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Abstract

This thesis examines how the treatment of newcomer youths’ names within social interactions between immigrants and the Canadian host society reveals immigration ideologies indicating either an integrationalist or assimilationist attitude. The data was collected from semi-structured interviews with newcomer youths and staff members at the Cross Cultural Learner Centre in London, Ontario, from April to August 2017. One the one hand, I examine how the newcomer youths’ names are treated by members of the dominant society, often including forms of name-based microaggressions that reflect an immigration ideology that includes a preference towards cultural assimilation. On the other hand, I demonstrate how some of the newcomer youths are using their names in order to facilitate integration and to advocate for cultural diversity by taking advantage of obligatory conversations or using the context-dependent best pronunciation of their names.
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Chapter 1 : Introduction

Immigration has long become a defining feature of Canadian society. In fact, the 2016 Census has shown that 21.9 percent of Canada’s current population have come to Canada as either immigrants or permanent residents, not including refugees (Statistics Canada, 2017a). While Canada has officially adopted a multiculturalism policy that ensures that each citizen can “keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging” (Government of Canada, 2012), immigrants are still facing issues of discrimination, especially when displaying their ethnic identities (Paling, 2017; Abedi, 2017). Discrimination can take place at different levels and is not always explicit. Instead, immigrants often face subtle forms of racism in their everyday life (Paling, 2016). These subtle insults become meaningful because of their cumulative nature and provide insight into predominant immigration ideologies that favour assimilation over integration.

One way this stance towards cultural assimilation can be observed is by looking at the treatment of immigrants’ names. Names are a constant part of our life, as we use them every day within conversations, when we identify others or ourselves, or when we sign a document. In addition to this, names are often the first bit of information that we learn about others (Dechief, 2015: 4). Not only do names exist in every society, but they are also considered to be a human universal (Bramwell, 2016: 265). At the same time, there is an extraordinary variety of names in the world as naming conventions differ among cultures. Immigrants’ names are often mispronounced by members of the host society who might also encourage newcomers to change their names in order to “fit in”. By examining the treatment of the names of newcomer youths in London, Ontario, I will
link forms of microaggressions\textsuperscript{1} to larger issues of immigrant integration such as ideologies that include a preference towards cultural assimilation. At the same time, I will demonstrate how some of these newcomer youths use their names in order to facilitate integration and to advocate for cultural diversity.

1.1 The Study of Names

Names are usually studied within the field of onomastics, which is considered to be a subdiscipline of linguistics, in particular of lexicology, the study of words. This is because names are not only embedded in, but also transmitted through language (Nicolaisen, 2015: 223). Nonetheless, names are not just equated with words: “Though names and words share many characteristics, they differ in one major respect which has fundamental consequences: their semantic properties” (ibid.). While words must have a lexical meaning to fulfill their connotative function, this is not expected for names; in fact, it is precisely “their capacity to function while being opaque semantically that makes them such fascinating and useful evidence for scholarly investigation” (ibid.). Many names started out as words, but when taking on onymic meaning we can then recognize those words as names. Consequently, a lexical meaning is not a requirement for a name. As Nicolaisen summarizes it: “We need to know names, not understand them” (ibid.). Even though some names derive from words (or lexemes), any “pronounceable sequence of sounds/letters can become a name” (ibid.: 224). Names do not need a semantic meaning in order to fulfill their function. Thus, when we consider all the meaningful words in a particular language to make up the language’s lexicon “the equivalent corpus

\textsuperscript{1} See page 43.
of names may be regarded as an onomasticon, which, like a lexicon, may range from all
the names embedded in any culture or language to the personal inventory of names
known to one individual” (ibid.). So, just like we can expand our lexicon by learning new
words, when we encounter previously unfamiliar names they are then added to our
onomasticon, which we can almost consider to be our personal dictionary of names.

Accordingly, within onomastics the relationship between words and names is
recognized, but at the same time, names are also considered to be different from words
and form their own unique category. My research is concerned with what Dechief refers
to as “critical anthroponomy” (2015: 14). Anthroponomy is the study of personal names,
while the term “critical” indicates taking an evaluative stance towards culture and
society. Critical anthroponomy then falls under the category of socio-onomastics, which
takes into account the role of names in society, as well as the usage of names, but also the
extended meaning of names, e.g. as markers of human identity (Nicolaisen, 2015: 225).

1.2 Names and Anthropology
In general, it can be said that names have not been a major topic within the field of
anthropology, though the interest in personal names has recently increased. For instance,
names have been important when studying kinship and allocating group memberships. At
the same time, anthropologists have compared naming systems (Alford, 1988),
researched naming ceremonies (Fisher, 2003), looked at names in social and political
practices (Alia, 2011), or focused on names as entities in themselves (Maybury-Lewis,
1984). When studying names, anthropologists generally simultaneously study the society
and community that the names are used in (Bramwell, 2016: 265). For example, Pina-
Cabral (2010) explored what the notion of the “truth of” names means to Portuguese-
speakers who use different names in order to adapt to the multi-ethnic environments they are living in. In order to understand which names are considered to be “truer” than others, Pina-Cabral had to consider the various social, cultural, and historical factors that had shaped the communities his participants lived in. Thus, anthropologists normally situate the study of names within the relevant socio-cultural context.

Looking at anthropological theories, names can be understood in many different ways. In a Boasian sense, which sees culture as a collection of behaviours, names can be seen to be determined by their cultural environment (Bramwell, 2016: 269). This means culture, as it has an impact on behaviour, also influences naming practices, and within each society culture will inform how names are chosen and given. Following Malinowski’s thinking and taking a more functionalist approach, culture is considered to be interconnected with society. Functionalism complies with an organic analogy, in which all parts of a society, including culture, function as a whole, and whereas a change in one function will affect the entire system. Consequently, the linked, organic view of culture created within this framework places names as part of a larger system, which will be affected by changes elsewhere in the cultural order. However, the framework need not to be a universal one, but one which fits naming practices in each case with reference to how that specific culture functions. (Bramwell, 2016: 270)

Names then can be influenced by any changes in society or culture. This can, for instance, be observed in colonial contexts, e.g. Spanish name usage by indigenous Latin Americans, but also in changing global contexts, e.g. parents naming their children with “international” names.

Vom Bruck and Bodenhorn, on the other hand, highlight a more social function of names: “The act of naming has the potential to implicate infants in relations through
which they become inserted into, and ultimately will act upon, a social matrix” (2006: 3). They suggest that names give rise to a person’s sociality, in which a name-bearer will be associated, but also identify themselves with certain social groups. Accordingly, names will have a high impact on social identity, while also strongly influencing self-identity. Moreover, vom Bruck and Bodenhorn recognize that names contain or convey other information about the name-bearer such as gender, kinship, origin, or religion, while simultaneously providing “the vehicle for crossing boundaries between those very same categories” (ibid.: 4). Names have the capacity to fix and detach; they can become identical with the name-bearer and hence, fix them as an individual or member of a group, but “it is their detachability that renders names a political tool for establishing and erasing formal identity, and gives them commodity-like value” (ibid.). Similar to Bourdieu’s (2006) economic view of language, names then can be seen as commodities, which provide either access to power or resources or limit a person. In extreme cases names, just like any commodity, can even be taken away from their owner (vom Bruck and Bodenhorn, 2006: 2)

While names can be detached from a person, they are nonetheless often equated with personhood. As vom Bruck and Bodenholz (ibid.: 3) point out, names are what turn us from “anybodies” into “somebodies.” By receiving a name, we are “called into humanity” (Pina-Cabral, 2015: 183), it is what ultimately acknowledges us as an existing person. Anthropologists thus recognize names as markers of personhood.

In conclusion, from an anthropological perspective “names individualize, classify, and tie people’s identity into the practices of their communities: to employ names is to create social action through language and culture” (Bramwell, 2016: 278). Within
anthropology, names cannot be separated from the community that uses them and names are deeply interwoven into people’s cultures. Moreover, “comparative ethnography reveals that names are often thought to express—and in some instances even to form—core elements of one’s person” (vom Bruck and Bodenhorn, 2006: 4). For this reason, there is generally a strong connection between the self and the name. This is similar to Bourdieu’s (1991: 120) argument that naming is an “act of institution,” which basically imposes a social essence onto somebody. Bourdieu describes an act of institution as an act of communication that “signifies to someone what his identity is, but in a way that both expresses it to him and imposes it on him by expressing it in front of everyone […] and thus informing him in an authoritative manner of what he is and what he must be” (ibid.: 121). From this perspective, names will ascribe identities to the name-bearer, while also offering an opportunity for self-identification.

1.3 Names, Agency, and Power

As pointed out above, names involve but also influence social actions. As a result, names are closely linked to agency. Agency as a concept is closely linked to personhood and the self. Ahearn (2016: 275) defines it as “the socio-culturally mediated capacity to act [which] is an essential aspect of, and counterpart to, power”. In a similar way, Duranti understands agency as

the property of those entities (i) that have some degree of control over their own behaviour, (ii) whose actions in the world affect other entities’ (and sometimes their own), and (iii) whose actions are the objects of evaluation (e.g. in terms of their responsibility for a given outcome. (2004: 451)
Hence, agency emphasizes a person’s ability to act, taking into consideration that each action has an effect on social interactions and that each action is constrained by the limits of the social institutions.

As mentioned, agency is also linked to power, or more specifically to power relations. A person who has power possesses the ability to impact other people’s actions and decisions. Drawing on Foucault’s concept of governmentality, Ahearn states that one aspect of power involves “actions upon other’s actions” (2006: 277), it is thus centered around one person or group acting against another. Power is more of a form of government, “that is, the governing of one person by another through the structuring of that person’s fields of possible actions” (ibid.: 278). Consequently, power involves one person acting and influencing or constraining another person’s actions and available possibilities.

Power affects names in many different ways: For instance, only a person who holds power can name somebody, thus power is located in the capability to name others and in the act of naming itself. Furthermore, power is also located within names themselves. A person with a more powerful name is less likely to be limited in their actions. For example, in Canada only a parent or legal guardian can officially name a newborn, meaning they often hold more power over the newborn than their extended family members. In the same way names can also be understood as signs, and thus they do not only “say” things, but also “do” things (vom Bruck and Bodenhorn, 2006: 5), which links them to Duranti’s act-constituting agency. For example, a name also serves as an index. When we hear a name, we frequently make assumptions about the name-bearer’s identity, such as gender, ethnicity, race, social class, religion, or language
abilities. Therefore, names can be powerful markers that can either work for one’s advantage (if received to be powerful) or disadvantage. This is related to the economic nature given to names in which some names can be of greater or lesser value. Besides, there is power in the ability to use other’s names; some names are secret and not known to everybody, and in the same way, endearing nicknames, for instance, can only be used by people who have been granted that privilege, while unwanted nicknames used for teasing or humiliation can challenge a person’s position of power.

As already emphasized, names can be seen as commodities, which can be removed from their owner. In this case, the powerful nature of names means that taking away one’s name is almost like taking one’s identity:

That identities can be stolen, traded, suspended, and even erased through the name reveals the profound political power in the capacity to name; it illustrates the property-like potential in names to transact social value; and it brings into view the power connection between name and self-identity. (vom Bruck and Bodenhorn, 2006: 2)

This connection between names and self-identity imbues the use of names with even more power. Because of this, it is not surprising that the misuse of names has an effect on the name-bearer: “[…] the fact is that a person’s name is seen as somehow continuous with a person’s value, so nowhere can names be used in an absurd or irresponsible way without that having implications for the bearer” (Pina-Cabral, 2015: 186). The misuse of a person’s name can have several impacts, ranging from negating the significance of one’s culture and identities (Kohli and Solórzano, 2012: 444) to such extremes as signaling “these names aren’t worth getting right, which is to say, these people aren’t worth getting right” (Barchas-Lichtenstein, 2017: n.p.), thus basically denying the acceptance of their personhood.
1.4 Names in the Context of Immigration

When people immigrate, they often bring names with them that can pose challenges for the host society to pronounce and which they might not be able to categorize immediately. Especially in multicultural societies, there is often a great diversity in names reflecting not only people’s linguistic, but also cultural backgrounds. Because names are part of our everyday life, they play an important role in the process of integration and the different dimensions of it, as will be shown throughout this thesis. However, the significance of names often gets little attention by the public and academia alike. Research concerning personal names in the context of immigration has predominantly been conducted in North America (Dechief 2015; Pennesi, 2016a; Thompson, 2006) and Europe (Gerhards and Hans, 2009; Wykes 2015) and has been of interest within different disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and psychology. While having been carried out in different countries, there are some similarities in regard to the foci of the research. A larger number of studies has concentrated on economic discrimination (Bursell, 2015; Eid, 2012; Oreopulous and Dechief, 2012), in which it has been shown that immigrants with foreign-sounding names are less likely to be invited to job interviews or to be offered a position. Within Canada, Oreopulos and Dechief (2012) concentrated on resumé discrimination in Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver, while Eid (2012) carried out research exclusively in Montreal. All discovered that resumes with English or French names were a lot more likely to hear back from employers than people with foreign-sounding names.

Since many immigrants experience problems with their names, it has also been explored how immigrant parents decide to name their second-generation children,
whether they are given a name that “fits in” within the host society, or an ethnic name that connects them with their cultural and ethnic roots. Parents are generally aware of how giving a child an ethnic name might lead to discrimination or racism (Wykes, 2015). Nonetheless, it has also been argued that parents who chose a non-ethnic name show a high degree of acculturation, while the choice of an ethnic name indicates cultural maintenance (Gerhard and Hans, 2008). Along the same lines, researchers have investigated whether adult immigrants alter their own names in order to facilitate their own integration or acculturation. Dechief (2015) looked at how immigrants respond to name challenges and balance them between different audiences in order to achieve belonging in Ontario, an occurrence she refers to as “identity labour”. She found that the way immigrants use a name depends on the type of audience they interact with and that most participants of her study engaged in minor name alterations that still honoured the original name. Meanwhile, Pennesi (2016a) explored how newcomers to Canada who do not assimilate their names challenge ideologies of integration. By insisting on the correct pronunciation and spelling of their names rather than changing it, immigrants are redistributing responsibility for integration to the Canadian society, whom they expect to learn the correct pronunciation of their seemingly difficult names.

Likewise, researchers have explored immigrants’ name use and name diversity within university populations. Heffernan (2010) found that Korean and Chinese international students coming to Canada usually adopt an English name for pragmatic reasons, but he also considers it to be a cultural phenomenon. Chinese and Korean people use several names throughout their lifetime, for this reason taking on an additional Anglophone name is an extension of their cultural practices (ibid.: 32). Pennesi (2014),
on the other hand, examined the treatment of names during a convocation at a Canadian university and the resulting consequences for the students whose names were marked as difficult or mispronounced, such as emphasizing their “otherness” and treating them as outsiders of the dominant society. Within the United States, for example, some research has exclusively considered the challenges of high school students with ethnic names (Kohli and Solórzano, 2012; Bucholtz, 2016), but in the context of Canada literature mentioning youth immigrants’ name challenges has been comparatively sparser.

While academic literature pertaining to names and immigration is somewhat limited, it is nevertheless a topic that affects many people, including both immigrants whose names get misspelled or mispronounced, and members of the host society who are unsure how to use those unfamiliar names or who might consider them as a basis for discrimination. This is evident in the number of news items, articles, videos, radio segments, and blog entries in which people share stories about their “complicated” names, give reasons why they changed their names to avoid problems, or show their pride for having a name that reflects their heritage (e.g. Barchas-Lichtenstein, 2017; Ogunyemi, 2017; Wei, 2015). For all the youths whom I interviewed names were an important part of who they are and how they saw themselves. They all had many stories to share about their names that related to their immigration experiences.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis
The multiculturalism policy in Canada views integration as a two-way process involving both accommodations by the immigrants and members of the host society. Because of this, my research focuses on two main questions representing this two-way process. First, I am investigating how the names of newcomer youths are treated by members of the
dominant society. At the same time, I focus on the youths’ reactions to those treatments and how they themselves employ their names in the context of immigration. I argue that the treatment of immigrants’ names in social interactions between immigrants and the host society reveals immigration ideologies indicating either an integrationalist or assimilationist attitude. I will show how the latter one becomes evident in the microaggressive treatment of newcomer youths’ names and thus opposes multiculturalism which prescribes an integrationalist attitude.

In the next chapter I describe the methodology used for my research. Here, I introduce my field site, the Cross Cultural Learner Centre in London, Ontario, and describe how I gained access to participants. I also explain why I decided to use directed, semi-structured interviews as my primary research method and describe the nature of the interviews.

Chapter three examines the nature of immigration within Canada, particularly focusing on the city of London. Using Berry’s (1997) model of acculturation strategies, I describe how the multiculturalism policy in Canada is necessarily linked to an integrationalist attitude, thus building the framework for the following chapters. I describe the ideology of multiculturalism and how the actual practice of it varies by delegating the responsibility of immigrant integration to newcomers themselves. I then emphasize special challenges faced by youth immigrants and their emphasis on social integration.

