

Vlad Popovici, Alice Velková, and Martin Klečacký

# Social Mobility of Elites in East-Central Europe in Historical Perspective. Introductory Study

The study of social mobility in pre-World War II periods has garnered increasing attention and experienced a marked surge in research activity worldwide during recent decades. A constellation of factors has converged to propel this development, with the most prominent being: the bedrock provided by the legacy of social mobility and historical social mobility research in the latter half of the twentieth century<sup>1</sup>; conceptual and methodological advancements, coupled with the emergence of innovative research tools in the field of historical sociology<sup>2</sup>; technological progress that has facilitated faster scholarly communication, enhanced access to a diverse range of sources, and boosted computing capabilities; and, lastly, the increasingly evident social disparities in contemporary society, which have kept the issue of social mobility at the forefront of discourse and demanded rigorous epistemological examination into the historical roots of the phenomenon.

Nevertheless, one of the main lingering challenges remains the uneven geographical distribution of research, even within the North-Western hemisphere, with a predominant focus on Western, Northern and (more recently) Southern Europe, and North America,<sup>3</sup> and fewer studies on Central and Eastern Europe.<sup>4</sup> Notably, the sub-field of research encompassing the social mobility of elites has received even less attention under this particular label and from this perspective.

---

**Note:** This study was supported by the project of the Czech Science Foundation, no. 20–19463X, “Social mobility of elites in the Central European regions (1861–1926) and transition of imperial experience and structures in nation-states.”

1 Selectively: Thernstrom, *Poverty and Progress*; Lipset and Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*; Parry and Parry, *The Rise of the Medical Profession*; Fitzpatrick, *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union*; Kaelble, *Historical Research on Social Mobility*; Kaelble, “Eras of Social Mobility”; Kocka, “Family and Class Formation”; Kaelble, *Social Mobility in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries*; Shumsky (ed.), *Social Structure and Social Mobility*; Van Leeuwen and Maas, “Social Mobility in a Dutch Province”; Miles, *Social Mobility*.

2 van Leeuwen, Maas, and Miles, *HISCO*; van Leeuwen and Maas, *HISCLASS*; Lambert et al., *HISCAM*.

3 Selectively, from among more recent literature: O’Neill, *Catholics of Consequence*, esp. 111–57; Dribe, Helgertz, and van de Putte, “Did social mobility increase”; Hertel, *Social Mobility in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*; Modalsli, “Intergenerational Mobility in Norway”; Breen and Müller (eds.), *Education and Intergenerational Social Mobility*; Todd, *Snakes and Ladders*.

4 See the references to national literature on social mobility included in most of the chapters.

---

**Vlad Popovici**, Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences (vladutpopovici@yahoo.com)

**Alice Velková**, Department of Demography and Geodemography, Faculty of Science, Charles University (alice.velkova@natur.cuni.cz)

**Martin Klečacký**, Masaryk Institute and Archives of the Czech Academy of Sciences (klecacky@mua.cas.cz)

As some of the chapters in this volume clearly illustrate, in the East-Central European regions social mobility research has primarily been the purview of sociologists and, in more recent periods, political scientists, while historians have engaged with the subject rather timidly and mainly within the interdisciplinary framework established by sociology. Within the literature dedicated to elites, while the social origins of those who comprise this conceptual category are addressed in numerous biographical and prosopographical works, studies explicitly grounded in the concept of social mobility, particularly intergenerational mobility at the group or social strata level, are also scarce. The present book, born out of the project “Social mobility of elites in the Central European regions (1861–1926) and transition of imperial experience and structures in nation-states,”<sup>5</sup> aims to provide an overview of contemporary perspectives, advancements, and adaptations in the research of elites’ social mobility in Central and Eastern Europe from the late eighteenth to the mid-twentieth centuries.

The book’s overarching objective is twofold. Firstly, it seeks to expand historical knowledge of elites in Central and Eastern Europe by focusing on an aspect that has received less attention in existing literature: the mechanisms associated with the social mobility of individuals, and by extensions of groups, who constituted the upper echelons of society and/or specific professional fields. To achieve this aim, the studies compiled encompass some of the main categories of elite research: traditional elites (aristocracy), political elites (including parliamentary elites and representatives of distinct ethnic groups), administrative elites, and intellectual elites.

