

Gregory Clark, *The son also rises. Surnames and the history of social mobility* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014. Pp. xii + 364. 132 figs. 42 tabs. ISBN 9780691162546 Hbk. £19.95)

The main contribution of this book is the ‘law of social mobility’: underlying social status in families regresses only slowly toward the mean, with a persistence rate of 0.75, and this persistence rate is constant across all societies. The persistence rate can be interpreted as the intergenerational correlation of underlying social status. Underlying social status, or social competence, is never observed. It is related to observed measures of status, but with some error. Two aspects of the law of social mobility are controversial. First, the intergenerational correlation of social competence is much higher than the intergenerational correlation of observed measures of status (such as income or occupational status). Second, the correlation does not change over time or vary between countries, whereas correlations of observed status show some change over time and considerable differences between countries. Not included in the law of social mobility, but claimed by Clark, is that the transfer of social competence between generations is largely genetic.

The law of social mobility is derived using a novel method. It starts with identifying surnames among an elite, preferably some centuries ago (for example, Swedish noble families in 1626). Names are selected that are rare nowadays. Then it is calculated to what extent people with these surnames are overrepresented in later elites (for example, in high status occupations) compared to people with common surnames. For example, people born in 1910 with the rare surnames of the old Swedish nobility were eight times as likely to be registered as a physician among those born in 1910 and 2.5 times as likely among those born in 1980. Under certain assumptions an intergenerational correlation of status is derived from two or more of such observations of relative representation. In this particular case the implied intergenerational correlation is 0.74.

Clark presents an amazing amount of empirical analysis to derive and test the law of social mobility. He and his colleagues analysed data from Sweden, the US, medieval and modern England, India, China, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, and Chile. In all cases old data on the surnames of an elite had to be found as well as data on the surnames of members of newer elites. Besides, data are required on how many people wear these names in the total population. The researchers showed an extraordinary creativity in finding and analysing these data. Another strong point of the book is that several chapters are devoted to empirical investigation of implications of the theory; for example, whether revolutions really do not change the intergenerational correlation, whether endogamy strengthens the intergenerational correlation, and whether the correlation is similar for families with few and many children.

Did the book convince me that the law of social mobility is true? Yes and no. It is convincing that there is more transfer (of resources or status) between generations than a simple correlation of occupational status or income between father and son suggests. People with the same surname as elite ancestors are more likely to have elite status than expected based on the observed correlations of status between generations. That implies that these (great)grandchildren are likely to be successful, even if their father had relatively low observed status. This is not a new observation. Sibling analyses show that the ‘total’ family influence is about twice as large as the observed influence. Also, multi-generation studies sometimes show direct effects of grandparents and great-grandparents on the status of their (great)grandchildren.

Is this correlation of unobserved social competence 0.75? Is it constant over time? And is it the same in all countries? Here I am less convinced. It remains unclear to what extent the correlation is driven by the fact that only a very small elite (1 to 5% of the population) is investigated. Would it be possible to estimate correlations for less elite parts of the population and what would be the result? It is not so surprising that the intergenerational

correlations are rather stable over time and not affected by large changes in the occupational distribution. The intergenerational correlations in this book are rather similar to coefficients from log-linear models, in the sense that they are also based on a comparison of odds and they rely on assumptions of stable status distributions over time and between surname groups. By definition they are insensitive to changes in the occupational distribution. Log-linear analyses also show only very slow change in association over time. The conclusion that intergenerational correlations do not differ between countries is, I think, not supported by the results in the book. The estimated intergenerational correlations range between approximately 0.60 and 1.00. Many analyses required corrections that brought the correlations closer to 0.75, but this raises the question why other analyses are not corrected. For example, the numbers for Taiwan are corrected for the significant migration from Taiwan to the US, but the numbers for Sweden are not corrected, although a quarter of the population left the country between 1850 and 1950.

Finally, I completely disagree with Clark's conclusion that parents do not need to invest in their children, because their social competence is mainly genetically determined. Parents are not interested in their children's unobserved social status, but in their actual well-being. By investing in their children they probably influence the 'error' that causes observed status to deviate from unobserved status. For parents there is little consolation in knowing that future generations of their offspring will be well off, if their children are not.

Utrecht University/VU University Amsterdam

INEKE MAAS

Francesca Fauri, ed., *The history of migration in Europe: perspectives from economics, politics and sociology* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2015. Pp. xx + 282. 23 figs. 2 plates. 17 tabs. ISBN 9781138777835 Hbk. £90/\$155)

This timely volume brings together a variety of papers on different aspects of migration, past and present. The chapters provide useful summaries of recent thinking in different disciplines and draw attention to disputed interpretations and to neglected dimensions of migration that shed particular light on broader themes. The introductory chapter by Vera Zamagni provides a useful overview of the topics and sets out some of the myths, misunderstandings, and gaps in the literature that the contributions seek to redress. The chapters cover a number of major themes: the evolution of migration, its economic and social impact, the interplay between immigration and politics, and the integration of immigrants into the host society.

Leo and Jan Lucassen seek to redefine migration as movement between cultures rather than merely across borders. Using this definition to re-calculate migration for Europe from 1500 to the present, they find that cross-cultural migration reached its maximum in the first half of the twentieth century, largely as a result of the displacements caused by wars and economic dislocation. Paula Corti argues that, although the long sweep of migration history is characterized by shifts in the scale and direction of migration, there were important elements of continuity. Family life-cycle strategies provide a unifying approach which links some of the recurring characteristics such as return and circular migration and the flow of remittances. According to M. Elisabetta Tonizzi the means of transport is a fundamental but often neglected element in all migrations. This is illustrated by the shift from sail to steam, which transformed the conditions of transatlantic migration; shipping companies also took an active role in recruiting migrants and lobbying governments.

The socio-economic outcomes of migration are reviewed from two very different theoretical perspectives. Thomas Faist reconsiders the concept of transnationalism, which is widely used in sociological analyses. He argues that inequalities in social status are shaped and transposed in a multitude of different ways, not just by migration but by globalization