In chapter four I analyze how the participants’ names are treated by the host society, and how some of these treatments can be understood as forms of othering and microaggressions. I show how the microaggressive treatment of immigrants’ names
extends onto newcomer youths and regulates their belonging, while also creating a power imbalance between the youths and the host society. I describe my participants’ reactions to these microaggressions and the immigration ideologies that become evident in those treatments.

In chapter five I look at the close relationship between names and identity and how this relationship becomes meaningful in interactions with others. I explain the naming strategies that some of newcomer youths use in order to create a bicultural identity, thus being in line with the aims of immigrant integration. I demonstrate how their behavior has some similarities to adult immigrants who accept popular mispronunciations of their names and continue to use them, but differs from those adults who use name changes as a passing strategy.

Finally, in the last section I describe initiatives and guidelines that are currently being introduced in order to build awareness for the importance of treating immigrants’ names correctly, and suggest ways in which they could be implemented in order to aid newcomer youths in Canada, especially in a school setting.

1.6 Notes on Terminology

I am using the term **Canadian name** to refer to any name that appears as unmarked in Canadian society. While this is a subjective notion, these names are often of English or French origin. They can also be names derived from other languages, which over time have become accepted as normative Canadian names. The term **ethnic name**, on the other hand, refers to any name that appears to be marked in Canadian society. Again, this is a subjective notion and usually includes names brought by recent immigrants, frequently containing sounds not found in Canada’s official languages. The
differentiation between ethnic and Canadian names is based on the interpretation of my data and is not intended as a generalization.
Chapter 2 : Methodology

This chapter outlines how I obtained the data for my research and which approaches I took to analyze it. Since the majority of my data was collected from semi-structured interviews complimented by fieldnotes, I describe how I gained access to participants through volunteering at the London Cross Cultural Learner Centre (CCLC), as well as the nature and format of these interviews. Additionally, I will explain why I chose the CCLC as a field site. I will then provide an overview of all participants, the correct pronunciation of their names, and how I coded the collected data.

2.1 Volunteering at the Cross Cultural Learner Centre

The Cross Cultural Learner Centre is a community organization in downtown London that first opened its doors in 1968. It is located right next to H.B. Beal Secondary School, and within one block from the Catholic Central High School. At first, the CCLC was a part of the University of Western Ontario and served as the first Global Education Centre in Canada (Cross Cultural Learner Centre, 2013a). Later, it extended its services to help with refugee needs, and eventually became a refugee reception centre, while also starting to provide settlement services (ibid.). The Cross Cultural Learner Centre made it its mission to provide integration services and support to newcomers and to promote intercultural awareness and understanding (ibid.) As such, the CCLC mostly attracts recent newcomers, but often immigrants who have already been living in Canada offer to volunteer and share their experiences in order to help newly arrived immigrants to settle in.
An important program offered by the CCLC is the Community Connections Program. As part of this program, newcomers are not only provided with opportunities to meet local people and improve their language skills, but also to become familiar with the London community and Canadian culture (Cross Cultural Learner Centre, 2013b). The Community Connections Program offers a youth program which “encourages newcomer youth and local youth interaction through mentorship, access to our resources, team sports, workshops and other community engagement/participation” (ibid.) through engaging them in a wide variety of activities, including music, cooking, soccer, arts, field trips, and tutoring. The group activities are open to any newcomer youth between 13 and 24 years. Most attendees are high school students from various cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

I previously had planned to carry out my research at a local high school, since this is the place where youths spend most of their time and in which a lot of social interchanges involving names happen. Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain permission for this from the Research Ethics Board, as schools in London require a separate ethics protocol in addition to the one by the university. The schools’ ethic board is run by the local school boards and often requires an application several months in advance. Because I was ready to begin field work in April and the school year ends in June, I needed a new field site in which newcomer youths frequently gather and where I could interact with them on a regular basis. I then chose the CCLC because it offers a separate program for newcomer youths with ongoing sessions that also run over the summer months.

The CCLC is a well-known community organization that supports immigrants and provides a place for newcomers from any country, leading to a quite diverse clientele.
Furthermore, the CCLC actively advocates for immigrant integration and thus takes on a leading role within the community. In addition to this, the CCLC’s building is centrally located and easily accessible by public transportation. This, along with the fact that it is right across from H.B. Beal Secondary School and close to Catholic Central High School, makes it easy for high school students to come to the youth program. Students who attend the program also receive a free bus ticket for their way home, which further increases the program’s attraction. Moreover, the CCLC has generally been open to academic research, and the staff members working with the youths were very supportive of my project, as well as letting me attend the various activities which they organized.

After completing my volunteer training and submitting relevant documents such as my research proposal, a timeline, and preliminary interview questions, I received permission to conduct my research with the youth group. I volunteered at the CCLC from mid-April 2017 until the end of August 2017, just before the youth program was paused for the rest of the summer. I was free to choose in which activities I wanted to participate, as long as I had permission from the respective staff members.

I had my first volunteer shift during lunch hour, a time when mostly students from the nearby H.B. Beal Secondary School and Catholic Central High School come over to the CCLC to eat lunch, study, or meet their friends. As part of the regular after-school program, I also attended an art class, in which the youths were currently working on a wall mural about integration and cultural diversity. Here, I normally helped to set up before the activity started and to clean up afterwards, while also painting alongside the youths. In addition to this, I volunteered as a tutor at the homework tutoring sessions, which were offered once to twice a week. Here, there were normally also other
volunteers. Every Friday, I also attended a program called “Freestyle Friday,” for which the youths cooked together, watched a movie, or just chatted with their friends. In the summer time, Freestyle Friday activities also included going to festivals downtown such as the TD Sunfest or the London Food Festival. I always participated in every Freestyle Friday activity, while again usually helping to set up.

During the summer months, the CCLC youth group did not offer its regular activities, but instead held different summer camps that normally ran from Monday to Thursday. Freestyle Fridays continued to be held every week. I volunteered at film camp, sports camp, arts camp, and leadership camp, as well as at Community Cup, an annual family event that includes a soccer tournament. At film camp, I helped the youths to create their own movies, aiding them with their ideas, filming, and editing. During sports camp, there were no real activities due to staffing issues at the CCLC, for which reason the youths and me would gather at the CCLC and talk, watch videos, or help to hand out flyers advertising the Community Cup around London. At arts camp, I again took on a double-role as volunteer and participant, helping with organizing, but also participating in the activities, such as soap-carving. During leadership camp, I accompanied the youths to workshops about job hunting, self-esteem, or entrepreneurship along with two other volunteers, while also creating and delivering workshops on related topics myself.

Since I considered it important to first build rapport with potential interview participants, I volunteered at opportunities which usually would attract a group of youths who regularly attend those activities. Moreover, I wanted to participate in activities in which it was possible to engage in conversations with the youths. This was, for instance, why I did not volunteer at the soccer sessions. While sports activities offer a great chance
for bonding, there is little opportunity to actually engage in longer conversations.

Besides, I recognized that the activities organized by the CCLC were foregrounded.

While the youths obviously attended the youth program for the social aspect, they also wanted to participate in the scheduled activities. Moreover, I was welcomed to the CCLC as a volunteer, meaning I took on a double-role as a researcher and volunteer, which I both assigned equal importance to and tried to balance. This is why I went to parts of the CCLC’s youth program where I could combine both at the same time. The wall mural created in the arts program, for instance, was a project that lasted several weeks and it was easy to talk to the youths while painting. In a similar way, the same students usually came to the tutoring sessions, and once homework was done there was plenty of time to talk. Studying with the youths allowed me to interact with them and learn more about their lives. The Freestyle Fridays were generally more easy-going and relaxed, making them ideal to get to know the youths even better. They were also among the most popular activities. The summer camps, on the other hand, always lasted for four days in a row each, meaning that usually the same people would attend for those days. This made it easier to build rapport with the youths.

2.2 Choice of Method

My primary method of investigation was the use of semi-structured, directed interviews. Directed interviews involve asking more focused questions on a specific topic (Crane and Angrosino, 1992: 18). More importantly, however, they allow researchers to collect information that is comparable from case to case (ibid.). A semi-structured interview is “open ended, but follows a general script and covers a list of topics” (Bernard, 2011: 156). In this way, a semi-structured interview allows for the freedom to adapt interview
questions and to delve deeper into a person’s individual answers and stories, while simultaneously ensuring that the same topics are covered in each interview, thus again providing a basis for comparison of the data.

Since I did not have permission to conduct research at schools, where I could observe the treatment of names firsthand, interviews proved to be the most fruitful method. Interviews allowed for the youths to recount several instances in which their names were in the focus. At the same time, interviews enabled me to ask the youths for explanations and to talk about their life histories, which would have been more limited if, for example, I had chosen to conduct surveys or use questionnaires. Furthermore, interviews meant I had a greater variety of qualitative data that also lent itself to comparison. Nonetheless, one limitation was that I only had access to how the interview participants themselves experienced the treatment of their names, and thus relied on their representations. Besides, without observations of the recounted experiences I was missing out on interactional cues that might have influenced how names were used and perceived.

In addition to the interviews, I also recorded fieldnotes and observations in a notebook. Here, I made additional notes during interviews, recorded which of the youths I had met, how the youths introduced themselves to me and others, and how they treated their names among each other. I also took notes on observation regarding the youths’ cultural practices, for example, which languages they were speaking, what food they were eating, how they dressed, or how they displayed their religious faith.

2.3 Recruitment of Interview Participants

Since my primary research method was conducting interviews, it was important to first build rapport with the youths, especially since the interview questions included personal
experiences. Unlike the afterschool activities, which were usually frequented by the same regulars and students just dropping in, the summer camp offered the advantage that I was with the same people for almost a week, which helped me to build a better relationship with them. In addition to this, during the summer months, students were not stressed from preparing for final exams. Nonetheless, many students still attended summer classes in order to earn extra credits and reduce their course-load for the next school year. As an almost daily volunteer and attendee at the youth program, the youths soon became familiar with me, and I had multiple opportunities to interact with them, and even became friends with some of them. I normally would try to engage people in conversations either during volunteering or participating in activities myself, talking about school, immigration experiences, future plans, travelling, or anything that might arise in the context of the activities we were doing (e.g. sports, painting, etc.).

I actively started recruiting interview participants after I had volunteered for about a month, and after which I had gotten to know some of the more regular attendees. For most people, I directly asked them whether they were interested in being interviewed after telling them what my research project was about. Nobody denied my request, but for most participants it took a few days before we actually found time to do the interviews. For instance, during the tutoring sessions, I would conduct interviews once students were finished with their homework, but during other sessions I would be busy helping them with their projects. However, spending time volunteering with the youth first helped me to build a better level of rapport with them, so the youths were usually comfortable talking with me and sharing their experiences. I could also ask more private questions without being obtrusive. In return, I often shared my own experiences with my name and
immigrating to Canada. For some of the youths, I also helped them with writing job applications, essays, etc., so that they agreed to help me by participating in interviews in exchange. This helped to create an equal relationship between us by helping each other out. Some people also volunteered to participate after hearing about my project, or witnessing their friends being interviewed. Other participants asked their friends for me, or staff members helped me to “advertise” my project. Overall, everyone I asked was willing to participate.

I always joked that the only criteria to participate in the interviews was “to have a name.” Despite this, participants, other than the staff members which I also interviewed, obviously had to identify as adolescent immigrants to Canada. I welcomed participants from a variety of backgrounds in order to get a more diverse sample. Everyone of my participants had experiences involving their names, which made participation in the research appealing to them because they had something to contribute and an opportunity to share their stories. I think due to being an immigrant myself, people were also more willing to participate. Not only did I myself attend high school as a newcomer in Canada, but I further had anecdotes about mispronunciations about my own name to tell. This meant that the participants and I could relate to each other. Since a lot of the youths were grade 11 and 12 students they were also interested in university life, so I could provide them with some insights, and they accepted my research as part of my “school work.” Moreover, being 23 years old at the time of my research, I was also close enough to the youths’ age to still relate to them and was treated similarly to their peers. Because I am from a German cultural background, which was different than those of my interview participants, they usually also explained their culture-specific customs, such as how they
are named for instance, in greater detail to me, therefore enriching the collected data. Additionally, some of the youths had previously participated in another research project related to immigrant health and well-being a few months earlier, in which they were also interviewed. Because of this they were familiar with the nature of research and being involved in it was not a novelty for them.

2.4 Nature of the Interviews

After obtaining the participants’ informed consent, I asked them whether they would be comfortable with me recording the interview. I recorded every interview except for three, for which I relied on hand-written notes. All interviews were conducted at the CCLC, some were in isolated rooms, but for most of them other people were present. I always ensured that the participants were comfortable with having other people around. This meant that oftentimes friends of the participant were present during the interview process. However, this actually turned out to be beneficial, because their friends contributed to the interviews with anecdotes or extra questions for the interviewee. In many instances, they also helped to translate a word or expression, or generally made the participant feel more comfortable to talk about their experiences. Although the majority of the participants were currently enrolled in ESL classes, they were all able to converse in English, except for one interview during which a friend of the participant also functioned as translator, after having previously been interviewed themselves.

2.5 Interview Format

Each of my interviews was divided into three different sections which drew on the participants’ life histories. The first section served to get to know the personal
background of the interviewee and the surrounding circumstances of their immigration to Canada. For the second section, I inquired about how the participants themselves handle their name in order to see what their name use reveals about their own attitudes towards integration, but also about their names more generally. The final section focused on how other people of the host society treat the participants’ names as well as the newcomer youths’ reactions to it. This section was important because it provided insight into prevailing immigration ideologies through the treatment of names.

These are the three sections:

1) *Personal background and Canadian experiences:* age, cultural and linguistic background, length of stay in Canada, school experiences in Canada, general immigration experience in Canada

2) *Own name and the self:* story of their name, meanings and perceptions of the name, feelings and attitudes towards the name

3) *Own name in interaction with others:* how do other people treat their names, are their names commonly mispronounced, how do others react to the names

For staff members, I adapted the questions, while also asking them about their own experiences with their names. I focused on their observations and opinions about newcomer youths’ general experiences with their names.

### 2.6 Interview Participants

Overall, I conducted 20 semi-structured interviews, including 17 newcomer youths and three staff members, who were all involved with the youth programming. Seven of the youth interview participants were females, and ten were males, while the staff members included two males and one female. The youths’ ages ranged from 16 years to 23 years
old and the majority of them were students at different local high schools in London. Two were students at centres for adult education, and one was a college student. Among the staff members I interviewed, two were immigrants and one was a second-generation immigrant. Most of the youths that participated in my research had been in Canada for less than a year, but some of them had been living in Canada for up to seven years. The interview participants identified themselves with the following countries to varying degrees: Albania, Canada, Democratic Republic of Congo, Dubai, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Nigeria, Palestine, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, and the United States of America. This means they were either places where they had lived for a long time, where they were born, or which they considered their heritage places.

For each participant, I received permission to use the name that functions as their first name in Canada, however, no other real names will be given, in order to protect their privacy. Because the participants’ names do not necessarily align with the institutionally required structure of names in Canada, I asked every interviewee which component of their names they are using as their first, middle, or last name in Canada. For example, some participants are using a family member’s name as their last name here in Canada, consequently, the name would technically be considered a first name. Nonetheless, I will describe the naming components in the way the participants identified them according to Canadian naming structures. In cases where it was essential to include components other than their first name in the analysis, I used pseudonyms, which are marked with an asterisk (*). The pseudonyms reflect similar attributes as the original name and derive from the same language. Two participants were named Mustafa, which is why they are simply being differentiated as Mustafa 1 and Mustafa 2.
The following chart (table 1) illustrates the participants’ first names in the way they would spell their first names in Canada, as well as an approximate pronunciation of their names in the International Phonetic Alphabet.

**Table 1 Names of the Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pronunciation in IPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam (staff)</td>
<td>[ˈædəm] / [ˈadam]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deema</td>
<td>[ˈdima]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emal (staff)</td>
<td>[ˈɪmal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>[ˈfares]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>[ˈfatˤima]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firas (staff)</td>
<td>[fɪras]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godswill</td>
<td>[ˈɡɔdzwil]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamza</td>
<td>[ˈhamza]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henok</td>
<td>[ˈhɛnɔk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>[dʒɔn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>[ˈmaha]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>[ˈmustafa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>[rafaˈela]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raneem</td>
<td>[raˈnim]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryad</td>
<td>[riɑd]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>[ˈsaːra]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiruq</td>
<td>[ʃuˈruːq]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toussin</td>
<td>[ˈtusɛ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeyad</td>
<td>[ˈzijad]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7 Transcribing and Coding

All interviews were transcribed verbatim in Microsoft Word, using a foot pedal and a transcription software. After many hours of transcribing, I printed a hard copy for each interview in which I noted observations and highlighted passages which stood out to me. From this highlighting, I came up with initial categories for coding, which I adapted and added to as I was working through the data using NVIVO 11. The chart below lists my three main categories relevant for this analysis, as well as the parent nodes that each category entails. For each node I further had generally around 4 to 5 child nodes, with a
total of 77 child nodes. The child nodes corresponded to the different points and perspectives reflected in the interviews that related to the topic of the parent node.