Secondly, from a methodological standpoint, the publication aims to illustrate how historians of modern-time elites in Central and Eastern Europe conceptualize and approach social mobility in conjunction with the more conventional research methodologies employed in this field (e. g., biography, prosopography, institutional history). Upon establishing these foundations, we aim to provide a comparative macro-zonal framework to better contextualize the findings of the underlying research project as well as future ones.

## **1 The Under-charted Borderland: Historical Social Mobility as Approached by Social Scientists, Political Scientists and Historians**

The historical study of social stratification and mobility, as well as the examination of elites, constitute distinct yet intertwined branches within the field of social history. Social mobility, broadly defined, encompasses the movement of individuals, groups, or

---

<sup>5</sup> Project EXPRO 2020 No. 20-19463X supported by the Czech Science Foundation. The current volume includes a selection of papers delivered at the conference “Political and administrative elites in Europe – Theory and Practice in Historical Perspective,” in Prague and online, November 10–12, 2020.

sets of values across the social hierarchy, either vertically, signifying upward or downward social mobility, or horizontally, indicating a shift within the same social stratum but to a different faction or socio-professional domain.<sup>6</sup> The concept of elite (*élite*), referring to persons and groups characterized by superior attributes or abilities, positions of power and influence, or widespread recognition and prestige, remains a subject of debate among scholars. There is no consensus on using the term “elite” (with particular reference to the “power elite”), or “elites” (e.g., Vilfredo Pareto’s view of the existence of elites in every professional field),<sup>7</sup> nor on regarding it as a distinct class or simply a social stratum.<sup>8</sup>

The concepts of social stratification, social mobility, and elites are closely intertwined, as elites are the product of a social hierarchization, and access to elite status, except in cases of inherited privilege, entails vertical social mobility – which may, but not always (as underlined by H. Kaelble in his overview of the field),<sup>9</sup> involve the displacement or decline in the status of others. Despite the inherent connection and overlap in social reality, research on these topics has exhibited a somewhat limited and imbalanced intersection. Perspectives, interests, and methodological approaches to social mobility vary among scholars from different disciplines, including social scientists, historians, and political scientists. While researchers of elites (historians and political scientists) generally demonstrate a higher interest in the social mobility of their subjects, scholars of social mobility (mainly social scientists) seem to pay less attention to elite groups or individuals.<sup>10</sup>

The divergence in perspectives and the distinct origins of these research fields play a significant role in this phenomenon. While the term “elite” itself is multifaceted and lends itself to diverse interpretations, the study of elites has traditionally centered on well-defined socio-professional groups occupying the upper echelons of the social hierarchy, wielding influence and exercising decision-making power.<sup>11</sup> The attention of elite scholars has only extended to other social strata when representatives of those strata interacted, individually or collectively, with elite spaces and, more notably, when they became part of them. One of the classic theories proposed by Pareto, the circulation of elites, hinges on the very description of a process of social mobility whose dynamics vary depending on the individual’s starting point and which, as it manifests itself closer to the pinnacle of the social or professional hierarchy, exerts

---

6 Sorokin, *Social and Cultural Mobility*, 133–37. A synthetic overview of the main concepts and indicators by Kaelble, *Historical Research on Social Mobility*, 113–24.

7 Hartmann, *The Sociology of Elites*, 12–21; Pakulski, “Classical Elite Theory”; Higley, “Continuities and Discontinuities.”

8 Bourdieu, “What Makes a Social Class?”

9 Kaelble, “Social Mobility,” 428.

10 The trajectory of this subfield of research bears a resemblance to the decline observed in studies examining the impact of social mobility on electoral preferences and behavior following its transfer from the domain of sociology to political science. See Ganzeboom et al., “Comparative Intergenerational Stratification Research,” 281.

11 Higley, “Continuities and Discontinuities,” 25–39.

a more profound impact on society as a whole through its function of selecting those in positions of power. In Pareto's view, the survival of the elite as a group, particularly the ruling elite, is contingent upon the tempo of social mobility; a stagnation or, conversely, an excessively rapid flow can trigger "revolutions," resulting in the displacement of the entire ruling bloc.<sup>12</sup>

For scholars of historical elites, social mobility serves as a crucial concept, both valuable and unavoidable, as analyzing elites over time necessitates examining two concurrent processes: their circulation and reproduction. The first process, elite circulation, is fully integrated into the broader flow of social mobility, while the second, elite reproduction, partially intersects with it, along with its corollary, social immobility. Tracking the social mobility of elites in a historical context also presents another challenge; many of the sources typically employed for prosopographical studies (i. e., lists of elite group members and their characteristics at a specific historical moment) suffer from a paucity of information about the outflow from elite strata to other social spheres,<sup>13</sup> leading to a better understanding of upward social mobility than downward mobility. Consequently, centripetal factors, which propel individuals and groups towards elite status, receive more intense scrutiny and are more extensively documented than centrifugal factors, which contribute to elite decline (a fact easily observable in this volume, too).

