihood increased by about 66%.

---

7 The female candidate, Tsai Ing-wen, lost the 2012 presidential election but won the presidency for her party in 2016.

8 We tried to include the variable of ethnicity in the analysis. However, this variable has no significant effects on the naming attitudes in both surveys, and including this variable has almost no effect on the coefficients of other independent variables. We thus excluded this variable from the final analysis.

Table 3. Binomial Logistic Regression of Attitudes toward Patronymy in Taiwan

**Dependent variable:** Attitude toward the last name of children

“Use the father’s last name under any circumstances” = 1, “Others” = 0

Independent variables	Coefficient (S.E.)			
	Two years combined		2002 (3)	2012 (4)
	(1)	(2)		
Survey year 2012 (2002=0)	-.446 (.08)**	-.476 (.09)**		
<b>Demographic factors</b>				
Age	-.027 (.02) <sup>+</sup>	-.025 (.02)	.003 (.02)	-.059 (.03)*
Age <sup>2</sup>	.3 <sup>e-3</sup> (.2 <sup>e-3</sup> ) <sup>+</sup>	.2 <sup>e-3</sup> (.2 <sup>e-3</sup> )	-.1 <sup>e-3</sup> (.2 <sup>e-3</sup> )	.001 (.2 <sup>e-3</sup> )*
Male	.656 (.09)**	.662 (.09)**	.644 (.12)**	.684 (.14)**
<b>Family status</b>				
<b>Marital status (Never married=0)</b>				
Married or cohabiting	.630 (.15)**	.646 (.15)**	.577 (.20)**	.720 (.24)**
Divorced, separated or widowed	.375 (.19) <sup>+</sup>	.354 (.20) <sup>+</sup>	.289 (.26)	.433 (.30)
<b>Number of children</b>	.092 (.04)*	.081 (.04)*	.086 (.05) <sup>+</sup>	.063 (.06)
<b>Socio-economic status</b>				
<b>Education level (University or higher=0)</b>				
Elementary or lower	1.242 (.16)**	1.053 (.17)**	1.053 (.22)**	.979 (.27)**
Junior high school	.669 (.15)**	.512 (.15)**	.475 (.21)*	.559 (.24)*
Senior high school	.373 (.12)**	.314 (.12)**	.348 (.16)*	.274 (.18)

Table 3. Binomial Logistic Regression of Attitudes toward Patronymy in Taiwan (Continued)

Independent variables	Coefficient (S.E.)			
	Two years combined		2002	2012
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<b>Occupational status</b> (Upper white-collar employee=0)				
Lower white-collar employee	.129 (.17)	.126 (.17)	-.200 (.22)	.661 (.30)*
Blue-collar employee	.510 (.18)**	.488 (.18)**	.338 (.23)	.842 (.32)**
Employer, self-employed or family business worker	.534 (.17)**	.491 (.18)**	.276 (.22)	.913 (.31)**
No job	.493 (.18)**	.398 (.18)*	.334 (.23)	.594 (.32)†
<b>Household income</b>	.3 <sup>e-3</sup> (.01)	.002 (.01)	.004 (.01)	.001 (.01)
<b>Gender role ideology</b>				
<b>A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family.</b> (Disagree=0)				
Agree				
It depends†				
<b>Politics is for men. It is better for a woman not to get involved.</b> (Disagree=0)				
Agree				
It depends				
<b>Constant term</b>	-1.783 (.39)**	-1.873 (.40)**	-2.252 (.52)**	-2.062 (.65)**
<b>Sample size</b>	3,409	3,381	1,843	1,538
<b>Pseudo R<sup>2</sup> (%)</b>	11.74	13.69	12.66	12.97

<sup>†</sup>*p* < .1, \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01, \*\*\**p* < .001. †see Table 2.

The effects of family status generally support our hypothesis. The married (including once married) or cohabiting persons were more likely to support following the father's surname than those who were single. The number of children did not make the parents more supportive of nontraditional naming, which also supports our hypothesis and is consistent with existing studies (cf. Liss and Erchull 2012). It is possible that families with children tend to be more 'conservative' after considering the possible inheritance disputes resulting from having children with different surnames.