Table 2 Nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Parent Nodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other’s reactions | • Calling them a different name  
• Commenting  
• Mispronouncing, misspelling  
• Avoidance, forgetting  
• Bullying  
• Used to name diversity |
| Own reactions      | • Labeling  
• Like sharing story of name  
• Getting upset  
• Changing, adapting name  
• Dealing with mispronunciations  
• Repeating and correcting |
| Name and self      | • Meaning  
• Ownership  
• Perception of name  
• Uniqueness  
• Identity |
Chapter 3: Immigration and Integration in Canada - Ideology versus Practice

This chapter will first examine who the immigrants are that have decided to settle in Ontario and, in particular, in London, and how the origin of the immigrant groups have changed over time, leading to a very diverse society with likewise diverse personal names. Following this, I will discuss the four different acculturation strategies as developed by Berry (1997), in order to see how immigrants adapt or do not adapt to their new surroundings. Then, I will show how the Multiculturalism Act in Canada is necessarily linked to an integrationalist attitude and demonstrate how the ideology of multiculturalism varies from its actual practice, in which immigrants are often expected to assimilate or experience different forms of racism. I also point out how these ideologies can be understood in regard to names. Finally, I investigate the unique challenges that youth immigrants face as compared to adult immigrants.

3.1 Immigration in Ontario and London

For the past several decades, Ontario has received the majority of newcomers to Canada, as well as often large numbers of refugees (Statistics Canada, 2017a). While immigrants now choose to settle more widespread in geographical terms, including the Prairies and Atlantic provinces, Ontario remains Canada’s most popular province for immigrants (ibid.), and still receives large numbers of refugees. Between 2015 and 2016, out of almost 30,000 Syrian refugees who came to Canada, over 40 percent settled in Ontario (Gajewski, 2016). As a matter of fact, with 29.1 percent of Ontario’s population being immigrants, the number is actually higher than the 21.9 percent for Canada’s overall immigrant population (Statistics Canada, 2017d).
From the 1950s to 1990s, some of the largest immigrant groups came from Hungary, the Czech Republic, Uganda, Southeast Asia, Somalia, and Sudan (Biles et al., 2011b: 195). More recently, the majority of immigrants arrived from Asia, including the Middle East, and accounted for over 60 percent of all immigrants to Canada between 2011 and 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2017b). In 2016, Asian immigrants still accounted for the majority, with the second largest group being immigrants from Africa, followed by Europe (Statistics Canada, 2017a). These groups are also reflected in my own data, as 11 participants were Middle Eastern followed by 6 newcomers from Africa. In addition to this, many research participants pointed out that there are large populations of Arab students at their school, reflecting Canada’s recent increase in Middle Eastern immigrants.

The city of London where I conducted my research is located in the southwest of Ontario, and has a total population of 383,822 people, with about 21.8 percent being immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2017e). It is important to note that 11,595 immigrants arrived in London alone between 2011 and 2016 (ibid.). In addition to this, London is also the third largest recipient of Syrian refugees within Ontario, and the seventh within all of Canada (Datas Bere, 2017). With over 20 percent of London’s population reporting a mother-tongue other than English or French, the city has become increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse. This diversity also extends towards the youth population of London; people coming to London aged between 15 and 24 years at the time of immigration were the second largest group after 25 to 44 years old immigrants (Statistics Canada, 2017e), meaning that the student population at schools has become much more
diverse over the recent years. This was also observed by staff members at the CCLC who noticed that ESL programs at school were constantly growing and expanding.

All in all, immigration nowadays is more of a distinctive characteristic of Canadian society than ever before and the numbers are unlikely to decrease in the future. De facto, it is predicted that by 2036, between 24.5 and 30 percent of Canada’s population will be foreign-born (Statistics Canada, 2017a). Because of this it is important to consider how immigrants are integrating into Canadian society.

3.2 Ethnic and Linguistic Diversity in London, ON

The city of London is located on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, but was settled by Europeans from the British Isles in the early 1800s. From village to town all the way to becoming a city in 1856, London has preserved a rather conservative reputation (Bradford and Esses, 2012: 87). Nevertheless, with more immigrants settling in the 1960s, by 1980, the ethnic composition of London had shifted so that 25-30 percent of London’s population was of non-British origin. The largest minority ethnic groups represented were still predominantly European—Germans, Dutch, Italians, and Portuguese—but the population of refugees from Central and South America, Poland, Africa, and Southeast Asia was growing. (ibid.: 88)

However, in most recent years the number of immigrants from Asia and the Middle East have been going up. Table 3 below illustrates the top ten immigrant places of birth within London in the two most recent censuses. The left number represents the total

immigrant population, while the right number focuses on the most recent arrivals prior to the time of the census. The table clearly shows the influence of the large number of Syrian refugees whom London welcomed, placing Syria as the top country of immigrant places of birth of recent arrivals. This also led to a change in London’s linguistic landscape: While previously Spanish used to be the most spoken unofficial language within London, Arabic is now the second most spoken language right after English (Mehta 2017). This is also reflected at the CCLC, where most newcomers who attended the youth group spoke Arabic as their first language. Many of my participants (about one quarter) were of Syrian origin, thus representing the currently largest immigration group, and thirteen interview participants were fluent in Arabic. This increase in Middle Eastern immigrants also means that people are starting to encounter more and more Arabic names, in addition to the names of other immigration groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Census</th>
<th>2016 Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recent Arrivals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Top 10 Immigrant Places of Birth within London

### 3.3 Acculturation Strategies

Whenever immigration occurs, it triggers the process of acculturation, which “comprehends those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different
cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups” (Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits 1936: 149).

As a consequence, all cultural groups involved in the immigration process will experience some sort of cultural change and undergo acculturation. However, it is important to point out that there are different acculturation strategies, and that acculturation is not synonymous with the process of assimilation (Berry 1997: 7). These strategies will be discussed below.

Often, there is a power imbalance between the different cultures that meet through immigration. In many cases, this leads to labeling the dominant culture as the “mainstream,” while the other cultural groups will be referred to as “minorities,” or “ethnic groups” (Berry 1997: 8). Again, it is often a political and social assumption that minority cultures should become part of the mainstream (ibid.). However, the question as to which acculturation strategy to employ must be dealt with by both groups. Berry states that

Strategies with respect to two major issues are usually worked out by groups and individuals in their daily encounters with each other. These issues are: cultural maintenance (to what extent are cultural identity and characteristics considered to be important, and their maintenance strived for); and contact and participation (to what extent should they become involved in other cultural groups, or remain primarily among themselves). (ibid.: 9)

Consequently, the cultural groups’ opinions and actions related to cultural maintenance, contact and participation will influence their preference for which acculturation strategy they will follow, or expect other groups to follow.

All in all, Berry identifies a total of four different acculturation strategies: assimilation, separation or segregation, integration, and marginalization (Berry 1997; Montreuil and Bourhis, 2001). How to classify these strategies depends on the
perspective of the group, i.e. whether acculturation expectations are looked at from the point of view of the dominant or non-dominant cultural group. Since in many cases the dominant cultural group is the host society and the non-dominant cultural group those of the immigrants, these perspectives will be used in order to describe the acculturation strategies.

Employing the assimilationist strategy, it is understood that immigrants will completely adapt to the new host culture in order to become accepted as members of the society. This means that immigrants will abandon their heritage culture completely, and at the same time have a high level of contact and participation with the host society. Assimilation is also often referred to as a “melting pot” of cultures, in which all non-dominant cultures melt into the dominant one.

In the case of integration, however, it is acceptable for immigrants to maintain their heritage culture, and while immigrants adopt important features from the host society, the host society will also engage in cultural adaptations (Berry 1997; Montreuil and Bourhis, 2001). This makes integration a two-way process, in which both the immigrants and the host society, play a large role in adaptation. Integration then supports cultural maintenance, while simultaneously promoting immigrant participation within the community. Integration is sometimes described metaphorically as a “salad bowl,” meaning a mix of many cultures. It is also often understood that immigrants will eventually become bicultural, i.e. embodying their heritage cultural and the cultural ways of the host society.

When immigrants sustain their heritage culture and when there is no interaction between them and the host society, this is referred to as either segregation or separation.
Marginalization occurs when immigrants do not maintain their heritage culture, and when there is no interaction between immigrants and the host culture, often resulting in feelings of exclusion. Thus, segregation and marginalization usually only include minimal involvement or contact of the immigrants with the host community (see figure 1).

While government policies often influence which acculturation strategy should be employed, individuals also form their own opinions about their preferred models. For instance, research in Canada has shown that Portuguese, Hungarian, and Korean immigrants to Canada are most likely to adopt an integrationalist orientation, followed by an assimilationist one, which concurs with the expectations of the plural society in Canada (Montreuil and Bourhis, 2001: 699). Sometimes, the acculturation preference of members of the host society can also depend on the national origin of the immigrants (ibid.: 701). In these cases, for example, the host society will lean towards an integrationist attitude for immigrants whose culture and language are more similar to their own, while they might favour an assimilationist or segregationist orientation towards immigrants that they feel are too dissimilar to them or towards whom they hold a significant amount of negative stereotypes (ibid.).

Figure 1 Berry's Model of Acculturation
3.4 Multiculturalism and Integrationalist Attitude in Canada

In 1971, Canada passed the Multiculturalism Act, making it the world’s first country that included multiculturalism as an official policy (Government of Canada, 2012). Initially, the Canadian multiculturalism policy was implemented to address two interrelated developments in the country that needed political accommodation: the rise of Québécois nationalism in the 1960s and the claim of immigrants “that their cultural rights were not to be forgotten in the social and political struggle among Canada’s so-called British and French founding nations” (Winter, 2015: 642). In the years following the introduction of the policy, it served more as a symbolic value rather than creating social action. This, however, changed when more and more visible minorities entered Canada and multiculturalism was used to address issues of equity and antidiscrimination (ibid.). Because of this, it is impossible to discuss immigration to Canada today without considering multiculturalism.

Flearas and Elliot divide the concept of multiculturalism into five dimensions as: (1) an empirical fact, (2) an ideology, (3) practice, (4) critique, and (5) as a state policy (cited in Wong and Guo, 2015: 4). Acknowledging that multiculturalism is an empirical fact within Canada, I will first consider the ideology behind multiculturalism, drawing on it as a policy, in order to show how multiculturalism more or less prescribes an attitude that favours the integration of immigrants above all other acculturation strategies. Following this, I will describe multiculturalism as practice and how it differs from the ideology. This will later help to understand the different immigration ideologies that become evident in the treatment of newcomer youths’ names.
In its ideal form, the Multiculturalism Act assures equal rights to all Canadian citizens, and that each citizen can “keep their identities, can take pride in their ancestry and have a sense of belonging” (Government of Canada, 2012). Consequently, multiculturalism in Canada is necessarily linked to an integrational acculturation strategy. This is also supported by Berry’s argument that integration can only be achieved in explicitly multicultural societies (Berry, 1997). Multiculturalism ensures that every new citizen to Canada adopts some common attitudes, such as basic values of democracy, but at the same time feels “no pressure to assimilate and give up their culture” (ibid.).

Moreover, equality of opportunity is also at the core of multiculturalism. This can, for instance, include equal access to education, health care, housing, or job opportunities. Equality within a society prevents incidences of discrimination and racism and ensures that all people are treated the same way, while being able to practice their own cultural beliefs without facing any disadvantages. In terms of names this means that immigrants should not be facing any disadvantages based on having an ethnic-sounding name when applying for jobs or housing. It also means that they should not be pressured to change their names to English-sounding ones. Coming back to integration being a two-way process, this also indicates that Canadians have to learn how to accommodate non-Canadian names, but immigrants, on the other hand, must also show willingness to accommodate their names if necessary. The input of both groups is required in order to turn multiculturalism into a successful practice.

Unlike the ideology, the practice of multiculturalism in Canada, however, shows that integration is not fully understood as a two-way process within society, and that not everyone supports the idea of a multicultural society. Some Canadians argue that “the
multiculturalism policy is promoting too much diversity at the expense of unity” (Dewing, 2009:8). They consider immigrants as a cultural threat and argue that multiculturalism places too much emphasis on diversity, which results in neglect of Canadian values and beliefs. In this way, immigration is seen as posing a threat to the national culture and identity. Nonetheless, it has been shown that Canadians “are generally supportive of a multicultural society, at least in principle if not always in practice” (Dewing, 2009:8).

In reality the discourse of integration is often taken for granted, meaning that immigrants are expected to fit into the mainstream Canadian society and to become similar to the rest of the population (Li, 2003: 316). In this sense, integration is often assessed in terms of how well immigrants “converge to the average performance of native-born Canadians and their normative behavior and standard” (ibid.). In fact, “sixty-eight per cent of Canadians believe minorities should do more to fit in with mainstream society, instead of keeping their own customs and languages” (McGillivray, 2016). It thus indicates that immigrants should undergo more cultural accommodations. As a result, it becomes obvious that a more assimilationist approach is often favoured in which immigrants are expected to conform to the dominant culture of the Canadian majority.

That the ideology and the practice of multiculturalism are not always convergent can also be observed within London. Despite the fact that more and more immigrants are arriving in London, the city did not fare too well in terms of integration in the past. Various studies have shown that many immigrants were underemployed or low-income, and faced problems with finding housing or accessing adequate health care (Bradford and Esses, 2012: 92). In addition to this, as many ethnocultural community organizations had
to deal with funding concerns, immigrants found it difficult to access settlement services. Racism and discrimination were recurring themes that lead to the aforementioned issues. News articles show that even in 2017, racism was still an issue in London with rallies in the city being held by white supremacists and anti-Islamic groups (CBC News, 2017). The city recognizes that racism and prejudices are a present problem and has passed an Anti-Racism Act (Government of Ontario, 2017a), and at the same time developed a three-year anti-racism strategic plan (ibid., 2017b), in order to reduce discrimination. Participants in my research also described experiences of racism, in particular those who identified as Black found that there was discrimination based on skin-colour. One of my youth participants who identifies as a Black African says: “I’m not gonna say like there is discrimination [depending] on the skin, but there is. […] If I were a white guy, they might have a respect more than they are giving me now. I would say that.” Besides, many youths mentioned being singled out for their accents and considered it to be a form of discrimination. One Muslim girl also described how she feels different because she wears a hijab: “I’m wearing hijab, so I feel I’m different.”

Nevertheless, all participants felt positive about the fact that Canada is very culturally diverse. In fact, multiculturalism is now found to be an integral part of Canada (Dewing, 2009: 9). Many Canadians even consider multiculturalism an important part of the country’s national identity (Wong and Guo, 2015: 5). While successful integration is usually desirable for most immigrants, for local Canadians the integration of immigrants is of equal importance. Integration of all people keeps the society functioning, as unsuccessful integration will have many negative consequences, such as, for instance, ghettoization of neighbourhood areas, greater economic gaps, dissatisfied citizens, greater
political tension, or a rise in crime rates. Successful integration, however, means that immigrants will contribute to Canada’s economy, fill labour market gaps, and thus benefit Canada’s aging population (Biles et al., 2011a: 2). This is especially true for younger immigrants. Since integration also requires accommodation by the host society, Canadians need to be open towards immigration and cultural diversity, and display a willingness to be inclusive of everybody no matter their religion, ethnic or linguistic origin. This openness has to expand from institutions to individual citizens, and also includes the ways newcomers’ names are being treated.

3.5 Challenges for Youth Immigrants in Canada

About 34 percent of all newcomers to Canada are under the age of 25 (AMSSA, 2016), and as pointed out earlier, youths are the second largest immigration group within London. While people of all ages immigrate to Canada, immigration poses many special challenges for youths due to their age and the circumstances of their life cycle; and while there are many special services and programs offered for immigrant adults and children, it has been found that the needs of newcomer youths differ from those two groups (ibid.). In fact, it is much harder for teenagers to settle in Canada because they already have established themselves at school in their home country (Seat, 2003: 176). This was also obvious among my research participants who mentioned their friend groups that they had at school in their countries of origin. For example, Henok says about his country of origin, Ethiopia: “I lived there, like I have a lot of experiences there. I have all my friends from my country back home.”

While immigrant integration is a multi-dimensional process, encompassing among others social, cultural, political, and economic integration (Frideres, 2008: 79), for
newcomer youths social integration is generally one of their greatest concerns (Wilson-Forsberg, 2012: 6). Social integration is “the process by which newcomers become a part of the social, cultural, and institutional fabric of the host community or society while at the same time retaining their own cultural identity” (Heckmann, 1997: 80). It thus means becoming a part of the Canadian society, while still identifying with one’s heritage culture. Immigrant youths often emphasize “the need to fit in or belong, [and] the challenge of making friends” (Wilson-Forsberg, 2012: 6). Unlike adult immigrants who tend to stress economic integration and spend large amounts of time at their workplace, youths spend most time at school and school-related activities, such as clubs and homework. The adolescents who participated in my research all attended school, and many were involved in extra-curricular activities and were regularly volunteering in the London community, showing the emphasis they place on social interactions. While names can impact different dimensions of integration, for youths names can become a barrier in achieving social integration. In many cases the youths’ experiences in my research have shown how their names mark them as outsiders who do not belong and fit into Canadian society (see Chapter 4).