In contrast to studies on elites, which focus on the upper societal strata, society-wide social mobility studies have emerged from a concern with exploring social inequalities and the expansion of equal and social opportunities amidst occupational diversification, technological advancements, and the social transformations of modernity. Their focus extends to the entirety of society, encompassing groups that were previously relatively immobile (e. g., agricultural or industrial workers) or those with status dependency (e. g., women).<sup>14</sup> Their researchers, particularly social scientists, utilize the concept of social mobility to debate and explain the underpinnings of macro-social processes, within which the majority of factors shaping social mobility operate outside the elite sphere. If we were to analogize social mobility to a railway line (a quintessential symbol of modernity), then the elite would represent just one of the stations along the route, the most distant and challenging to reach, yet also the least populated, least socially diverse, and most exclusive in comparison to all others. Within this context, the reduced interest in elites among social mobility scholars is understandable, especially considering that the former already benefit from a clearly defined research area and specialized practitioners. Notably, researchers of social mobility are not the only representatives of social science history to exhibit less interest in elites; a similar phenomenon exists among anthropologists.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Nielsen, "Economic Inequality," 629–30.

<sup>13</sup> van Leeuwen and Maas, "Historical Studies," 432.

<sup>14</sup> Kaelble, "Social Mobility," 426.

<sup>15</sup> Gusterson, "Elites, Anthropology of," 386–99.

Furthermore, disparities in methodology that depend on the typology and accessibility of sources, as well as differing viewpoints, impede interdisciplinary cooperation. Studies of the elites' history show a preference for two distinct methodological approaches: biographical (including genealogies and family monographs) and prosopographical, along with related historiographical sub-species. Sometimes, an institutional history perspective is also employed. The examination of social mobility, irrespective of the historical timeframe investigated, has chiefly been connected to the sociological viewpoint and depends on sophisticated statistical analysis.

Biographies and family histories offer the benefit of facilitating in-depth analysis of one or multiple life courses (though limited in number), along with tracing social mobility within and across generations at a micro-social level, incorporating various qualitative factors. Research in these sub-fields, sometimes bordering on microhistory, relies heavily on the unpredictable existence and preservation of primary sources. Generally, it examines the elites and the upper echelons of the middle class, who typically generated more evidence, but also occasionally focuses on individuals who established themselves in particular professional contexts, such as public intellectuals or cultural figures with fleeting political careers.<sup>16</sup> The studies that emerge from a small number of research subjects and a narrow pool of elites, who prioritize social mobility as a secondary issue, are useful but insufficient in their representation of the elite social micro-group, especially as social mobility analysis generally does not encompass biographies and family histories.<sup>17</sup>

When exploring beyond individual or familial contexts, late modern elite historians typically concentrate on pre-selected groups or micro-groups based on structural or functional criteria. These criteria may comprise of high-ranking positions in institutions, such as governmental (including the military), economic, intellectual,<sup>18</sup> but also church-related, and could also include representatives of an entire social class, such as the aristocracy.<sup>19</sup> In cases like these, historical explanations concentrate on structural modifications grounded on individual data. Social mobility is primarily studied at the group level by analyzing the progression of the background and social status of varying members or sub-groups over an extended period of time.

The primary basis for this approach is rooted in the traditional methodologies employed by the elite-studying historians, which make heavy use of the prosopographical method – a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis.<sup>20</sup> The former are conducted on small to medium-size datasets, encompassing a few dozen to a few thousand individuals and employing a restricted number of variables attributed to data source limitations and biographical data collection procedures. They also rely on more basic

---

<sup>16</sup> Buchen and Rolf, *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich*; Fasora et al., *Elitenforschung*; Řezník and Velek, *Adelsgeschichte als Elitenforschung*; Stekl and Wakounig, *Windisch-Graetz*.

<sup>17</sup> Kaelble, "Social Mobility," 426.