Among factors of socio-economic status, educational level appears to be a much more important explanatory factor than others. There was a linear association between education and the attitude of supporting patronymy. In general the better educated were less likely to support the patronymic surnaming practice than the less educated. Based on the value of the coefficients, the least educated respondents were clearly more likely to agree or strongly agree with children taking the father's surname than the most educated. As to differences of occupational status, compared to upper white-collar workers, respondents holding blue-collar jobs, the self-employed (including employers), and the jobless were more likely to support patronymic naming. These results seem to indicate that the white-collar class, especially those in the upper rank, were more sympathetic to using the mother's surname for their children than respondents in other class and occupational positions. The results also generally support previous research that found that occupational self-direction serves as a factor in paternal values (Kohn 1977). Lastly, differing from our hypothesis, income level did not have significant effects.

The results in column 2 show that including attitudinal variables in the analysis did not greatly alter the influence of objective factors on people's attitudes toward patronymic surnaming. Only age differences became non-

significant. Among the subjective factors, respondents supporting a gendered division of labor between work and family tended to support patronymy as an institution too. Similarly, those agreeing that women should stay away from politics and leave it to men were more likely to support patronymic surnaming than those holding different views about women's participation in politics. In general, respondents endorsing patriarchal ideology tended to support patronymic naming practice, which also supports our hypothesis.

We next compare the results between 2002 (column 3) and 2012 (column 4) surveys to see whether there was any change in the factors that affect people's attitude toward children's surnaming ten years apart. Being male, being married, having junior high or lower education, and endorsing patriarchal ideology (i.e. gendered division of labor, and being against women's participation in politics) remained significant in accepting patronymy in both 2002 and 2012. There were differences too. Age was an important factor in 2012 but not in 2002. Differences between respondents with a senior-high school degree and those with more advanced education were not significant in 2012. The effect of occupational status was significant only in the 2012 survey. Upper white-collar workers were significantly less likely to support patronymy than respondents in all other positions or employment status. If the change of laws in 2007 had any impact on people's attitudes, it might have disproportionately influenced the attitudes of professionals and those in managerial positions in society and increased their support for matronymic naming. Thus, the importance of labor market positions increased in 2012, while that of education seemed to diminish, as the differences between high school graduates and college graduates (or higher) are not significant in 2012. Since their model did not include occupational differences, Johnson and Scheuble (2002) and Scheuble et al. (2012)

may have overestimated the effects of education. Future research may note this development and examine whether or not it is a phenomenon unique to Taiwan.

The last part of the analyses compares differences in attitudes between married couples. According to findings in Johnson and Scheuble (2002), husband's education had a significant impact on the spouse's views about child naming. Improving upon their work, we add spouse's age and occupational status in addition to spouse's education (measured in years) in the model. The results are presented in Table 4. To indicate the differences of effects between husband's and wife's characteristics, we conducted analyses for married women and men respectively. In general we found that spouse's effects were not as strong as the characteristics of respondents themselves. For the female sample, many of their personal factors and socio-economic status had significant effects on their attitudes, including age, educational background, and occupational status. Husband's socio-economic status had no significant effects on the wife's attitude in the naming issue. As to the results of analyzing male respondents, we found only three variables with significant effects. The self-employed class was associated with being more likely to support patronymic naming compared to the white-collar workers. Wife's education had significant effects on husband's attitudes. Men married to wives with more years of education were less likely to follow patronymy than husbands with less-educated spouses. The results of the male sample also show the importance of gender ideology on men's attitudes. Male respondents who supported gendered division of labor or women staying away from politics were also more accepting of the traditional practice of patronymic surnaming.