In addition to school, adolescents’ lives are also primarily shaped by their home, their friends, and the broader community (AMSSA, 2016). At school, newcomers will often face differences in the education system and might have a different level of education. Some of my interview participants, for instance, had already finished high school in their home countries. Nonetheless, their diplomas were not accredited, meaning they currently have to take courses at an education centre for adults where they are by far the youngest people in their classes. This made it even more difficult for them to fit in.
Friends will probably have the greatest impact on the integration process of newcomer youths. They are the people whom the youths spend the most time with at school, including doing homework together, playing sports, socializing after school. As a result, friends are an important aspect of newcomer youths’ social integration. This was also emphasized by the youths in my research. Most of the friends they made in Canada were of the same or similar cultural backgrounds as themselves, which led to some regretting not having any “real Canadian” friends. One major barrier that prevented the youths from connecting with others was their English language skills. Even when asking them to participate in my interviews, some youths were initially reluctant because they felt that their English skills were not proficient enough. For some newcomer youth, their English language abilities were also a reason why they enjoyed coming to the CCLC, because here they would not be judged for the way they speak. Language is often seen as one of the major barriers to integration and “is one of the highest ranked settlement challenges impacting many immigrant and refugee youth” and impacts “the integration of youth into all aspects of Canadian life” (OCASI, 2009: 16).

All this shows that the spheres which have the greatest impact on youth integration are at the social level. Research in Canada generally has shown that one of the areas in which immigrant youths face the largest barriers to integration are within their school communities (OCASI, 2009: 13; Seat, 2003: 166; Ngo and Schleifer, 2005). Thus, it is not surprising that the youths in my research mostly recalled name-related experiences from their school community, mostly including student-teacher interactions. As I will show in the next chapters, these are also the areas in which immigration ideologies are reflected within name use in social interactions.
3.6 Summary

The integrationalist attitude towards immigrants is implied within the Canadian Multiculturalism Act. While integration expects some degree of assimilation from newcomers, they are able to preserve their heritage culture, which ideally will eventually result in a stable biculturalism. Nevertheless, integration is considered to be a two-way process, involving both action and accommodations from the immigrants and the host society alike. However, the practice of multiculturalism in Canada often pushes immigrants to assimilate, and discrimination and racism are still an issue in today’s society. Successful integration takes places along many different dimensions, but for newcomer youths social integration is commonly prioritized.
Chapter 4: Names as Barriers - Reactions to Microaggressive Treatment of Names

This chapter explores how names oftentimes function as barriers to successful integration, by looking at how they trigger microaggressions in interactions with others. In particular, the chapter investigates four different kinds of microaggressions in relation to names: (1) renaming, (2) othering in the forms of attaching labels to the youths’ names or commenting on them, as well as (3) othering in the form of obligatory conversations prompted by hearing their names, and finally (4) microaggressions in terms of mispronouncing names. I will demonstrate how these types of microaggressions regulate the belonging of youth immigrants in Canadian society, and how they reinforce power imbalances between the adolescent newcomers and members of the host society.

4.1 Theoretical Background

Kohli and Solórzano (2012) focused on racism against high school students of colour in the USA through racial microaggressions as performed through having their names mispronounced by teachers in the classroom. Microaggressions are subtle forms of racism that occur in everyday life, and while they might not always be obviously identified as racist actions, microaggressions are still hurtful for the recipient (ibid.: 447). Often, microaggressions are of an unintentional or unconscious nature, but since they happen on a cumulative basis, they will still cause distress to the recipient. However, “the racial undertones to the mispronouncing of names […] are often understated, […] these are racial microaggressions – subtle daily insults that, as a form of racism, support a racial and cultural hierarchy of minority inferiority” (ibid.: 443). Because names are closely linked to one’s identity, the mispronunciation of students’ names, commenting
that their names are hard, or even renaming them, not only negates the significance of their names and heritage culture, but also of their identities (ibid.: 444). Furthermore, Kohli and Solórzano’s study demonstrates that while “racism is tied to race, it is not always acted out based on racial categories; it is also enacted based on factors affiliated with race such as language, immigration status and culture” (ibid.: 445), as well as names. This shows how presumed indexes of one’s race or ethnicity can serve as a basis for discrimination.

Names become a distinguishable racial category that is grounded in people’s language ideologies, which influence whether a name is considered to be Canadian or not. Ahearn defines language ideologies as the “attitudes, opinions, beliefs, or theories that we all have about language” (2017: 23). This includes all aspects of language such as language in general or particular languages, language use and users, and linguistic structures (ibid.). Language ideologies often appear to be “forms of common sense” (Hill, 2008: 34) and classify which use of language is considered to be good, bad, correct or incorrect. Language ideologies “place a focal emphasis on speakers’ ideas about language and discourse and about how these articulate with various social phenomena” (Kroskrity, 2000: 5). As follows, they allow “scholars to connect micro- with macro-level social interactions and to analyze questions of cultural identity, morality, power, inequality, and social stereotypes” (Ahearn, 2017: 24).

Kroskrity (2000) describes four features of language ideologies: Firstly, they always represent the interests of a specific social group that uses language ideologies to further promote and protect their interests. Secondly, in any society there are multiple language ideologies, for any society has various subgroups that hold their own ideologies.
Usually the dominant ideologies become naturalized, and thus are taken for granted by the group. In addition to this, the variety of linguistic ideologies can lead to in-group conflict if they are challenged. Thirdly, language users may or may not be aware of their language ideologies to varying degrees. Kroskrity suggests a correlational relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness and active contestation of ideologies [...] and by contrast, the correlation of merely practical consciousness with relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, and definitively dominant ideologies (ibid.: 19).

Lastly, language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk, in this way, as pointed out above, they link micro-level speech to macro-level social structures. Kroskrity adds that “language users’ ideologies bridge their sociocultural experience and their linguistic and discursive resources by constituting those linguistic and discursive forms as indexically tied to features of their sociocultural experience” (ibid.: 22).

Because names are expressed through language, people’s opinions about certain names are impacted by their language ideologies. In the context of immigration, language ideologies become especially apparent in the classification of names as Canadian or ethnic. Since language ideologies often appear to us as forms of common sense (Hill, 2008: 34), this categorization of names usually occurs without much consideration. In many instances, it seems obvious to us that a person with an English-sounding name must be a Canadian, while when we encounter an unfamiliar, ethnic-sounding name often assume the opposite. This shows how names are regarded as proxies for the name-bearer’s identity, such as (assumed) nationality or ethnicity. These language ideologies about names represent the beliefs of a specific social group, namely those that favour assimilation over integration, by treating non-English names as marked, as is expressed through microaggressions, and signaling that they do not belong within Canadian society.
Consequently, focusing on the treatment of immigrants’ names allows me to link those interactions to larger scale attitudes and beliefs about immigrant integration.

Sometimes, a name that previously was considered to be ethnic and non-Canadian, can over time become a Canadian name and loose its markedness. As Mateos, drawing on Lieberson, points out, “in rare cases, names brought by migrants end up becoming popular with the majority population, such as for example Eric (or Erik), Carl, Karen, Kelly, Maria or Dolores in the U.S.” (2014: 107). The name Eric, for instance, would also be considered non-marked in Canada, despite having an origin that is neither English nor French. This shows, that just like words, names can also be borrowed from other languages in a process called nativization (Barchas-Lichtenstein, 2017). Through nativization, ethnic names become an integrated part of the Canadian namescape and their phonetic structure is adapted to either English (Anglicization) or French (Francization).

4.2 Renaming

Renaming is not only a frequent form of microaggression, but sometimes, it is even required of the minority groups. In Canada, for example, the government carried out different projects that included the forced renaming of First Nations members. One of these instances was Project Surname that was initiated in the 1970s in the Canadian Arctic and required all Inuit to adopt a surname (Alia, 2006: 250). This was introduced along with a certification program, as part of which the births of Inuit children were recorded on birth certificates with first and last names, through which family names were brought into Inuit communities. The use of birth certificates was meant to represent the official image of a ‘normal’ family, in which the father is considered the head of the
household, despite this not always being the case in Inuit families (ibid.: 250).

Simultaneously, the certification program was also initiated in order to simplify record keeping of Inuit communities (ibid.). During Project Surname, all Inuit were renamed and received a surname, which was “intended to make Inuit like other Canadians” (ibid.). Consequently, forced renaming not only clearly demonstrates power imbalances in who has the power to name, but also reflects people’s language ideologies in the marking of which names belong and do not belong in society. In this case, the language ideologies reinforced the belief that a normal Canadian needs to have a family name, and thus reflected larger scale attitudes in which Inuit should assimilate to mainstream Canadian culture. It also ignored Inuit cultural customs, in which last names are not used and where beliefs about families differ.

Nowadays, immigrants’ names must conform to provincial naming laws and they must be transliterated into the Latin alphabet (Government of Canada, 2015). While some immigrants decide to adopt a Canadian-sounding name, immigrants are not required to do so. Nonetheless, members of minority groups are often expected by members of the dominant group to adopt a name that does not stand out as foreign, in order to increase their acceptance by the majority group. In this way renaming facilitates the minority group’s belonging, while at the same time distancing them from their heritage culture by adopting a non-ethnic name. As a consequence, imposed renaming often does not support integration, but instead serves as an advocate for cultural assimilation.

The examples below demonstrate different forms of imposed renaming that were experienced by the youths whom I interviewed: calling the person a completely different name, using a different component of a person’s name which they normally would not
use in those situations, and changing the spelling of a name. While all forms of renaming are supported by language ideologies and imposed by members of the dominant group who yield more power, the responses to them are not necessarily always negative, as the examples of Henok and Deema will show.

In the following passage, Zeyad, 18 years old, who is originally from Egypt and bilingual in English and Arabic, remembers introducing himself to a teacher on the first day at a new school in the United States, and how his teacher decided to rename him without his approval:

I was like my name is Zeyad. She was like ‘Oh.’ She said something totally- I don’t even remember what she said, such a total weird thing. ‘Ok. I’m just gonna call you Steven. I’m like ‘What, what, Steven?!’ Like [she] literally went from Zeyad to Steven. I’m like that’s a drastic change. Not even Z.

In Zeyad’s case, he remembers that the teacher first evaluated his name in a negative way, and then decided to call him Steven, an obvious English name, without asking him for permission. Bucholtz (2016) describes this phenomenon of renaming as deracialization, “the stripping of contextually marked ethnoracial meaning from an indexical form” (ibid.: 275). A more specific instance of deracialization is indexical bleaching, the process in which “an index sheds part of its social meaning” (ibid.). In Zeyad’s case, his name is an index of his cultural, linguistic, and racial background. By renaming him with the very Anglophone name Steven, Zeyad’s teacher stripped his name of the indexed ethnoracial meanings, thus denying or masking his heritage. This is not a form of just anglicizing a foreign name, but rather a complete renaming. As Zeyad points out, the name Steven is not even close to the pronunciation of his own name. Instead, it is quite different and begins with a completely different letter. We can understand renamings like this as coerced assimilation, in which immigrants and members of
minority groups are assigned Anglophone names in order to conform to the expectations of the host society, meaning that they should assimilate to the dominant culture, and to not stand out as a person of ethnic heritage. This belief is supported by language ideologies, in which Steven is seen as an obvious unmarked name, one that represents American culture, while Zeyad’s names is classified as a marked name, one that is not part of American society and reflects non-American culture.

After living in the United States, Zeyad moved to Canada about two years ago. Here, at a local high school in London, he has also experienced renaming: “[At] London High School*, the teachers there trash names. They trash. My name, the teacher said Rias. Where did you get the R? […] My first name is Zeyad, no R.” Unlike his experience in the United States, the Canadian teacher renamed him with a non-English name. While deracialization masks a person’s ethnic origin, this act of renaming emphasized Zeyad’s otherness by singling him out. Instead of trying to pronounce or even remember Zeyad’s real name, he is assigned another ethnic name, indicating a non-integrationalist attitude of the teacher in which immigrants’ cultural origins are being devalued. This teacher’s language ideologies considered both names, Zeyad and Rias as marked names and of lesser value than English names, since they both could be interchanged. It also indicates that a name that does not belong does not deserve respectful treatment, e.g. remembering or learning it.

While in the examples above, Zeyad was assigned completely new names, renaming of the youths in my research also occurred by using a different component of their names. In those cases, the youths would normally not use the specific component to identify themselves in those situations. One example is illustrated in Henok’s case in the
following passage. Henok, 19 years old, came to Canada about a year ago and was born and raised in Ethiopia. His first language is Amharic. Henok is talking about his second given name, and how some teachers in London call him by his last name only, instead of using his first name as they would for other students. We were looking at his full name (Henok Fessehaye* Daniel*) written down, and he was pointing at the different components of his name:

I like my last name because like here it’s not as weird as this one [Fessehaye*]. Even I won’t like to use this name always. [My last name] is easy to pronounce actually. So they like prefer […]my last name] always. Even my vice-principal and my teacher, they called me ‘Where is Daniel*?’ She doesn’t call my name, my first name.

Even though Henok did not choose to be called by his last name, he nevertheless agrees with the use of it by his teachers. He compares his English-sounding last name with his second given name, a name that would clearly be marked as ethnic and would cause difficulties for others to pronounce. Henok makes the comparison even stronger by referring to his second given name as “weird” and saying how even he would not want to use it.

It is also interesting to note that the pronunciation of Henok’s last name differs in English from that in his native language. This means he is called by an Anglicized version of his last name. This use again reflects the belief that immigrants should culturally assimilate. The linguistic ideologies held by the teachers mark Henok’s first name as ethnic, a name that is too difficult to pronounce. Instead, they prefer his last name, which they just can “make English” by Anglicizing the pronunciation. It also reflects how language ideologies appear to us as common sense, in which the English pronunciation of the last name is the only possible variation that is being considered.
Since his last name, Daniel*, is also a common English given name, this might have influenced the use as well. Nevertheless, Henok mentions at a later point in the interview that he actually prefers the English pronunciation of his last name. He sees no issue with being renamed, for he sees the practical benefits it offers through easing the pronunciation for other people and having a name that is not classified as “weird”. This shows how he has been influenced by dominant Canadian language ideologies. Henok’s middle name originates from Tigrinya, a language that he does not speak, but that is common in Ethiopia and is related to his mother-tongue, as both derive from the Semitic language branch. It is thus not an unheard name where he is from. His last name, on the other hand, is known from the Bible and consequently more familiar to a wider audience. While his first name appears in the Bible as well, the English equivalent is Enoch, while the English equivalent of his last name has the same spelling. Because his middle name does not exist in English and the phonetic structure is also dissimilar to common English names, it again becomes a marked name in Canadian society. This leads to people classifying Henok’s middle name as different, a notion that is reproduced by Henok, whose linguistic ideologies have become influenced, resulting in labeling his middle name as “weird” and favouring the English pronunciation of his last name. Nonetheless, it remains to be pointed out that Henok normally would not use his last name to be identified by his teachers, that most teachers in Canada will call students by their first name in the classroom, and that the renaming was not an active choice. While calling him Daniel* reduces any issues with pronunciation, the practice of addressing him by his last name still marks him as different from other students whom the teacher will just address by their first names.
The last form of imposed renaming some youths in my study had experienced was a changed spelling of the names. This is a common problem for immigrants from various backgrounds. New immigrants to Canada have to deal with a considerable amount of paperwork before entering Canada. This means that the Canadian immigration personnel usually have to handle a great variety of foreign names and often even entirely different writing systems and naming conventions. Because of this, it can for instance happen that the transliteration of immigrants’ names by the Canadian immigration personnel will change the pronunciation of their names or that family members end up with different last names. This can sometimes also arise before immigrating to Canada, when newcomers have crossed borders beforehand, and the boarder personnel in another country changed the spelling.

Mistakes when transcribing names often occur as “the result of hastily processed forms, no documentation from their home country and the difficulties of transliterating Arabic names using a Roman alphabet” (Beeby 2017). In addition to this, when transliterating names, the Canadian immigration personnel have to rely on their own understanding of which letters represent which sounds when written in English. The name Youssef, for instance, has a standardized spelling in Arabic, but in the Latin alphabet it can be represented in many different ways, such as Yousef, Yusef, Yussef, Yusuf, Yosuf, or Yusof (ibid.). In some instances, a certain spelling may feel to the immigrant like a misspelling of their name, and thus lead to feelings of alienation and unhappiness. One interviewee, for example, reported that their parent’s name had been misspelled when entering Canada a few years ago, and to this day it still bothers them because it changes how others pronounce their name.
Deema’s name was also misspelled when she came to Canada several years ago after having lived in Iraq and Egypt. She is 16 years old and currently attends high school. Deema remembers:

Ok, so when I was younger it is actually in my birth certificate, it’s spelled D-E-M-A, so with one E. And then once I came to Canada, they changed it double E, they made it D-E-E-M-A, and that really bothered me at first, and I remember I used to write D-E-M-A and then the teacher would correct me and be like ‘no you’re name is D-E-E-M-A, you’re spelling it wrong.’ And I’d get really mad and be like ‘NO! It’s originally spelled D-E-M-A.