<sup>18</sup> Bottomore, *Élites and Society*, 52–71.

<sup>19</sup> Chaussinand-Nogaret, "Introduction."

<sup>20</sup> Keats-Rohan (ed.), *Prosopography*; A recent overview of the field: Keats-Rohan, "Prosopography."

statistical analyses, whose methodology and results are easily understandable and contextualized by general public,<sup>21</sup> with the latter, whenever feasible, anchored on an in-depth understanding of the biographies of a select number of research subjects. The extensive information provided allows for the validation of some quantitative analysis results through individual examples, particularly in scenarios where it is hard to quantify indicators like status, prestige, and subjective personal choices, however, it does not sufficiently tackle the overarching issue of biographical knowledge imbalance in the micro-group under examination. Most of the historical studies in this volume adhere to the perspective that social mobility shapes the composition of predefined elite groups. These studies are based on datasets that contain information on numerous individual biographies and career categories, which are analyzed in varying degrees and combinations as mentioned before.

Unlike studies devoted to elites and in particular to their history, social mobility research *per se*, usually conducted by social scientists, focuses on much larger demographic samples, grouped into cohorts based on various criteria, in the investigation of which they apply, almost without exception, advanced statistical analysis at a national or transnational level.<sup>22</sup> By choosing cohorts over pre-defined socio-professional groups, the quantitative sociological approach provides a stronger explanation for the individual subject and life course compared to prosopographical examination. This is partly attributed to the ability of individuals to belong to multiple cohorts simultaneously, allowing for their analyses to be cross-referenced and verified.

Another significant distinction is that sociologists have made strides in establishing a common analytical framework for examining social mobility using universally comparable indicators. For the post-World War II period, Donald J. Treiman's occupational prestige model and the social stratification research tools stemming from it, along with the cross-national comparative studies they enabled, remain the benchmark.<sup>23</sup> From a historical perspective, within the Western context and the modern period, the expansion of population databases compiled from censuses and civil registers from the eighteenth century to World War II has facilitated the development of a historical model of occupational stratification and classification<sup>24</sup> and, subsequently, several models of social hierarchy, with increasingly compelling results in recent decades.<sup>25</sup>

The breadth of sociological samples, which tend towards big data, is challenging to replicate in datasets compiled by historians, particularly those focused on elites. However, another contributing factor to historians' reluctance to engage with theoretical models from sociology lies in the difficulty of establishing universally comparable indicators of social mobility across time, even within major social groups. The most com-

---

21 Kaelble, "Eras of Social Mobility," 489.

22 Ibid.

23 Treiman, *Occupational Prestige*; Erikson and Goldthorpe, *The Constant Flux*; Breen (ed.), *Social Mobility in Europe*.

24 van Leeuwen, Maas and Miles, *HISCO*; van Leeuwen and Maas, "Historical Studies," 443.

25 van Leeuwen and Maas, *HISCLASS*; Lambert et al., *HISCAM*.

monly employed indicator of social position and mobility remains occupation, but its value for historical societies is far more subjective than for contemporary ones, which necessitates incorporating a broader range of complementary variables into the analysis, such as income sources beyond the primary profession or positions within networks and other social structures (i. e., multipositionality).<sup>26</sup> Although these traits are characteristic of elites and could potentially facilitate the engagement between these two broad research areas, it is precisely the inherent difficulty of objectively identifying, quantifying, and comparing such indicators, largely due to the limitations of historical sources, that renders the study of social mobility more challenging as one approaches the upper echelons of society. Furthermore, when examining social mobility within elite groups, the explanatory power of objective, quantifiable, and comparable variables tends to diminish, giving way to quintessentially qualitative and subjective factors such as status, prestige, or cultural milieu. For instance, the same “elite” profession or position (e. g., clerical professions) may hold a varying degree of significance in the same geographical area, political system, and time period, depending on factors such as race, ethnicity, or confession/religion.