Unlike what Johnson and Scheuble (2002) reported in their paper, our

Table 4. Binomial Logistic Regression of Attitudes toward Patronymy in Taiwan (Married or Cohabiting Respondents)

**Dependent variable:** Attitude toward the last name of children  
 "Use the father's last name under any circumstances" = 1, "Others" = 0

Independent variables	Coefficient (S.E.)	
	Female respondents	Male respondents
<b>Survey year 2012 (2002=0)</b>	-.548 (.17)**	-.389 (.15)**
<b>Respondent's socio-demographic factors</b>		
<b>Age</b>	-.086 (.04)*	-.008 (.04)
<b>Age2</b>	.001 (.4 <sup>e-3</sup> )*	.2 <sup>e-3</sup> (.3 <sup>e-3</sup> )
<b>Number of children</b>	.110 (.07)	.007 (.06)
<b>Education level</b> (University or higher=0)		
Elementary or lower	1.013 (.36)**	.382 (.30)
Junior high school	.582 (.33) <sup>+</sup>	.243 (.27)
Senior high school	.248 (.27)	.248 (.20)
<b>Occupational status</b> (Upper white-collar employee=0)		
Lower white-collar employee	.728 (.46)	-.051 (.24)
Blue-collar employee	1.111 (.49)*	.277 (.25)
Employer, self-employed or family business worker	.830 (.49) <sup>+</sup>	.616 (.25)*
No job	.933 (.46)*	.264 (.36)
<b>Household income</b>	-.009 (.01)	-.015 (.01)
<b>Spouse's socio-demographic factors</b>		
<b>Age</b>	.009 (.02)	-.022 (.02)
<b>Years of schooling</b>	-.013 (.03)	-.072 (.03)**
<b>Occupational status</b> (Upper white-collar employee=0)		
Lower white-collar employee	-.469 (.31)	.078 (.32)
Blue-collar employee	-.014 (.30)	-.260 (.37)
Employer, self-employed or family business worker	.406 (.30)	-.515 (.36)
No job	-.088 (.38)	-.096 (.32)
<b>Gender role ideology</b>		
<b>A man's job is to earn money; a woman's job is to look after the home and family.</b> (Disagree=0)		
Agree	.138 (.18)	.319 (.16)*
It depends <sup>†</sup>	-.260 (.23)	.354 (.21) <sup>+</sup>
<b>Politics is for men. It is better for a woman not to get involved.</b> (Disagree=0)		
Agree	.795 (.19)***	.815 (.21)***
It depends	.137 (.28)	-.597 (.25)*
<b>Constant term</b>	-.376 (1.2)	1.095 (1.0)
<b>Sample size</b>	1,017	1,086
<b>Pseudo R<sup>2</sup> (%)</b>	16.33	9.43

<sup>+</sup>*p*<.1, \**p*<.05, \*\**p*<.01, \*\*\**p*<.001. <sup>†</sup>see Table 2.

findings show non-significant effects of husband's educational background on spouse's attitudes toward children's surname. But in the reversed direction, we found that wife's education had significant effects on the husband's attitude, which was not tested in the analysis of Johnson and Scheuble (2002). Our model seems to explain more variance in the attitudes of married women (pseudo  $R^2$  is about .16) than in that of the married men (.09). Empirically, the results indicate that our model can better predict the determination of women's attitudes than men's, because there is little difference among men of different socio-economic status. Nugent (2010) argued that maintaining a system of exclusive patronymic surnaming confers multiple benefits to men as a group. Men are inclined to maintain the status quo because they benefit from it. This might explain the irrelevance of men's social-economic status to their attitudes. It is only gender ideology that can predict men's support for nontraditional naming practice.