Deema mentions that the changed spelling of her name was bothersome to her, because it did not match the original spelling on her birth certificate. This shows a conflict in language ideologies concerning the correct written form of a name. For Deema, the original spelling recorded on her birth certificate represented the correct form, while her teachers considered the spelling on her official Canadian documents (and thus on the class rooster) as the right spelling. When pointing out the incorrect spelling of her name to teachers, they actually told Deema that she was wrong and apparently misspelling her own name, which in turn was upsetting to Deema who felt violated by the change in spelling. However, Deema later revised her perception of the changed spelling, when she understood it to be advantageous in Canada:

And so my mom one time, like got me over and she was like ‘I know it’s spelled D-E-M-A, but here it’s spelled D-E-E-M-A, like that’s your name now. Like I’m sorry you can’t change it.’ And then once I started telling people, like my friends, ‘oh it’s actually originally spelled D-E-M-A,’ they’d be like ‘it’s good that they changed it, because we would have pronounced it Demma.’ Right? And then I realized it, and I was like ‘oh yeah, well good thing it’s D-E-E-M-A.’… And I really would hate it if people would start saying Demma. So I don’t mind the extra E.

Once her friends pointed out that the original spelling of her name would actually lead to mispronunciations of her name in Canada, Deema changed her opinion about the altered
spelling and now sees it as a “good thing” that prevents people from saying her name incorrectly. In fact, she would “hate” constant mispronunciations of her name and rather prefers to have the spelling of her name altered than the other way around. This reflects Deema’s ideologies in two ways. On the one hand, it shows that she places more ontological weight on the spoken form of the name than on the written form. This makes sense when we think of the written form as a representation of the spoken one. In addition to this, the spoken form is more dominant in social interactions. This privileging of the sound of one’s name is also true for adult immigrants (Dechief, 2015: 171).

On the other hand, accepting the new spelling also shows how part of Deema’s ideology shifted: At first, it was important to her that her name was spelt correctly, meaning the original way which she was used to. Once her teacher reinforced the change in spelling in an authoritative way, she tried to defend the original spelling. The teacher clearly is in a more dominant position, and the change in spelling thus was almost received as a threat to the name. However, Deema’s friends are in a more equal position of power and therefore are able to draw attention to the pragmatic benefits of the new spelling in a non-threatening way. This leads Deema to realize that the correct pronunciation is more important to her than the correct spelling, which then can be adapted if it preserves the proper pronunciation of the name.

As these examples show, imposed renaming can often be bothersome and upsetting to the person experiencing it, but at the same time, it can also be seen as advantageous by reducing mispronunciations or being singled out for having a different name. Nonetheless, forced renaming is an indicator of power imbalances in which members of the dominant group take on the right to rename people of minority groups.
Clearly influenced by linguistic ideologies, renaming is used as a tool to force ethnic minorities into cultural assimilation or to highlight their “otherness” when preserving their original names.

4.3 Othering through Labels and Comments

Another common form of microaggression that is grounded in linguistic ideologies and was frequently experienced by the youths in my research is othering. The concept of othering is based on group identities, and closely tied to the concepts of power and agency. Othering is a process which always results in an ‘us versus them’ differentiation, but can occur at either the individual level or at the group level. Because othering is founded on binary divides, generally, “‘the other’ is understood not in terms of what it is, but in relation to what ‘we’ are not or do not wish to be” (Bruce and Yearly, 2006: 223).

Hence, ‘the other’ reflects an opposite characteristic that the ‘we’ does not have and in fact, does not even want to have.

Jensen (2011: 65), defines othering as the discursive processes by which powerful groups, who may or may not make up a numerical majority, define subordinate groups into existence in a reductionist way which ascribe problematic and/or inferior characteristics to these subordinate groups. Such discursive processes affirm the legitimacy and superiority of the powerful and condition identity formation among the subordinate.

Therefore, through othering, the dominant group tries to differentiate itself from ‘the other’, thus not only marginalizing ‘the other’, but at the same time displaying its own power and superiority. ‘The other’ group then is regarded as inferior and less desirable, and holds less power than the dominant group. Nonetheless, through oppositional agency, ‘the other’ can demonstrate its resistance to the more powerful group and reclaim its status as being of equal value. Othering itself can occur on different dimensions, such as
religion, gender, or ethnicity, but can also be intersectional, meaning it can take into account different social identities at the same time, e.g. a person could face othering on the basis of being the member of an ethnic minority and for belonging to a religious minority.

Othering is closely related to the concepts of ingroup and outgroup, and hence to social identity. People normally favour other persons who are part of their ingroup rather than members of the outgroup. Ingroups can be based on any criteria or category, such as nationality and religion, but also on more trivial characteristics, for example, having the same favourite colour. In fact,

[...] people belong to more than one social category at a time, and some categorizations might place a target in an outgroup while others place him or her in an ingroup. Original ethnic names enable the majority to categorize foreigners and ethnic minorities based on a simple categorization (either ingroup or outgroup members), but Anglo given names may enable majority group members to see foreign individuals as partial ingroup members. (Zhao and Biernat, 2017: 60)

Accordingly, people form ingroups based on similarities and generally hold a more favourable attitude towards other members of the same group.

In the context of immigration, the dominant group usually is the host society, which is not only in the position of greater power, but also forms the ingroup and hence excludes ‘the other’, or outgroup, based on characteristics the other possesses, but which the dominant group does not have, for example a foreign accent or a different skin colour. As a consequence, othering also has an influence on identity formation, as well as on belonging. Through othering the dominant group signals “you are not one of us,” thus indicating that the other, in fact, does not belong to them and hence excludes them from their society. In this way, othering also serves as an instrument that determines who is one of ‘us’ and belongs to the society, by selecting the criteria the othering is based on.
In regard to names, one of the most common forms of othering experienced by the youth immigrants is hearing comments about their names. This is again influenced by language ideologies, in terms of which names are perceived as Canadian and thus represent the ingroup, and which names are part of the outgroup. Ingroup names are those that are common within the group and with which other people of the ingroup are familiar with. Moreover, those names often derive from English, the language of the ingroup, or are names that through the process of nativization have become accepted as ingroup names.

Thirteen out of the 18 youths I interviewed mentioned receiving comments when they are asked for their names, introduce themselves to others, or are called upon by their teachers. This happened especially to youths with Arabic names, but other youths still shared similar experiences. In Fatima’s experience “they say it’s nice,” while Raneem, who like Fatima is a Syrian girl, mentions that “sometimes people tell me it’s hard to remember your name.” Overall, the comments on the youths’ names range from positive labels – “nice”, “cool” and “beautiful” – to more negatives labels such as “difficult” and “weird”. Fares, a boy from Eritrea, on the other hand, says the only thing people ever say about his name is “interesting”. Other youths also frequently receive an ambiguous, single “oh, interesting”, or are told “Oh, interesting. I’ve never heard that name”. This notion of having an “interesting” name is often interpreted in a negative way. Some youths’ names are further commented on with questionable “what?!?”- reactions. For example, Godswill, an eighteen-year old boy from Nigeria says that many people have a “what the heck” reaction to his name and reports being asked whether his name is an actual name.
All these labels and comments on the youths’ names constitute forms of othering that regulate belonging by marking the immigrants as the other who is not really part of society. Even though some comments are of a positive nature, for instance referring to a name as “beautiful,” they nonetheless are still forms of othering and exclusionary, and are still received as such. For instance, Toussin, 17 years old, who is originally from the Democratic Republic of Congo points out: “Oh they say it’s a nice name because even though they say it’s a nice name, they don’t know it. They don’t know what it means, they don’t know anything about the name.” Toussin emphasizes that despite receiving positive remarks about his name, people still see it as foreign and are unfamiliar with the name’s meaning and origin. Similarly, Zeyad explains that people say his name is “cool,” because “it’s different. They don’t hear it as much here.” Therefore, such comments still mark the name as not belonging and highlight its otherness. At the same time, commenting on immigrants’ name also indicates a power imbalance between newcomers and Canadians. As Pennesi (2016a: 51) points out:

When a Canadian-born person comments on the markedness of an immigrant’s name, that person is claiming the right to make judgements about the immigrants, as if the name were being submitted for approval rather than for information. Even positive comments such as ‘that’s a beautiful/pretty/nice name’ can be seen as condescending or patronizing because of the associated difference and a power imbalance.

By labeling and commenting on immigrants’ names, the dominant group considers itself to be entitled to judge the names of those who are not part of the ingroup, and thus displays its greater power.
4.4 Othering through Obligatory Conversations

Another form of othering that was experienced by the youths in my research is what Pennesi (2017a) calls obligatory conversations. Obligatory conversations are generally initiated by members of the dominant group and are characterized by questions that clearly mark the conversation partner as ‘the other.’ For instance, these questions include asking where the other person is from, and in this way indicating that they must be from outside of Canada, based on their accents, or looks, et cetera. In this manner, the initiator of the conversation marks the conversation partner as a member of the outgroup who does not belong. Obligatory conversations occur in small talk and institutional talk between people who are not familiar with each other. Because they happen over and over again to the person being perceived as ‘the other’, they are often regarded as “tiresome and annoying” (ibid.). Questions that are part of obligatory conversations commonly demand personal information from the conversation partner. While the initiator usually offers no reciprocal information, the conversation partner often feels obliged to explain themselves to the member of the dominant group. As Pennesi (ibid.) points out, obligatory conversations are best understood in relation to Brown and Levinson’s (2006) model of politeness strategies, in particular to the concepts of positive and negative politeness. Positive politeness is making the other person feel good about themselves, demonstrating interest in the other, or making compliments, while negative politeness is avoiding or minimizing imposition on the other.

In the case of obligatory conversations involving ‘the other,’ the initiator usually fails to use negative politeness, as the questions are clearly impositions that demand personal information, explanations, and sometimes even justifications. Moreover,
obligatory conversations obviously reflect the power imbalances between the two conversations partners. The initiator demonstrates their belonging to the society and their right to question the other, while the conversation partner feels the need to explain themselves. Pennesi says because the initiator generally offers no reciprocal information about themselves, obligatory conversations often almost feel like interrogations to the conversation partner (ibid.). Because of all of this, obligatory conversations have an exclusionary nature and, like other forms of microaggressions, regulate belonging within the society.

Introductions to other people, that is saying one’s name, frequently trigger obligatory conversations. The youths in my study reported that often they will be asked about the origin of their names, where they are from, and what their name means. In this sense, the exclusion is based on having a name that is identified as non-Canadian, but sometimes the cause for exclusion is also intersectional with other criteria such as having an accent or a certain physical appearance. This adds up to the common expectation of some people, that people who look “ethnic” to them, must have an ethnic name and vice versa. For instance, Sarah stated being asked by people whether it was indeed her “real” name. Sarah is 16 years old and was born in Jordan. She grew up speaking Arabic. While she learned English before coming to Canada, she said that her English “was not that good” and she later attended ESL classes in London. Sarah wears a hijab, a physical marker that some people I met during my fieldwork had often felt discriminated for. In her case, having a seemingly easy name that is also common in Canada did not match people’s expectations. Because of Sarah’s physical appearance and her accent, it was assumed that she must have a more ‘difficult’ and unfamiliar name. The same
phenomenon can also be observed in Firas’ case. CCLC staff member Firas was born in the United States, but does have Palestinian origin. He does not have a foreign accent when speaking English. Firas reports that very frequently, when he introduces himself to others, people will just assign a more Anglophone name to him: “I say Firas is my name, and people start calling me Ross, or Russ.” Instances like this also reflect people’s language ideologies based on the expectation for all those who appear to be members of Canadian society to have a Canadian name. Firas’s name is marked, but he appears to be a member of the dominant group, consequently he is expected to have a name that conforms to people’s expectations.

In other common types of obligatory conversations, the youths generally receive questions about the origin of their name and its meaning. Nevertheless, while obligatory conversations are often perceived as a negative occurrence, some youths actually take advantage of obligatory conversations and having their names frequently commented on. Obligatory conversations are started by using positive politeness in which an interest in the other is expressed (Pennesi, 2017a), and some youth therefore interpret obligatory conversations in a positive way. These youths see reacting to these forms of othering as a chance to share information about their name and themselves, and thus their culture. In this way, they can be understood to use agency in order to advocate for cultural diversity and to promote integration, while at the same time allowing members of the dominant group to get to know ‘the other’. The following excerpts are from the interview with Deema who enjoys when other people show an interest in her name:

“[…] I actually like it when people like are interested in my name, and what does it mean, cause I like explaining it, it’s cool. […] Yeah, actually like with teachers, like you know substitutes or like new teachers, I always like most of the time, I started a conversation with like cause they’re ‘Tell me what’s your name,’ and I
be like ‘It’s Deema’, and sometimes they ask ‘Oh, what does that mean?’ And that’s how I kind of get to let them know me and stuff like that.”

At school, Deema is frequently engaged in obligatory conversations with her teachers who will ask her about her name. For Deema, explaining her name to new teachers opens up conversations and offers a chance for them to get to know her. This shows how the teachers’ attempts at using positive politeness are proven to be successful since Deema gladly responds to their inquiries:

“They say ‘Oh, it’s interesting, I’ve never heard that name’, and most actually ask ‘Oh, what does it mean?’ And then when I tell them it’s baby clouds that produce baby rain, they really like that idea. Even my teacher, my […] teacher last year when I explained my name to him, he stopped calling me Deema and called me Baby Rain. And he still calls me Baby Rain.”

While people will comment on her name (othering), point out its rarity in Canada (“I’ve never heard that name”), and engage her in obligatory conversations, Deema will give them the answer they asked for and actually considers it to be a pleasant task. Explaining one’s name can be seen as ‘educational’ moments for members of the dominant group in which they learn more about ‘the other’ (Pennesi, 2017a; Pennesi, 2016a). In this way, explaining one’s name increases a person’s familiarity with it and thus reduces othering. As a result, those educational moments reflect immigrants’ attempts to facilitate integration and advocate for it.

In the case of forms of othering, the youths’ experiences reflect those also experienced by adult immigrants whose names are also commented on by members of the host society (ibid.). In addition to this, the youths are also constrained by their age, in which it often would be considered inappropriate to talk back to adults. For instance, if Deema had refused to answer the teacher’s questions it would be considered as rude and disobeying the teacher’s authority. Therefore, while adult immigrants often face similar
situations, newcomer youths are in a position of even lesser power. Furthermore, while some youths in my research were bothered by comments about their names, none of them questioned the appropriateness of those labels. As I will discuss, below (section 4.6), they even started to reproduce some of these labels.

4.5 Mispronunciations

Frequent mispronunciations of one’s name are probably the most common form of micro-aggressions that immigrants experience. All of the youths who I interviewed are familiar with having at least some parts of their names mispronounced. The reception of those mispronunciations is generally different for each individual. Some youth stated they were not bothered by hearing their names pronounced incorrectly, while others said that they will get upset when somebody says their name with the wrong pronunciation. However, most youths had ambivalent responses, reporting that they were not bothered when people mispronounce their names, but at the same time, they were still caring about the correct pronunciation. A lot of their feelings were context-dependent. One common theme, for example, was the relationship with the other person. Usually, when encountering strangers whom they are unlikely to ever see again, the youths would just let the mispronunciation slide and not feel too upset about it. Nineteen-year old Shirug came to Canada from Saudi-Arabia and attends a local high school. She speaks fluently English, Arabic, and Tigrinya. Here, Shirug describes not correcting mispronunciation in the case of supply teachers: “I’m like it’s not gonna make a difference. She’s gonna go now, she’s just a supply teacher. She’s gonna go now, she’s gonna forget; it’s ok.” When the youths will not meet the other person again, they generally save the trouble of explaining how to pronounce their names. Nonetheless, in cases where they will meet the
person on a more frequent basis, such as with their regular teachers, the youths care about having their names said the right way. However, even in those instances, the youths will only correct the other person a few times, and not over and over again. This behaviour of the youths concerning when to correct or not correct mispronunciation can be understood through politeness strategies, in particular face-threatening acts (FTAs). According to Brown and Levinson (2006: 312), aspects of face are “basic wants, which every member knows every other member desires, and which in general it is in the interests of every member to partially satisfy.” There are two components of face: negative face, which reflects a person’s want for their actions to be unimpeded by others, and positive face, “the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others” (ibid.).

Correcting other’s mispronunciations would thus be a FTA in that the youths would impose on others by demanding a correct pronunciation. On the other hand, mispronunciations are a FTA to the youths’ positive face, since it ignores their wants for the correct pronunciation of their names. In the interactions with strangers or other people with whom the youths only interact infrequently, the adolescents suppress their own wants in order to not threaten the other person’s negative face. However, when interacting with people who they encounter more frequently, e.g. friends or teachers, the youths prioritize their own positive face over others’ negative face, and thus become more insistent on the proper pronunciation of their names.