Given these differences, even the sophisticated sociological instruments designed to explore social mobility from a historical vantage point, as mentioned above, become less efficient when applied to the study of elites. While these tools incorporate a range of standardized qualitative indicators aimed at highlighting status disparities within the same occupational domain or on a macro-social level (e. g., prestige measures or different types of social relations), they only partially capture the distinctions between elites and other social strata in their immediate vicinity. This limitation arises from subjective elements such as forms of status or prestige that are challenging to incorporate into a straightforward taxonomy, hierarchical stratification within the same professional environment, combinations of professional positions and informal statuses that defy categorization, the fluctuating social relevance of professions over time, and occupational multipositionality prevalent among nineteenth-century elites. It is thus no surprise that, as H. Kaelble rightly observed four decades ago, “these two theatres of the history of social mobility [n. n., the one run by historians and that of the sociologists] have no actors and very few spectators in common.”<sup>27</sup>

If we consider that historians typically identify elite socio-professional groups in conjunction with the context and social stratum within which they operate, even the initial step (i. e., identifying elite individuals based on professional stratification) becomes fraught with challenges. For example, the Historical International Standard Classification of Occupations (HISCO) model provides a single professional code for clerical professions (14120), to which status codes can be associated in order to define top positions in the field. However, the latter do not allow for precise differentiation between positions such as that of archpriest (hierarchically superior to a parish priest, but to be

---

<sup>26</sup> van Leeuwen and Maas, “Historical Studies”, 443; Kaelble, “Social Mobility,” 426–27.

<sup>27</sup> Kaelble, “Eras of Social Mobility,” 489.

associated at most with the local elite) or that of bishop (hierarchically superior to the archpriest, and definitely part of the regional or state elite, almost regardless of historical conditions). Using the same example, when the HISCO code is transferred to the International Historical Class Scheme (HISCLASS) system (i. e., placement in a major social class according to profession and other status indicators), either the priest and the archpriest will be assigned to HISCLASS 2, and the bishop to HISCLASS 1 (in which case the difference in professional and social status between the first two is blurred), or the archpriest will also jump to HISCLASS 1 (because he has been coded with a status code higher than the basic profession indicated by the HISCO code), which will place him alongside his much more prestigious hierarchical superior, the bishop. Assuming we opt for the first variant, which is closer to historical reality, we run into another problem; the archpriest (HISCLASS 2) is placed in a lower social class than a headteacher (HISCO 13940, HISCLASS 1 – like the bishop), even though during late modernity, at least in Central Europe, the two enjoyed roughly the same social status, and moreover, if the headteacher was running a religious school, the local archpriest was actually his administrative superior. In addition to the aforementioned challenges, if we also incorporate the variances in legal standing between religions and confessions, perpetuated in Central and Eastern Europe until the mid-nineteenth century, it becomes evident that, from the perspective of elites' historians, the implementation of an otherwise highly refined and valuable historical sociological model presents, in practice, a myriad of challenges.

Historians' traditional inclination towards qualitative approaches and their partial reluctance to sophisticated statistical methods are also rooted in the specificity of the evidence they typically employ. Historical sources, even those related to elites, rarely offer information as detailed, consistent, accurate, and pertinent to the research questions as that derived from questionnaires specifically designed to address social scientists' research inquiries. The hurdles presented by the substantial distinctions between the information on political and administrative elites provided by pre- and post-interwar sources are aptly reflected in the research conducted by political scientists. Their interest in political and administrative elites, coupled with the employment of advanced statistical methods and a greater focus on biographical details and qualitative sources compared to social scientists, has fostered their keen interest in the social mobility of elites.

However, political scientists' research on this topic seldom extends to any period before 1900, typically commencing with the 1930s and 1940s. This is exemplified by one of the most recent syntheses on political elites, which primarily focuses on the twentieth century and barely mentions social mobility as a pathway to elite access. Instead, the authors predominantly utilize the term "elite recruitment,"<sup>28</sup> emphasizing the active and deliberate involvement of elite members in shaping the social mobility process and influencing the composition of their own socio-professional group. Works

---

28 Best and Higley (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook*.



studying the period from before 1914 are fewer in number and rarely cover East-Central Europe, due to specific conditions of biographical data gathering. The analyses focus on geographical mobility and to a certain degree on the occupational profile of the representatives, and less on social mobility (it is true that they do highlight the important part played by the emergence of political parties).<sup>29</sup> Hungary represents an exception in this regard, being the best covered country in East-Central Europe, owing to the works of Gabriella Ilonszki, whose datasets are integrated into the above mentioned European-scale research. Still, Ilonszky's conclusions on the topic of professionalization – a closely linked concept to social mobility – were questioned by historian Andras Cieger, who identified, using qualitative methods, several factors signaling the professionalization process of the political class in Hungary since the end of the nineteenth century, and not only after 1989, as Ilonszky suggests.<sup>30</sup>