## Discussion and Conclusion

Using two nationwide survey samples and a longitudinal approach to study the trends of people's attitudes toward children's surnames, our study has produced the following findings that at once provide new insights and confirm some conclusions of previous studies. First of all, we have identified a change in people's attitudes that official statistics of naming practices fail to reflect. Judging from the official number of newborns taking the mother's surname after 2007, the new surname law has produced very little change in the practice of children's surnaming. Most people seem to support the status quo. Contrary to the persistence of patronymy in people's *behavior*, however, our study found noteworthy change in people's *attitudes* towards

children's surnaming in two samples a decade apart. Taiwanese people's endorsement of patronymy has declined (from 40.3% in 2002 to 28.3% in 2012), and their acceptance of the possibility of matronymic naming through private negotiation has increased. In the same vein, we found that people's endorsement of patriarchal ideology has declined within the ten years, especially for male respondents. While we are unable to prove a causal relationship between the change in the gender-equality laws and the change in people's attitudes, Taiwanese people overall have become more open regarding children's surnames as well as gender equality.

Secondly, our study found that gender, marital status, educational level and occupational status are all strong factors in explaining public attitudes toward children's surnames. Echoing previous studies, we found that women, singles, and better-educated people are more open to matronymic naming than men, married, and less-educated people. The former are arguably the groups that have more reasons and/or agency to pursue gender equality. These effects are significant when controlling for gender role attitudes, which per se is a strong predictor of matronymic naming support. This result shows similarities between societies where married women disproportionately take their husbands' surnames and societies where women usually keep their surnames after marriage. It seems to suggest that these objective demographic factors operate independent of prevailing women's marital name practices.

The finding about the impact of occupational status, which was not identified as a strong factor in previous studies, is more complex. Those holding upper white-collar positions are more supportive of matronymic naming than people with blue-collar jobs or without paid jobs. We may interpret the result as showing that people with more resources and power

are more confident about their influence, and hence do not oppose gender-equal reforms. However, we also found that employers, the self-employed and family business owners are more likely to support patronymy than white-collar employees. The power and resources owned by people in this category are quite diverse. It is necessary to disentangle these sub-groups in future research so as to accurately assess the effects of occupational status.

An original and inspiring finding of our paper, thirdly, is the sharp contrast between married men and women in terms of the factors influencing their attitudes toward patronymy. While previous studies of marital names found that women with higher education and higher occupational status are more likely to be “name-keepers” and preserve their own identity (Hoffnung 2006; Lockwood et al. 2011), our study shows that these women are also more favorable toward passing their surname identity to their children. We found that married women with higher education and a higher-ranking job are more supportive of matronymic naming, but these factors have no significant impact on married men’s attitudes. In an identical manner, we found that a husband’s social-demographic characteristics do not affect his wife’s attitudes toward patronymy, but a higher-educated wife tends to have a husband more supportive of matronymic naming. In other words, while women as a whole are more likely to support matronymic naming than men, our finding points out that the more powerful a woman is (in terms of education and occupation), the more likely she is to challenge patronymy and have positive influence on her husband or be supported by him.

Our study leads to the conclusion that the liberalization of the children’s surname law (gender-neutrality plus private negotiation) is consistent with the change in people’s attitudes toward children’s surnaming, as shown in the trend of the two surveys a decade apart. However, the increasing

acceptance of maternal surnaming over time has not yet functioned to dismantle the dominance of patronymy, as shown in the official statistics of children's surnaming. In this respect it buttresses the finding of Scheuble et al. (2012) and Liss and Erchull (2012) with stronger evidence in terms of the disjuncture between attitudes and behavior involving nontraditional surnaming.

On the other hand, our study has confirmed that when people accept gender-equal ideology and when women have more social and economic power, families are more likely to accept the taking of the mother's surname. If power is the main and most consistent "factor" sustaining and challenging patronymy, then the new "gender-neutral" surname law in Taiwan that focuses on "negotiation" or "mutual agreement" between husband and wife, that is, she has to get his permission and he has a right to say no, partly explains why there is such a huge gap between those who support the idea of using the mother's surname and those who actually do so.