Some youths also expressed general discomfort when they are correcting somebody mispronouncing their names. One person said they do not like correcting people because they are not used to it, since they had never encountered people having difficulties pronouncing their name before coming to Canada. Other youths do not want
to make the other person feel bad about saying their names wrong, thus avoiding a possible FTA to the person they are interacting with. Another common theme was not correcting people when the youths felt “tired” or “lazy” as they described it. In other words, this means considering whether or not it is worthwhile to correct somebody. As mentioned above, the relationship and frequency of interaction with the other person often determine how insistent the youths are on the correct pronunciation. Sometimes, whether the youths will correct a person or not, also depends on the degree of difference between the incorrect and the proper pronunciation. Fatima, 16 years old, is a high school student and is originally from Syria. She came to Canada about a year ago after living in Jordan. Fatima says that she will not correct people mispronouncing her name as [fəˈtɪːma] instead of the correct [ˈfatˤɪma], because according to her, the two ways of saying it are almost the same. But if they “say [it] wrong, like really wrong, I tell them it’s [fatˤɪma].” This closeness between the correct pronunciation and the incorrect pronunciation used by the other person was another determinant whether or not the youths will correct their conversation partner. Along with the frequency of interaction and relationship with the other person, the phonetic resemblance between the correct pronunciation and the mispronunciation thus becomes another criterion for whether to correct or not. Minor mispronunciations might not be considered to be as face-threatening as greater mispronunciations, which is why the youths do not correct them and avoid threatening the other’s negative face.

During each interview, I asked the youths for their thoughts on why their names are so frequently mispronounced. Many replied that this is simply due to unfamiliarity
with the name; people have not previously encountered their names and consequently just do not know how to pronounce them:

“It’s ok, because they don’t know, [it’s] their first time to hear it.” (Fatima)

“It’s not [an] English name. They hear it the first time.” (Shirug)

On the other hand, the youths noticed that people who generally spend more time with people from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds have fewer problems with pronouncing ethnic names. With increasing numbers of immigrants and expansions of schools’ English Second Language (ESL) programs, people are becoming more and more comfortable with name diversity. This observation was brought forward by the CCLC staff members who have worked at local high schools and youths alike:

I think now because of the diversity we have in the schools, it’s not as- I guess mispronouncing names and things like that is not- it doesn’t happen as much as it used to before. I think before, when people like- when there wasn’t that many newcomer students and things like that, I think it was bit- it wasn’t that common, so it was a lot harder for people to pronounce names. But now I feel like because we have such a big, diverse population in the schools it’s becoming less and less. (Firas)

Because I’ve noticed that they’ve kind of already like been through this, like my science teacher’s been to a different school. She’s been to- I think it was A.B. High School*- which had ESL, so they had a lot of Arabic speaking people, and a lot of difficult- you know Arabic names, so she kind of already knows how to pronounce them. (Deema)

Increased exposure to cultural and linguistic diversity raises a person’s familiarity with name diversity and as a consequence, they become more comfortable handling and pronouncing ethnic names. Deema’s teacher, for instance, had already encountered a variety of Arabic names at another school with an ESL population, and therefore had fewer issues pronouncing Arabic names. At the same time, Firas, who grew up with an ethnic name himself, noticed that with a growing number of newcomer students, teachers
become more and more acquainted with pronouncing diverse names. This reflects successful attempts at immigrant integration, in which teachers handle newcomers’ names respectfully, do not display microaggressions, and value cultural diversity.

In addition to being unfamiliar with their names, the youths also stated people’s phonetic inability to reproduce certain sounds as another reason for frequent mispronunciations: “I think it’s just […] the difference in the like pronunciation, right. Like rolling the Rs. A lot of English-speaking people can’t – people can’t do that. […] It’s very hard for them to do” says sixteen-year old Rafaela from Albania. Zeyad and other youths agree with this and he adds the fact that some sounds (“letters”) that occur in the youths’ native languages do not occur in English, which makes pronouncing certain names much harder for Anglophone-speaker: “They can’t say names. They have letters – we have letters that they don’t have. […] So it’s not their fault they can’t pronounce your name.” Interestingly, no youths blamed Anglophone-speakers for their inabilities, but instead they provided arguments that it is “not their fault” that they can’t pronounce names or that it is just “very hard for them.” Indeed, the notion of “hardness” came up several times:

“[…] but some people don’t know how to pronounce it, but it’s ok. I just take it. Because it’s too hard for them to pronounce.” (Toussin)

“It’s just Arabic as a language is really hard to pronounce.” (Deema)

“[…] ok, my name is- I’m gonna tell you, you gonna find it hard […]” (Shirug)

4.6 Discussion

Just like the names of adult immigrants (Dechief, 2015; Pennesi, 2016a), the youth immigrants’ names are often the object of microaggressions because they are seen as
indexes that they are not members of the dominant Canadian society, but instead their names mark them as members of the outgroup. Whether certain names are considered to belong to the ingroup or outgroup depends on people’s language ideologies. A name that is not perceived as Canadian or lacks Anglophone features is generally regarded as an outgroup name. As mentioned, language ideologies often appear to be “forms of common sense” (Hill, 2008: 34), thus the categorization of one’s name usually occurs without much consideration and is based on an individual’s experiences, such as familiarity with certain names, which impact their linguistic ideologies. This becomes obvious when the youths are confronted with forms of othering, such as receiving comments on their names or being pulled into obligatory conversations right after introducing themselves to others. To their conversation partners it ‘makes sense’ that the youths bearing ethnic names are not from Canada, and consequently, ‘not one of us’.

In addition to this, the categorization of different names can be of a subconscious nature. Research conducted in Toronto, Montreal, and Vancouver (Dechief and Oreopoulos, 2012), for instance, has shown that even in Canada people with ethnic-sounding names are less likely to be called for job interviews after submitting their resumes to a job opening. Followed by international work experience and international education, ethnic names had the greatest influence on reducing the success of a job application. While many job recruiters stated that the lower callback rates for individuals with ethnic-sounding names was due to a concern regarding their English language skills, Dechief and Oreopoulos concluded that implicit discrimination also played a large role in determining whether or not a person would be invited to an interview (ibid. 28-29). Implicit discrimination is based on “unconscious mental associations between a target
(such as immigrants) and a given attribute (such as ‘poor communication skills’)” (ibid.: 9). Because of these subconscious beliefs, “employers may believe they are rejecting an applicant out of language skill concerns when in fact their implicit biases are driving the decision” (ibid.: 10). Thus, a certain name might trigger stereotypes that influence the employer’s decision. From this it becomes clear how having an ethnic-sounding name can lead to oppression based on dominant linguistic ideologies.

Language ideologies that are reflected in the mispronunciation of names have several impacts. On the one hand, they negate the significance of an immigrant’s name and heritage culture. Turning names into objects of judgement by deciding whether they are “beautiful” or “difficult”, not only objectifies the names and turns them into commodities that can be either an asset (when they are approved of and considered part of the ingroup) or a liability (when they mark a person as a member of the outgroup and for instance, prevent them from getting a job), but it also negates the name bearer’s culture and hence their identity. It discredits the whole history behind the name and its meaning, such as religious connotations or kinship ties, which then in turn, also become subjects that need approval or require justification for their existence among the dominant group.

Lastly, many immigrants can relate to having their names mispronounced. As reasons for why they thought their names were so frequently mispronounced, the youths stated that people are unfamiliar with their names and phonetically incapable of pronouncing certain sounds occurring in their names, e.g. “rolling the Rs”. While these reasons seem logical, mispronunciations still reflect a person’s language ideologies. As Bucholtz (2016: 286) explains:

The fundamental issue, however, is not a speaker’s language ability but her or his language ideologies. […] Misnaming can be perpetrated by anyone who benefits
from structural power on the basis of race, class, language, and/or citizenship—that is, members of most groups at one point or another. The responsibility of those in such situations is therefore not to master all possible names but to avoid symbolically dominating others through misnaming.

In other words, phonetic inabilities should not be an excuse for mispronunciations or even renaming. Instead, they indicate a power imbalance that has to be overcome in order to achieve successful integration. Because integration involves efforts and adjustments made by both groups, the immigrants and the host society, immigrants can, on the one hand, not expect everyone to say their names correctly, but members of the dominant group, on the other hand, should make an effort to pronounce names correctly and to treat names respectfully. Just as 17-year old Maha from Dubai says, when people cannot say her name correctly “that’s fine. At least they tried.”

What is more, some youths started to reproduce the dominant ideologies by referring to their names as “hard” or “difficult.” Not only does this support power imbalances, but it also hinders the process of belonging to the society. The youths were accustomed to having members of the dominant group ‘other’ their names by putting labels on them or the language they originated from. As mentioned, Deema, whose mother-tongue is Arabic, said that the language is “really hard to pronounce,” which is why people mispronounce her name. However, for her as a native speaker Arabic pronunciation is not a challenge. In a similar way, Mustafa 1, who is of Syrian origin but was raised in Saudi-Arabia, says that his name is “too long” despite it being a common name where he is from. Shirug, even before saying her own name, points out that “you gonna find it hard.”

The youths are thus internalizing the ingroup’s perspective, in this case the dominant Canadian one. By doing this they are justifying how others treat their names, while also accepting their position within the outgroup. This suggests that they are aware that they
are not equal members in the Canadian society and will more or less remain ‘the other’. The othering of names violates the ideology of immigration, for those names are not regarded as Canadian names, but instead as markers of belonging to the outgroup. Accommodations by the dominant group to accept and respect those names are missing. With the youths internalizing those forms of othering, they are accepting a permanent position within the outgroup, despite multiculturalism calling for biculturality and pride of one’s heritage.

In Dechief’s (2015) research with adult immigrants in Ontario, newcomers actively changed their name in order to fit in, thus often taking an assimilationist approach, while other adult immigrants in Pennesi’s research (2016a), resisted name changes and redistributed responsibility for integration onto Canadians whom the newcomers expected to learn how to say their names. Unlike adult immigrants, the youths were not aware yet of any future implications that having an ethnic name might bring when they are older, for example the much lower callback rate for job applications. By accepting, or even excusing mispronunciations and name-based microaggressions, some of the youths in my research are taking a more passive approach towards acculturation. While they are integrating in other areas, for example learning English or familiarizing themselves with the Canadian education system, their names become an area in which they do not integrate and rather accept the mistreatment of their names as something that should be expected upon immigration. Only two youths displayed a clear stance towards integration by educating others about their names and thus advocated for cultural diversity. However, the youths also employed another naming strategy that facilitated integration, which I will discuss in the next chapter.
4.7 Summary

This chapter first discussed the connection between microaggressions based on names and people’s language ideologies. After this, different forms of microaggressions which the immigrant youths frequently experience were discussed. Zeyad’s and Henok’s cases showed examples of imposed renaming by either changing the name completely or using a different component of the name, while Deema’s name was misspelled on her documents when entering Canada. Each case of renaming evoked different emotions, while Zeyad, for instance, was upset about being called by an English name, Deema later appreciated the changed spelling because it prevented mispronunciations. Two types of othering in regard to names that most of the youths were familiar with are labeling or commenting on names and obligatory conversations. Othering is based on binary differences and divides the outgroup from the more powerful and often more prestigious ingroup. Furthermore, types of othering regulate belonging by signaling that the other is not a real part of the society. Nonetheless, some youths saw obligatory conversations as a chance to advocate for diversity. The last kind of microaggressions mentioned were mispronunciations, something that most immigrants are familiar with. The youths employed two main criteria when deciding whether or not to insist on the correct pronunciation of their names: frequency of interaction and relationship with the other person, and phonetic resemblance between the correct pronunciation and the mispronunciation. Finally, the consequences of name-based microaggressions were discussed and how they act contrary to achieving immigrant integration.
Chapter 5: “It’s My Name, It’s Me.” - Names and Identities in Social Interactions

This chapter illustrates the close connection between names and identities, and how this relationship becomes meaningful in social interactions with others. First, I discuss identity as a general concept in anthropology and how language serves a powerful resource for identity creation. Because names are a part of language, I demonstrate how they also impact self-identity as well as the identities that others ascribe to us. I focus on the different meanings of names and how they impact the identities of the newcomer youths in my research. Moreover, I consider Dechief’s (2015) framework which examines name use in regard to different audiences and how audience reactions give insights into how one’s social identity is perceived. I point out youths who changed their names when coming to Canada, and others who instead make use of ‘the best pronunciation’, a context-dependent alternative of the correct pronunciation. Then, I move into a discussion suggesting that the way the youths use their names serves a pragmatic function which enables them to work towards a bicultural identity that is in line with the ideology of integration.

5.1 Defining Identity

Hall (2012: 31) describes identity as a “socially constituted, reflexive, dynamic product of the social, historical and political contexts of an individual’s lived experiences.” Identities are not fixed, but always in process, and shaped or changed depending on the social context (ibid.: 34). According to Aldrin (2016: 383), there is an inside and outside perspective of identity. On one hand, there is how we view ourselves—the inside perspective—and, on the other hand, there is the outside perspective of how others view
us and single us out from a group. This does not necessarily mean that those two points of view are always compatible. While other people might ascribe certain identities to a person, “individuals do not passively inhabit identity categories” (Bucholtz, 2011: 1). Instead, they negotiate identity categories in social interactions with others. As follows, the way one identifies oneself is not always obvious to others and might also differ from assigned identity categories (ibid.). Furthermore, “externally imposed categories generally have at least as much to do with the observer’s own identity position and power stakes as with any sort of objectively describable social reality” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004: 370). As a result, the outside perspectives that other people hold is influenced by their inside perspective of their own identity.

Every person has their own social history and different group memberships (based on social class, location, religion, etc.) which contribute to their identities. These group memberships, “along with the values, beliefs, and attitudes associated with them, are significant to the development of our social identities in that they define in part the kinds of communicative activities and the particular linguistic resources for realizing them to which we have access” (Bucholtz, 2011: 32). What follows is that our identities influence our use of language and vice versa. In fact, “among the many symbolic resources available for cultural production of identity, language is the most flexible and pervasive” (Bucholtz and Hall, 2004: 369).

Identities really become meaningful in social interactions with others. Identities are used to classify oneself, but also others. As such identities are based on binary distinctions of sameness and difference. Sameness “allows for individuals to imagine themselves as a group” (ibid.), while difference “produces social distance between those
who perceive themselves as unlike” (ibid.). It is important to note that those distinctions are not based on objective notions, but rather they are “phenomenological processes that emerge from social interaction” (ibid.). The binary notion of sameness and difference can be understood through the concept of markedness, “the process whereby some social categories gain a special, default status that contrasts with the identities of other groups” (ibid.: 372). Markedness thus can be applied to situations in which a distinction between what is considered a norm (“unmarked”) and a non-normative (“marked”) characteristic is established (ibid.: 370). In this case, unmarked identities are always understood to be the most powerful ones and are supported by widely-held ideologies (ibid.: 372).

5.2 Names, Identities, and Meanings

As already mentioned, there is a significant connection between names and identity. The youths in my research recognized the close link between names, the self, and identity. As Rafaela simply puts it: “It’s my name, it’s me.” Rafaela thus equates her name with her self-identity. Her name is what identifies her, but she also identifies with her name, highlighting how her name indicates her personhood. In a similar way, Maha points out that her name “[…is] like- it’s my identity. So it’s like if you’re not saying my name right or my last name right, and I’m answering you, that means it’s fine, you can ignore anything else.” Maha also recognizes the meaningful relationship between names and identity and takes it one step further by adding that any misuse of her name shows disrespect to her as a person. She says that if she accepts mistreatments of her name, she simultaneously accepts people “ignoring” who she is. Consequently, Maha clearly considers her name as a symbol of her personhood and believes that the microaggressive treatment of names discussed in the earlier chapter has a direct impact on her identity, in
which not caring about her name is equal to not assigning any importance to her as a
person.

The youths in my research also drew on the close connection between names and
identity in another way, which is the different meanings ascribed to their names. Nyström
(2016) identifies different kinds of meaningful elements that a name can possess,
including lexical, categorical, associative, and emotive elements. As already mentioned,
many names derive from actual words, or a lexicon, before becoming recognized as
personal names and entering an onomasticon (Nicolaisen, 2015). Lexical meaning, then,
is the literal meaning associated with the original word the name derived from. In
English, some obvious examples would be the names Daisy, Rose, or Destiny, or last
names like Baker and Smith, for they each correspond to a lexical item in the English
language.

Categorical, associative, and emotive meaning are all presuppositional meanings
that every name might give rise to (Nyström, 2016: 47). The categorical meaning “is
based on the presumption that human beings mentally divide objects and other
phenomena into categories of some kind” (ibid.). For instance, we might place a name
into a “female human being” or “male human being” category. This, however, does not
mean that we always automatically place a name within the right category, instead it is
based on our own assumptions which later can be proven to be wrong (ibid.). As a result,
categorical meaning is also linked to our language ideologies, for example in terms of
what a male or female name should be.

Meanwhile, associative meaning “implies that a name user— or a group of name
users— when hearing a certain name comes to think of something else or something
more, apart from reacting to the primary function of the name, namely the function of
individualizing and localizing the referent” (ibid.: 48). These meanings can, for instance,
be associations with another person, a milieu, or a certain mood, and they are linked to
our thoughts, feelings, hopes, and memories (ibid.). As an example, Nyström gives the
name Adolf, which, because of its negative connotations to World War II, is often
considered to be an inappropriate name (ibid.: 49-50). Associative meanings are closely
linked to emotional meanings, as some connotations might be caused by an emotional
character (ibid.: 50). Seeing a name shared by a loved one, for instance, might invoke
positives feelings of endearment or happiness.