To change the *practice* of patronymic surnaming, therefore, we suggest an alternative, more radical legal reform approach accompanying continuous feminist activism to empower women and men, and to encourage the decision to give children the mother's surname. We endorse Jonathan Herring's proposal of pursuing "a legal regime which avoids the sexist messages of patronymic naming; respects the right of children to change their name; and emphasizes the relationships the child is living in" (Herring 2013: 327). The creation of a new naming system which recognizes multiple possibilities for the choice of surnames—e.g., more than one registered surname, a joint surname, or a surname different from the mother's and father's—may contribute to women's empowerment in the negotiation process within the family and facilitate the change of naming practice. We would also like to stress the

importance of raising gender equality consciousness of men, as they are less likely to support using the mother's surname regardless of their socio-demographic characteristics. As some women's groups in Taiwan have started to campaign for matronymic practice in recent years,<sup>9</sup> whether or not this campaign will function to increase support for matronymic practices and narrow the gap between people's attitudes and behavior regarding children's surnaming in Taiwan is also worthy of continuous attention.

Our study provides unique contributions to the existing literature on the politics of surnaming in at least three ways. The first contribution is to enrich the empirical study of children's surnames, especially in the context where wives usually keep their own surnames after marriage—a context that is relatively understudied, as most surname studies by far have mainly been conducted in the US and U.K.. Second, while previous survey research is mostly based on small-scale data in certain prestigious institutions—mostly universities—and not generalizable to the whole population, our data source is from nationwide, randomly sampled, and face-to-face surveys. The result of our analysis is therefore much more generalizable to other countries with similar cultural and social backgrounds. Finally, we provided some original findings and pointed out some factors or trends that were underestimated in existing literature, including the impact of occupational status, the importance of gender ideology in prescribing men's attitudes, and the power and agency of wives in influencing husbands' attitudes toward patronymy. These

---

9 The two women's movement organizations that advocate matronymic practice in Taiwan are the Awakening Foundation and Kaohsiung Women Awakening Association. In addition to continuously analyzing and promoting the statistics on children's surnaming in public arenas, the latter also has published a book of 23 stories of individuals or families that have adopted a matronymic practice for various reasons.

findings merit more follow-up research and should inform future researchers in surname study.

One final remark for future research. For many Taiwanese parents, using the father's surname is such a common practice that they probably do not view it as a gender or egalitarian issue. As the fertility rate in Taiwan has fallen below the replacement rate starting in 2000 and was only 1.17% in 2015 (Ministry of the Interior 2016b), families and society are probably more concerned about whether or not to have children than deciding the surname of their children. It is, however, also possible that parents will become more concerned about the surname of the child because they have only one child. The case of China has revealed an emergent practice that a couple's only child is given the mother's surname in certain circumstances (Qi 2017). It would be interesting to analyze and compare explanations of surnaming practices of one-child families in Taiwan and China in future studies. In addition, the law permits one to freely change one's surname in adulthood. Children with a paternal surname can legally change their surname and adopt their mothers' surname as soon as they reach adulthood. As of now, very few people exercise this newly granted right. Children's attitudes and decisions of whether or not to continue taking fathers' surnames is therefore also a subject that begs for more research.

## REFERENCES

- Almack, Kathryn, 2005, "What's in a Name? The Significance of the Choice of Surnames Given to Children Born within Lesbian-parent Families." *Sexualities* 8(2): 239-254. doi:10.1177/1363460705050857.
- Augustine-Adams, Kif, 1997, "The Beginning of Wisdom Is to Call Things by Their Right Names." *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies* 7(1): 1-35.

- Brightman, Joan, 1994, "Why Hillary chooses Rodham Clinton." *American Demographics* 16(3): 9-11.
- Carroll, Tessa, 2006, "Changing Languages, Gender and Family Relations in Japan." Pp. 109-127 in *The Changing Japanese Family*, edited by Marcus Rebick and Ayumi Takenaka. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chang, Ying-Hwa, and Yang-chih Fu, 2003, The Report of 2002 Taiwan Social Change Survey (Round 4, Year 3), <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/cht/datafile/tscs02.pdf> (Date Visited: May 15, 2016).  
章英華、傅仰止，2003，台灣社會變遷基本調查計畫第四期第三次調查計畫執行報告 (<http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/cht/datafile/tscs02.pdf>，取用日期：2016年5月15日)。
- Chang, Ying-Hwa, Su-Hao Tu, and Pei-shan Liao, 2013, The Report of 2012 Taiwan Social Change Survey (Round 6, Year 3), <http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/cht/datafile/tscs12.pdf> (Date Visited: May 15, 2016).  
章英華、杜素豪、廖培珊，2013，台灣社會變遷基本調查計畫第六期第三次調查計畫執行報告 (<http://www.ios.sinica.edu.tw/sc/cht/datafile/tscs12.pdf>，取用日期：2016年5月15日)。
- Chen, Chao-Ju, 2014, "Patronymic Norm and the Right to Use the Maternal Surname: A Social-legal Study of the Legal Reform of Children's Surname Law." *National Taiwan University Law Journal* 43(2): 271-380.  
陳昭如，2014，〈父姓的常規，母性的權利：子女姓氏修法改革的法社會學考察〉，《國立臺灣大學法學論叢》43(2): 271-380。
- Chen, I-Chun, 2010, "The Second Surname! Gender power relationship in the negotiation of a newborn's surname." *Forum in Women's and Gender Studies* 92: 48-59.  
陳怡君，2010，〈第二「姓」！新生兒姓氏協商的性別權力關係〉，《婦研縱橫》92: 48-59。
- DGBAS (Directorate General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics), 2016, "National Statistics of Republic of China (Taiwan)." <https://eng.stat.gov.tw/ct.asp?xItem=15761&ctNode=1609&mp=5> (Date visited: November 29, 2016).
- Eshleman, Amy, and Jean Halley, 2016, "Self-Identified Feminist Mothers' Naming Practices for Their Children: Accepting Being 'as Feminist as Everyone' Else." *Women's Studies* 45(3): 215-229. doi:10.1080/00497878.2016.1149033.
- Goldin, Claudia, and Maria Shim, 2004, "Making a Name: Women's Names at Marriage and Beyond." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18: 143-160. doi:10.1257/0895330041371268.

- Gooding, Gretchen E., and Rose M. Kreider, 2009, "Women's Marital Naming Choices in a Nationally Representative Sample." *Journal of Family Issues* 31(5): 681-701. doi: 10.1177/0192513x09344688.
- Herring, Jonathan, 2013, "The Power of Naming: Surnames, Children, and Spouses." Pp. 310-327 in *Law and Language*, edited by Michael D. A. Freeman and Fiona Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hoffnung, Michele, 2006, "What's In a Name? Marital Name Choice Revisited." *Sex Roles* 55(11-12): 817-825. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9133-9.
- Intons-Peterson, Margaret Jean, and Jill Crawford, 1985, "The Meanings of Marital Surnames." *Sex Roles* 12(11-12): 1163-1171. doi:10.1007/bf00287826.
- 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(3): 724-732. doi: 10.2307/353926.
- , 2002, "What Should We Call Our Kids? Choosing Children's Surnames When Parents' Last Names Differ." *The Social Science Journal* 39(3): 419-429. doi:10.1016/s0362-3319(02)00203-3.
- 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(4): 593-617. doi:10.1177/0265407596134007.
- Kohn, Melvin L., 1977, *Class and Conformity; A Study in Values* (2nd edition, with a reassessment). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lebell, Sharon M. G., 1988, *Naming Ourselves, Naming Our Children: Resolving the Last Name Dilemma*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.
- Lin, Yun Hsien Diana, 2014, "In the Name of the Father? The Law and Social Norms of Children's Naming in Taiwan." Pp. 75-94 in *Gender and Family in East Asia*, edited by Siumi Maria Tam, Wai Ching Angelo Wong, and Danning Wang. New York: Routledge.
- Liss, Miriam, and Mindy J. Erchull, 2012, "Differences in Beliefs and Behaviors between Feminist Actual and Anticipated Mothers." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 37(3): 381-391. doi:10.1177/0361684312468334.
- Lockwood, Penelope, Caitlin Burton, and Katelyn Boersma, 2011, "Tampering with Tradition: Rationales Concerning Women's Married Names and Children's Surnames." *Sex Roles* 65(11-12): 827-839. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-0034-1.
- MacDougall, Priscilla Ruth, 1985, "The Right of Women to Name Their Children." *Law and Inequality: A Journal of Theory and Practice* 3(1): 91-160.