Because names can have various meaningful elements, they can often lead to
either positive or negative connotations and thus impact the name-bearer’s life. As shown
in this research, it is often the categorical meaning which creates a distinction between
“Canadian” and “non-Canadian” names and therefore leads to forms of othering and
microaggressions. The types of meanings somebody ascribes to a person’s name also
have an effect on the person’s social identity and how their identity is viewed by others.
In the same sense, the meanings a person ascribes to their own name have an influence on
various dimensions of their identities. In the next sections, I will describe the types of
meanings that the youths in my research attribute to their own names. In many instances,
the youths were proud that their name has “a meaning”, which generally resulted in a
positive attitude towards the name itself, while also implying dimensions of their lives
that are important to them such as religion or family.
5.2.1 Religious Meaning
The first type of meaning that some youths emphasized was religious meaning, which can be considered a type of associative meaning. Henok, a Christian, actually equates the religious origin of his name with its meaning: “So it [the name] has a meaning. It’s not like something which you get from accidentally. It’s from like the Bible, and it have some religious meaning.” For him, the religious aspect is what gives the name meaning in the first place, while other names are “accidental” that just come to be used. Meanwhile, for Mustafa 1 (“Because it’s my prophet’s name.”) and Fatima (“Because I- my- our messenger, her daughter [is] named Fatima. That’s why […] we love [the name].”), both Muslims, the associative meaning of their names, in fact, results in an interconnected emotive meaning of positive attachment to their names that reflects their religious beliefs. In this way, their names are simultaneously linked to their self and social identities. On the one hand, the names are connected to how the youths identify themselves as religious persons, while on the other hand, the names also identify them with the religion at large, i.e. as part of the Christian/Muslim community.

5.2.2 Family-Based Meaning
For many of the adolescents that I interviewed, names were seen as ties that link them to their families. In these cases, the emotive meaning was always foregrounded and again demonstrated a positive attachment to their names. There were two ways in which names created emotive meaning in regard to families: being named by a family member or being named after a family member. For example, Rafaela was named by her brother, Hamza, a Syrian boy, by his father, and Deema by her aunt. As a result, all three attributed positive emotions to their own names because the act of having been named by a family member
was seen as a link to them. However, in Mustafa 2’s situation there were mixed emotive meanings. Mustafa 2 is originally from Iraq and was also named by his father, but he said that his mother preferred to name him something else. Consequently, while Mustafa likes his name, there is an associative meaning of the disagreement between his parents which leaves him with mixed emotions regarding his name. On the one hand, there is a positive attitude towards his name, but on the other hand he knows that his name led to disagreement between his parents. Lastly, Ryad was named after his grandfather with whom he has a close relationship. In his case, sharing the name of a loved one led to a positive attachment to his name because it connects him more closely to a beloved family member. In the same way, John, who is originally from Congo, was also named after his grandfather. For all these youths the emotive meanings behind their names is a way they identify themselves with their families.

5.2.3 Lexical Meaning
Lexical meaning is probably one of the first meanings that come to mind when talking about names. As a result, many of the youths also placed an emphasis on the lexical meanings of their names. In fact, the majority of my participants knew the lexical meaning of their names, some even of their last names. Table 4 states the meanings of the interviewees’ names as they explained them to me. Sometimes, the youths were unsure of the exact English translation, but they knew the meaning in their own language. Some youths simply enjoyed the lexical meanings of their names because of associated positive connotations. For instance, Shirug likes that her name means “sunrise” in Arabic. Fares is originally from Eritrea and aside from English speaks Arabic, Tigrinya, and Bilen. His name is Arabic and literally means “knight”, but also has several other meanings: “I think
everything positive is my name. Like it’s Fares, like you’re the knight, you’re the
gentleman, you’re the charm, they are kind, you are the handsome…” For him the lexical
meaning of his name is also something that he is expected to live up to:

[My mom] gave me or she chose that name to be the knight to hold the family…Like she want[s] me to be somebody- some person who have a big
history, a legacy. […] Fares does not only mean the knight, its deeper than that, it’s bigger than that. It means he’s hero, he’s savior, something like that. So my
mom want me to be like that. And I’m [on] my way, I will one day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Meaning as Given by Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deema</td>
<td>“clouds that produce baby rain showers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>“knight”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatima</td>
<td>weaning a baby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godswill</td>
<td>“God’s will”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamza</td>
<td>not asked for meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henok</td>
<td>name from the Bible, “Enoch in English, so it’s like a follower of God”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>did not know the meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>“eyes of a deer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustafa</td>
<td>name of a prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>“God has healed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raneem</td>
<td>to sing, sweet voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryad</td>
<td>he described it as “a certain place in heaven”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>“princess”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiruq</td>
<td>“sunrise”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toussin</td>
<td>“holy people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeyad</td>
<td>“more”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Meaning of Names
Fares is indeed not the only one of the youths who connects the lexical meaning of their name to their personhood. Zeyad’s name derives from Arabic as well and means “more” or “abundance”. He says about his name:

It’s unique. It means more. And I like to get more. […] No it’s not really common. It’s not like Omer, Ahmed, and these names. It’s like one of the less common things. So like, you know, it’s unique in the way that it means something that I- that describes me kind of, you know. So like I like things to be more, like more food, more fun, more free time, not more school. You know, I like these things so yeah it kind of suits me -ish.

While his statement is partly humorous, Zeyad nonetheless talks about how his name “describes” him and “suits” him.

Zeyad also brings up the notion of uniqueness, meaning that his name is not as common in Canada nor in Egypt, where he is originally from. The notion of uniqueness was brought up by several youths, always with a positive connotation of being “the only one” with that name. For some youths, however, the name only was thought of as unique by them once they immigrated to Canada. While Maha knows other girls with the same first name in Dubai, she says “but they are not here [in Canada]. I’m special.” Later, she adds that the uniqueness of her name has a positive nature to it because it allows others to easily identify her: “It’s like in my most classes, even back home, I was the only Maha in the class. So they know me.” Toussin feels the same way:

[…In] Canada, no one have it, like here in London I guess no one have that name. Because like at what- like when they’re calling me at the office, there is no anyone else. If they say Toussin I’m the only one who will go. But if they say Sebastian, like every Sebastian will go to see if it ‘It’s me, is it me?’ Toussin has not encountered somebody in London yet who shares his name. Like Maha, he refers to his name at the school setting and how it can be advantageous to have a unique name as he is the only person identified with it. This avoids miscommunication in
terms of who is being addressed by that name. Moreover, the uniqueness of his name also appeals to Toussin: “I love [my name] so much, because it’s not popular. I don’t like the name which everybody knows.” This is similar to the way Maha feels, saying her name makes her “special”. Toussin and Maha prefer having a name that is not too common. As pointed out above, Zeyad also considered his name unique for two reasons. First, it is not too popular, and second the meaning “describes” who he is. In a similar way, Deema first emphasizes the family-based meaning of her name, and then explains why having a unique name actually suits her because she does not want to be too “typical”:

It just kind of links me more to my family, because my aunt named me, and I love the story, it links me to just who I am and because it’s a unique name, and I love like being unique, and not typical like you know like a typical person. And I know a lot of people have like uniqueness, like of course I’m not the same as you, right. But I don’t know, I find my name just to be the uniquest, cause it’s meaning clouds and stuff like this. I also even think I’m getting a cloud tattoo.

In her research with adult immigrants to Canada, a few of Dechief’s (2015: 187-188) informants also showed an appreciation for having a name that is unique in Canada, but they recognized that those names also brought challenges with them, such as other people considering the name to be “odd” or having to repeat it to others. The youths in my research, on the other hand, did not bring up any negative consequences of their names, even though they all had obvious experiences of microaggressive treatments. Instead, the youths mentioned above valued the uniqueness of their names, because it allowed them to stand out among their peers. As Toussin and Maha mention, everybody will know who they are and they are more easily identified than other students with more common and often repeated names. In this context, their names become more powerful than more familiar names like Sebastian, because they bring the privilege of greater individualization which is linked to pragmatic advantages such as knowing when one is
addressed without needing any additional classification in order to distinguish the youths from one another. On the other hand, we see how this uniqueness, which in the cases of the newcomer youths results in the names being labeled as ethnic, leads to microaggressions for being considered a member of the outgroup. As a result, it is the outsider identity perspective (Aldrin, 2016), meaning the way others perceive their names, that creates problems.

The opposite is true for Sarah. While she also likes the meaning of her name and feels that it describes her to some extent, she likes her name because it is common:

First, I like the meaning of my name. It has more than different meanings, so I like my name. And then because it’s easy to say, and it’s popular. And it kinda describes- no, it doesn’t describe me, but like in the other meaning- there’s so many meanings than what I told- that describe me sometimes.

While Sarah likes her name because it is “popular”, she also enjoys that it is “easy to say”. In this way, Sarah as well feels positively about the pragmatic benefits her name offers, and how it minimizes problematic encounters such as microaggressions. Her name allows Sarah to fit in more easily and thus becomes powerful in situations where fitting in is desirable, such as with cultural assimilation.

All in all, names are powerful markers with several meanings attached to them. They can have an influence on the name-bearer’s life in terms of how they feel about themselves, but also how they are perceived by others as names impact the identity categories that are ascribed to us, such as ethnicity, race, and religion. The way others interpret identities based on our names can often have negative consequences. Staff member Emal, who is originally from India, has an Islamic name but does not identify as Muslim. She recounts an unpleasant incident experiencing Islamophobia while working for a crisis line. A client called her line to get counselling for their child, and Emal
pointed out one of the line’s regulations to the client. This upset the client and they replied: “Oh what are you? Are you Muslim? Do you want my child to just die?” This example clearly reflects how a name and the associated meaning (Islamic religion) can result in being confronted with stereotypes and discrimination. Aldrin (2016: 390) argues that “[…] names ‘in general arouse widely-held images’ in terms of positive or negative generalizations about individuals” (2016: 390). For this reason, names can become a source of stigmatization or discrimination, when they are considered to be marked. An unmarked name, on the other hand, will identify the name-bearer as a member of the ingroup and establish a sense of sameness.

Drawing on Goffman, Bursell (2012: 476) defines stigma as “an attribute that is ascribed negative meanings in certain contexts […]”. As discussed in the previous chapter, ethnic names often lead to different forms of othering and microaggressions. This is because in the Canadian context English and French names are often privileged, while ethnic names are frequently assigned indexical meanings such as ‘foreign’. These attributes in turn lead to negative stereotypes such as ‘not belonging’, or characteristics the name-bearer is believed to possess such as ‘not speaking English’. This shows that there is a close connection between stigma and social identity:

Society establishes the means of categorizing persons and the complement of attributes felt to be ordinary and natural for members of each of these categories. […] When a stranger comes into our presence, then, first appearances are likely to enable us to anticipate his category and attributes, his “social identity” […] (Goffman, 1965: 4)

Stigma is caused by our interpretation of someone’s social identity, based on the categories and attributes which we assign to them. A name is often one of the “first appearances” which we learn about others. As a result, many people will draw
conclusions from what they believe the name-bearer’s social identity to be. In Emal’s example, the caller “categorized” her as a Muslim and then ascribed certain negative attributions to her that were clearly motivated by assumed beliefs of the client.

5.3 Names and Audiences: The Audience’s Impact on Identities

As we have seen, microaggressions and name-based discrimination are caused by the interpreted meanings of a name, from which people draw conclusions about the assumed characteristics of the name-bearer. In Emal’s case, the associated religious meaning was linked to a characteristic or attitude that she supposedly held. In the youths’ examples the interpreted meaning of their names results in categorizing them as foreigners and non-belonging to the dominant group. At the same time, the youths do not encounter any othering of their names when interacting with people of the same or similar cultural and linguistic backgrounds. The youths’ families and friends with similar backgrounds obviously do not have any issues pronouncing or spelling their names, since they often have encountered those names before or know the language the names derive from. From this it becomes apparent that the treatment of names depends on the type of audience with which the youths are interacting. According to Dechief (2015: 58), there are three types of audiences relevant to name use: quotidian, institutional, and traditional. The quotidian audience involves everyday interactions and name use. The institutional category focuses on official interactions, and lastly, the traditional audience consists of “family members, diaspora, and cultural knowledge from participants’ heritages” (ibid.). These audiences are not mutually exclusive, rather they overlap to varying degrees (ibid.: 59).
It is quite clear that the traditional audience usually has no problems pronouncing certain names. However, I noted during my research that members of the traditional audience often make use of nicknames. For example, Zeyad mentioned the nicknames that his mother uses for him, and I noticed that Mustafa 1 was always called a nickname by his Syrian friends at the CCLC. Maha also mentioned several nicknames that her Arabic-speaking friends call her at school. Mustafa 2, on the other hand, said that he was always called by a nickname before coming to Canada, and was never referred to as Mustafa back in Iraq. Since nicknames tend to be forms of endearment, it makes sense that they are predominantly used by friends and family members, who are people that have a close relationship with the name-bearer. Yet, the use of nicknames observed in the youths also suggests that utilizing nicknames often requires a certain degree of familiarity with the name, in order to successfully phonetically manipulate the name and thus create a functional nickname. Interestingly, in the case of Maha the ability to generate nicknames out of her name is also used as a form of teasing by her friends: “It’s like people […] say Mahoosh and I don’t like it. But ehm- so I try to correct them and tell them ‘say Mahavy’ or ‘Mahoy’, the nicknames that I’m used to. But they stay and say it’s Mahoosh.” Maha presents alternative nicknames to her Arabic-speaking friends, but they will insist on calling her Mahoosh in order to joke around. Thus, they are purposefully using a nickname they know will be rejected.

During my interview with Rafaela, another youth from Nigeria interjected whether they could just call her Ella. Rafaela did not seem too impressed with the suggestion, and later even stated “I don’t like that- Ella. I like better Rafa.” In Rafaela’s case the other youth, who was not a member of the traditional audience, failed to create
an adequate nickname that was then dismissed by her. Maha’s friends, however, were all part of the traditional audience. Consequently, they knew how to come up with an adequate nickname but used knowledge of the name to purposefully create a nickname they knew would be rejected.

Since newcomer youths prioritize social integration, the reactions of the quotidian audience will have the greatest impact on their integration experience, as interactions with the quotidian audience “represent the participant’s current day-to-day life in Canada” (Dechief, 2015: 64). For the youths, the most important interactions with a quotidian audience take place at school and at after-school activities, such as volunteering or participating in sports clubs. Moreover, the quotidian audience is the audience that is most likely to mispronounce names (ibid.). “Name-related interactions with the quotidian audience are not necessarily weighty or meaningful, as they happen regularly, but they are dynamic: in general, it is when these actions are repeated that there may be some kind of identity impact” (ibid.). As follows, the quotidian audience is most likely to engage in microaggressive treatment of names. This, for example, includes teachers mispronouncing names or calling the youths by a different naming component.

All of these happen on a daily basis, namely at school, which is how those forms of othering become meaningful by rejecting the newcomer youths’ identities at several levels. First, they clearly violate cultural identity. Calling names “weird” or “difficult” devalues the cultural meanings of a name as in each culture names have different meanings whether lexical meaning or as link to kinship, culture, etc. Therefore, dismissing a name because it is “hard to pronounce”, also dismisses the meanings
attached to the names. Furthermore, it also subordinates other cultures to the more dominant one, by marking other cultures as different and often inferior.

In the previous chapter I showed that the youths in my research did not expect people to say their name correctly because they realized that not everyone is capable of doing so. As Maha had said “it is fine” if others cannot say her name, but it is important that “at least they tried”. Mispronunciation itself is not necessarily an issue, but problems arise from the way the immigrant youths’ names are treated in general. Renaming is often not presented as a choice, and frequently no effort is made to learn the adolescents’ names. For example, Rafaela is aware that the teachers at her local high school in London cannot say her last name correctly because it contains a sound that is spelt differently in English (“dh” which is pronounced like the English “th”). She remembered a conversation she had with one of her teachers about her last name, in which she pointed out to the teacher that they were in fact mispronouncing her family name:

Rafaela: “’Actually, you’re wrong.’ I said. ‘Because my last name is Bardhi*.’ Nadja: “So did she say anything?” Rafaela: “Yeah, she said it. She tried to say, and she still would forget the next day.”

Rafaela corrected the teacher who then “tried” to say her last name, but “still” forgot how to pronounce it the next day and went back to saying it incorrectly. While the teacher showed some interest in the correct pronunciation, she did make no real effort to actually learn it or remember her mistake.

As pointed out the newcomer youths in my research spent most of their time at school. While schools are part of a quotidian audience, they also have features that mark them as an institutional audience. Institutional audiences involve more official uses of names, including the use of documents or official identification (Dechief, 2015:58).
Consequently, misspellings are likely to fall within interactions with an institutional audience. One example would be Deema (see chapter four), whose name’s spelling was changed from Dema to Deema on her official documents when entering Canada. One example showing how schools overlap with a quotidian and institutional audience is in Fatima’s case in which her name was spelt Fatema on her official school identification card and consequently on all class lists. While she did not get her school ID changed, she continues to spell her name correctly at school.

Examining name use within audience reactions can give insight into how social identities are perceived as it is the “[…] audience’s reaction to a name that allows each participant to see how, via their name, they are received” (Dechief, 2015: 60).

Microaggressions therefore are based on our presumed social identities, through which people are classified as foreigners. Because of this some immigrants change their name after coming to Canada. Renaming allows those newcomers to make interactions with the quotidian and institutional audience easier by creating a name that can function among these audiences without or with fewer issues (Dechief, 2015). Nonetheless, the close connection between names and identities means that a name change can also be accompanied by a change in identity. For example, changing a last name after marriage is related to complex questions of “autonomy and professional identity, as well as establishing an identity as a couple” (Aldrin, 2016: 389). Taking on a new last name therefore may also mean taking on a new identity, for instance, an identity as somebody’s partner by signaling kinship ties through the name.
5.4 Name Changes

As already mentioned, having an ethnic name can frequently result in stigmatization and discrimination, which is why some immigrants decide to change their names to avoid these problems or to fit better into the host society. None of the youths I interviewed underwent a legal name change, however, Ryad, a 16-year old Syrian boy, changed his name’s spelling from Riad when coming to Canada from Egypt. He was advised to do so by family members who were already living in Canada. He did not speak any English before immigrating to Canada, and thus followed the advice to change the spelling, because they said that is how it “should be.”

Godswill, 18 years old, who is originally from Nigeria, started to use his middle name as his primary name for identification, because he noticed that Canadians were unable to pronounce his official first name, which is in Igbo. Zeyad, as already mentioned, experienced a forced renaming. While he did not appreciate it, it only lasted within the context of the one class at school. On the other hand, Deema came to appreciate the changed spelling of her name after noticing that it would preserve the proper pronunciation. Henok often gets called by his last name in instances when normally the first name would be used. However, his name is actually pronounced in an English way, which he says he prefers over the correct pronunciation. Thus, while not initiated by him, Henok nonetheless holds a favourable attitude towards being called by his last name. Using a different component of one’s names or changing the spelling was also a common renaming strategy for adult immigrants to Ontario (Dechief, 2015).

The fact that only two youths in my research, Ryad and Godswill, underwent active name changes, shows that renaming was not a popular choice for the newcomer
youths. All youths in my research held a favourable attitude towards their names, which might be one of the reasons why they did not consider changing their names. Another reason for not undergoing name changes were constraints by the traditional audience. With around half of my interview participants identifying as Muslim, it is important to consider the religious impact on naming choices, especially in terms of taking on an English name. Shirug, a Muslim girl, says: “My [first] name is Muslim, and my last name is Muslim. I’m Muslim. So I can’t change my name. [...] My parents won’t accept this.” This notion is also reflected by Fatima, another girl who identifies as Muslim and is originally from Syria: “Because my- our parents will say ‘no’ because in my religion, [we can] just [use] the name from our books.” The books Fatima is referring to are the writings of the Quran. As the girls explained to me, Muslims are expected to follow certain rules when naming their children. While names must not perforce be from the Quran, there are specific names which are deemed acceptable or unacceptable. Most Arab Muslims choose names derived from the Islam or traditional Arab names (FBIIC, 2006: 33). However, Islamic scholar Sheikh Ahmad Kutty says:

[…] There is nothing in the Islamic sources to indicate that we are allowed only to give our children Arabic names. Since Islam is a universal religion, there is no such requirement. Any name is okay so long as we keep in mind the above points. But, at the same time, while choosing names, we must strive our best not to compromise our Islamic identity. (Islam Online Archive; emphasis added)

In this way, taking on an English name would undermine their identities as Muslim, and was not compatible with their religious beliefs and family traditions. The two girls point out that their parents would not accept it, if they changed their name or anglicized it, showing how the traditional audience constrains their naming options.
5.4.1 Use of Best Pronunciation

As already stated, none of the youths in my research took on a completely new name when coming to Canada. Instead, some of youths employed another naming strategy which allowed them to stay true to their cultural and ethnic identities, while facilitating the pronunciation of their name and displaying a stance towards integration. Recognizing that the correct pronunciation is often unachievable for many Canadians, Rafaela, Sarah, Maha, and Toussin altered the pronunciation of their first names to include a second pronunciation category, here referred to as ‘best pronunciation’, along with the correct pronunciation. The correct pronunciation reflects the original pronunciation, meaning the phonetically correct way in which the youths would pronounce their names in their own language. The determination and use of the best pronunciation on the other hand are highly context-dependent. Under the circumstances of immigration to Canada, what is considered to be the best pronunciation is oriented towards the mainstream society, in this case London’s Anglophone population. In general, the youths did not come up with the best pronunciation themselves. Instead, these are the pronunciations they most often encounter in their everyday lives in Canada, and which they started using when interacting with the quotidian audience. As Rafaela explains: “It was like now I try to say it [my name] how people say it to me. To make it easy for the others.” Many Canadians will just pronounce her name in English, despite the correct pronunciation being different. Rafaela’s statement is similar to what Maha says. Maha grew up in Dubai until moving to Canada, where she is often encountering mispronunciations: “It’s like I tried first to say [maha]. It’s like in Arabic it’s [maha], but they will be like [mɔha]. So I just got used to [mɔha].” She initially introduced herself with the correct pronunciation, but
then “got used” to going by the best pronunciation, which is again the one used by the mainstream society.

Linguistically, the best pronunciation is either equal to the existing English version of the name (e.g. Sarah going by [səɾə]) or is influenced by an approximation of how Canadians would treat the name phonetically. Table 4 indicates the correct and best pronunciation of the names of the youths who used this strategy. As can be seen, the best pronunciation usually removes sounds that are not found in the Canadian English Standard, such as the trilled R-sound [r], or the nasal vowel [ɛ̃], and replaces them with approximate English sounds, for example, [ɑ] and [ɛj]. The youths actively use the best pronunciation, meaning they will make use of it if when introducing themselves to others or identifying themselves, but also when interacting with quotidian audiences. In interactions with the traditional audience, the correct pronunciation is still being used. Therefore, the youths are not changing their names, but rather expanding their pronunciation categories by including the use of the best pronunciation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Correct Pronunciation</th>
<th>Best Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rafaela</td>
<td>[rafaˈela]</td>
<td>[ɹɑ.ʃælə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>[sa.ɾa]</td>
<td>[səɾə]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maha</td>
<td>[maha]</td>
<td>[məha]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toussin</td>
<td>[ˈtusə]</td>
<td>[tusɛn]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Correct and Best Pronunciation

5.5 Discussion
The youths in my research are often confronted with mixed audiences. While the school and after-school environment are places for quotidian audience interactions, most of the schools the youth attend also have a larger newcomer population, meaning that the youths are also likely to encounter a traditional audience, for example, Maha’s Arabic-speaking
friends who made up a nickname for her. Moreover, the school also houses an institutional audience with which issues can arise, as seen in Fatima’s example with her student ID. This means the adolescents need to find naming strategies that will enable them to interact with all of these audiences and to move between different ones, while also establishing belonging to the society.

Extending their pronunciation categories to include the best pronunciation allows the youths to engage with all audiences with minimal problems while preserving their ethnic identities. Meanwhile, it also enables the adolescents to create a new aspect of their identities that reflects their ‘Canadianness’. All the phonetic alterations found in the best pronunciation are orientated towards English sounds, meaning Anglophones will be able to say them. Thus, the best pronunciation breaks down barriers and supports social integration. I agree with Dechief (2015: 3) that newcomers only making subtler name changes, as is the case with the best pronunciation, demonstrate their bicultural identity positions. This means the immigrants are not seeking to change their identities. Consequently, I also agree with Bursell (2012) who argues that immigrants’ name changes are not always to be equated with a stance towards complete assimilation. The youths’ use of the best pronunciation allows them to facilitate interactions with the quotidian audience. At the same time, it allows them to keep their cultural ties, but also to build ties with Canadian culture. Therefore, it indicates the newcomer youths’ willingness to integrate into Canadian society. Consequently, these name changes serve a pragmatic purpose and are not attempts to assimilate through losing or disguising their ethnic identities. In the context of my research, this means that newcomer youths did not change their names in order to pass as native Canadians. Instead, they maintained their
original identities and constructed an additional identity category which represents their membership of Canadian society.

Using the best pronunciation as a naming strategy is similar to some adult immigrants to Canada who accept popular mispronunciations of their names and continue to use them (Dechief, 2015: 172). The youths’ determination of the best pronunciation is equal to the mispronunciations they most frequently encounter by members of the traditional audience. While the change in the best pronunciation is motivated by pragmatic reasons to facilitate interactions with the quotidian audience, it is dissimilar to what Bursell (2012) found in adult Arabic immigrants to Sweden. Bursell argues that the immigrants took on Swedish-sounding names for pragmatic reasons as well, such as when applying for job opportunities or at their work place. In their private life, and thus mostly with a traditional audience, the immigrants continued to use their original names. As a result, Bursell considers the name changes that her participants underwent as a passing strategy to disguise their ethnic background (ibid.:481). This wish to masks one’s cultural origin was unlike what the youths are doing. The youths display pride in their heritage by not masking the origins of their names. Moreover, unlike the adults interviewed by Bursell, the youths in my research were not concerned with the disadvantages of having an ethnic name. Unlike adult immigrants who are usually more concerned with economic integration, and therefore finding employment to begin with, youth immigrants are more focused on social integration (Wilson-Forsberg, 2012: 6). They are thus more focused on interacting with people and do not yet have any economic disadvantages that would pressure them to assimilate their names. In addition to this, the youths in my research all felt positively about their names, a factor that likely prevented
them from considering renaming. While the adolescents encountered name-based microaggressions, they did not feel at this point that their names prevented them from any achievements. It is important to point out though, that the majority of my participants had been in Canada for less than two years (arriving between 2015 and 2017) and none of the youths had worked in Canada. At the time of my research, they did not consider the economic disadvantages of having a name that is considered to be foreign yet.

In fact, some youths in my research enjoyed having unique names, despite those names marking them as the other. The different meanings the youths in my research ascribed to their names further reflected how strongly they identify with their names. Changing their names would for some of them also bring about changes in their religious identity and break the links through which their names connect them to their families. As a result, it becomes clear that the youths did not seek to change their identities through altering their names. Because of this, the use of the best pronunciation can also be understood as an altered form of polyonomastics (Pina-Cabral, 2010: 298).

Polyonomastics is the use of several names adapted to interactions within a multi-ethnic environment (ibid.). It “reflect[s] a dynamic concept of identity, which involves making naming choices for performances of different identities according to shifting linguistic and ethnic contexts” (Pennesi, 2014: 45). As mentioned, the youths will continue to use the original pronunciation when interacting with traditional audience members. On the other hand, they will use the best pronunciation with the everyday audience, which is comprised of people of a different linguistic and cultural background. However, unlike the participants of Pina-Cabral’s (2010) and Pennesi’s (2014) studies, the youths did not switch between two names of different linguistic origins, but instead switched between
two pronunciation categories. This again shows how the use of the best pronunciation allows them to stay true to their original name and thus becomes a tool for facilitating integration and not assimilation.

5.6 Summary

This chapter discussed the close connection between names and identity, while also showing how names influence the way immigrant youths are perceived by others. In addition to this, I explained the different types of meanings that names can have and showed how religious, family-based, and lexical meaning were among the most important for the youths in my research. Drawing on Dechief’s (2015) types of audience interactions, I demonstrated how the different audiences can impact name use. Furthermore, I showed how the youths in my research make use of the best pronunciation which enables them to create bicultural identities and facilitate interactions with the quotidien audience.
Chapter 6 : Future Directions
Like similar research conducted with adult immigrants in Canada (Dechief, 2015; Pennesi 2016a, 2017a), this research has shown that issues immigrants face regarding their names also extend to youth immigrants of different origins. Like newcomer adults, the youths in my study commonly experienced microaggressive treatments of their names, often occurring in the school setting. The youths reacted to those experiences in different ways, implying either more of an integrationist attitude or an attitude towards assimilation, the latter one being one that is also produced in public discourses about immigration in Canada. While some youths accepted or excused microaggressive treatments of their names, others used them as an opportunity to advocate for diversity by educating members of the dominant group about their names and culture. Some youths also used the best pronunciation of their names and thus reflected a bicultural identity. However, by considering integration as a two-way process, members of Canadian society are also expected to accommodate to the youths’ names, especially because names are linked to identity and personhood in so many ways. In the United States, some efforts have been made to inform teachers of the importance of respectfully treating the names of students with immigration backgrounds, while also emphasizing the important connection between names and identities. One example is the “My Name, My Identity” campaign (2016). The My Name, My Identity campaign was initiated in Santa Clara County, California, and is aimed at teachers and educators. The campaign emphasizes the relationship between names and identity as well as how mispronunciations essentially misrepresent who a person is. The goal of the campaign is to foster a sense of belonging within school communities and to improve cross-cultural communication. My Name, My
Identity creates awareness through social media and platforms such as Twitter or Facebook. Overall, the campaign has two objectives. One is to raise awareness of the importance of respecting a person’s name and identity by getting community members to take a pledge to agree to respect students’ names. The second objective is to establish a culture within schools that values diversity. So far, there are no comparable campaigns in Canada yet.

While campaigns like My Name, My Identity are more concerned with bringing attention to the issues surrounding mistreatment of names, there are also more practical services available. One example is NameCoach (2018: n.p.), a Californian online service provider that realizes that names are central to identities and that the correct pronunciation of one’s name is “the first step in respecting, appreciating, and connecting with each other.” The concept of NameCoach is based on users recording their own names and creating an audio file which is then accessible by the organization or institution that requested and is paying for the service. NameCoach is geared towards “people who read names at graduations and award ceremonies, teachers, conference or meeting attendees, and individuals who wish to show others how to pronounce their names” (Pennesi, 2016b: 59). Consequently, it also focuses more on educational settings (ibid.), especially colleges and universities. There are numerous other webpages, e.g. forvo.com, that offer audio files for the pronunciation of certain names, as well as videos available on YouTube. However, it is important to note that the pronunciation presented online is not always accurate and that two names spelt the same way might not necessarily have the same pronunciation. Services in which people can record their own pronunciation are thus a better option.
Bucholtz (2016: 286-287) created some guidelines regarding the treatment of names in a more practical sense. She advises not to comment on others’ names and not to ask any questions about the names’ meanings, in order to “avoid treating some names as normative and others as nonnormative” (ibid.: 286). Moreover, it is important to ask people how they would like to be addressed and not to use nicknames or change names without the name-bearer’s agreement. Furthermore, she states that one should “make the effort to correct your ignorance; don’t expect the bearer of the name to do the work for you” (ibid.: 287). For example, one could ask other people how to pronounce certain names or check the pronunciation online. If unsure about the way a name is pronounced or spoken, it also acceptable to ask the name-bearer in a polite and apologetic manner (ibid.).

Pennesi (2017b) expands on Bucholtz’s recommendations by drawing on Universal Design for Learning (UDL), an “approach to education which is grounded in the belief that more people will be successful learners if the educational environment and experience are adequately designed to allow for diverse needs” (35). Her guidelines aim to create an inclusive and welcoming Canadian society in an institutional setting by applying UDL “outside the classroom, through workshops or employee training, to contribute to the larger social project of integrating immigrants and minorities with the more established and dominant population” (ibid.). These guidelines for the respectful treatment of diverse names can also be applied to other social situations. Pennesi’s approach is based on the two-way process of integration, in which the host community is expected to undergo accommodations, in this case learning about different naming practices and how to handle unfamiliar names.
Because microaggressions are often unconscious or unintentional, it is important to first bring attention to the issue of mistreatment of names, especially in a school setting. The majority of the microaggressive treatments that the youths in my study experienced took place at school, where they spend most of their time and are expected by society to socially integrate. Therefore, I think it is essential to raise awareness to the importance of names in schools. Not only will this facilitate integration for newcomer students, but domestic students will also learn how to handle names that are unfamiliar to them. Because of this, I think it is important to first educate teachers about the importance of names who then inform their students.

One obvious possibility to help reduce mispronunciations and othering would be to use a service like NameCoach, where all students, not just newcomers, record their own names and teachers can then access the audio files. However, not only is there a cost associated with the service ($499/year), but Pennesi (2017b: 59) also points out that not all students, especially elementary students, might have an email address, which is needed for the recording. In addition to this, while services like NameCoach are a good opportunity to learn how to correctly pronounce students’ names, students and teachers alike would not become aware why mispronunciations are a problem. Because of this, I think the best approach is to familiarize teachers with more practical guidelines like Bucholtz’s (2016) and Pennesi’s (2017a). This would provide teachers with the reasoning behind why names should be treated in a certain way and could also be applied to other settings where an online pronunciation service might not be available. Teachers who are familiar with the guidelines could then facilitate workshops for students. For those workshops, the topic could encompass different aspects of names — discovering what
one’s own name means, learning about other naming cultures and how to respectfully treat names — or they could focus on diversity and acceptance with names being one aspect like the workshops offered by Ronit Baras (2012), an Australian parenting expert and life coach. These workshops could also include creative projects about names, like making posters, writing stories or creating videos, which would enhance the educational value. Unlike campaigns like My Name, My Identity which might be more short-lived, resources for those workshops could be reused for several classes and be expanded or changed over the years.

Because Canada welcomes many newcomers every year, it is important to keep in mind that the way newcomers’ names are handled reflects larger ideologies concerning immigration. As such, the respectful treatment of newcomers’ names is a small step towards better immigrant integration, and an overall more inclusive society.
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