- McCann, Michael, 1994, *Rights at Work: Pay Equity Reform and the Politics of Legal Mobilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ministry of the Interior, 2016a, *National Statistics and Analysis of Names*. Taipei: Ministry of the Interior.  
內政部, 2016a, 《全國姓名統計分析》。台北: 內政部。
- , 2016b, 2015 Yearly Bulletin of Interior Statistics, <http://sowf.moi.gov.tw/stat/year/list.htm> (Date visited: February 23, 2017).  
內政部, 2016b, 104年內政統計年報 (<http://sowf.moi.gov.tw/stat/year/list.htm>, 取用日期: 2017年2月23日)。
- Noack, Turid, and Kenneth Aarskaug Wiik, 2008, “Women’s Choice of Surname upon Marriage in Norway.” *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(2): 507-518. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2008.00497.x.
- Nugent, Colleen, 2010, “Children’s Surnames, Moral Dilemmas: Accounting for the Prevalence of Fathers’ Surnames for Children.” *Gender and Society* 24(4): 499-525. doi:10.1177/0891243210376380.
- Peng, Yen-wen, and I-Chien Chen, 2011, *Surname Liberation in Single-Parent Families: A Study on the “Negative Impact” of the Article on Children’s Surname in the Civil Code*. Taipei: Awakening Foundation.  
彭滄雯、陳宜倩, 2011, 《單親家庭「姓」解放: 民法親屬編子女姓氏條文之「不利影響」研究》。台北: 財團法人婦女新知基金會。
- Peng, Yen-wen, and Ling-Chun Hung, 2011, “Why Taking Mother’s Surname? Investigating the Factors That Influence Taiwanese Married Couples’ Decision on Their Children’s Surnames.” *Journal of Women’s and Gender Studies* 28: 1-54.  
彭滄雯、洪綾君, 2011, 〈為何從母姓? 夫妻約定子女姓氏的影響因素調查〉, 《女學學誌: 婦女與性別研究》28: 1-54。
- Peng, Yen-wen and Ling-Chun Hung, 2011, “Why Taking Mother’s Surname? Investigating the Factors That Influence Taiwanese Married Couples’ Decision on Their Children’s Surnames.” *Journal of Women’s and Gender Studies* 28: 1-54. [in Chinese]
- Qi, Xiaoying, 2017, “Neo-traditional Child Surnaming in Contemporary China: Women’s Rights as Veiled Patriarchy.” *Sociology*, First published date: February 14, 2017. doi: 10.1177/0038038516688613.
- Rosenberg, Gerald N., 1991/2008, *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring about Social Change?* Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Scheuble, Laurie K., and David R. Johnson, 2007, “Social and Cognitive Factors in Women’s Marital Name Choice.” *The American Name Society* 55(3): 229-251. doi:10.1179/

nam.2007.55.3.229.

- 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(3-4): 282-292. doi:10.1007/s11199-011-0089-z.
- Suter, Elizabeth A., 2004, "Tradition Never Goes Out of Style: The Role of Tradition in Women's Naming Practices." *The Communication Review* 7(1): 57-87. doi:10.1080/10714420490280198.
- Tanaka, Kimiko, 2012, "Surnames and Gender in Japan: Women's Challenges in Seeking Own Identity." *Journal of Family History* 37(2): 232-240. doi:10.1177/0363199011434684.
- Twenge, Jean M., 1997, "'Mrs. His Name': Women's Preferences for Married Names." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21(3): 417-429. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00122.x.
- Yang, Hyunah, 2013, "Colonialism and Patriarchy: Where the Korean Family-head (Hoju) System had been Located." pp. 45-63 in *Law and Society in Korea*, edited by Hyunah Yang. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.