To sum up, the study of social mobility among elites remains a cross-disciplinary frontier, embraced by historians, sociologists, and political scientists, yet hindered by challenges in communication and establishing a shared framework. Political scientists typically restrict their investigations to periods post-WWI (mainly due to the difficulties of gathering reliable data) and focus solely on political and administrative elites, while sociologists and historians employ disparate methodologies mirroring their divergent epistemic perspectives and choice of sources. Consequently, examining the social mobility of late modern elites presents obstacles stemming from the methodological and analytical distinctions between research on overall social mobility across macro-groups or social classes and the more nuanced examination of social mobility within the same socio-professional group<sup>31</sup> or social stratum composed of the top representatives of multiple professions.

It is also essential to keep in mind the disparities in historical knowledge regarding elites across various regions, even within Europe, and, more significantly, the absence of a shared analytical framework. Focusing specifically on the instance of political elites, particularly the parliamentary type, which has garnered the most scholarly attention, the common analytical framework covering all of Europe developed under the guidance of Heinrich Best and Maurizio Cotta seems to be used only by political scientists and mainly for the post-World War II era.<sup>32</sup> In the context of the late modern period, despite the publication of a considerable number of national or imperial parliamentary prosopographies, there is neither a formally recognized common framework of reference nor a transnational database, not even in the region of the former

---

<sup>29</sup> Best and Cotta (eds.), *Parliamentary Representatives*; Cotta and Best (eds.), *Democratic Representation*.

<sup>30</sup> Cieger, "Politics as a Profession."

<sup>31</sup> See the debate around the employment of the "micro-class" approach, among others: Erikson, Goldthorpe, and Hällsten, "No Way Back?," and Ruggera and Barone, "Social Closure."

<sup>32</sup> Semenova, Edinger and Best, "Parliamentary Elite Formation."

Habsburg Monarchy.<sup>33</sup> Transnational comparative studies, in turn, have only been undertaken for Western Europe.<sup>34</sup> Instead, there exists a multitude of datasets, which have expanded exponentially due to the extensive digitization of primary sources over the past two decades, but these datasets typically evolve into prosopographical websites<sup>35</sup> rather than aggregated databases. The situation is largely analogous for university graduates (multiple national prosopographies and datasets built using different techniques) and administrative elites, particularly imperial bureaucracies.

The challenges mentioned above limit, for the time being, the scope of research on the social mobility of late modern elites in East-Central Europe, as well as on other aspects of their social history. Studies are constrained to the level of the state (either national or imperial) and establishing a symmetrical dialogue with historical sociology and political sciences remains challenging, which hinders the calibration of macro-social analysis tools to align with the epistemological expectations of historians. In what follows, based on the case studies presented in this volume, we will discuss two central issues related to investigating this topic: the main factors underlying the social mobility of elites in late-modern East-Central Europe and the limits of the social mobility process among and towards upper social strata.

## 2 Social Mobility of Elites in Central and Eastern Europe During Late Modernity

The chapters in this collection center on Central and Eastern Europe during the late modern era – a region where the investigation of social mobility has only recently garnered research attention, primarily from sociologists<sup>36</sup> – and on socio-professional groups often associated in historical studies with the concept of “elite”: members of parliament, aristocracy, high bureaucracy, and academics. Nevertheless, this homogenizing label fails to capture the structural and functional distinctions that exist between and within these groups. The aristocracy is a form of traditional elite, rooted in early modern or even medieval times, whose status stems from the accumulation of tradition and prestige over generations. In their endeavor to adapt to modernity, some members of the aristocracy have successfully transitioned into the ranks of the emerging professional and political elites (Pál),<sup>37</sup> with academics (Urbanitsch, Po-

---

33 Selectively: Toth, *Parteien und Reichstagswahlen*; Ceaușu, *Parlamentarism*; Ilonszki, *Képviselők és képviselőket*; Luft, *Parlamentarische Führungsgruppen*; Adlgasser, *Die Mitglieder*; Pap et al., *Képviselők és főrendek*.

34 Best and Cotta (eds.), *Parliamentary Representatives*; Recker, *Parlamentarismus in Europa*; Cotta and Best (eds.), *Democratic Representation*.

35 For example, <https://www.parlament.gv.at/WWER/NR/ABG/#>.

36 Most research on the topic still comes from the field of sociology. Selectively: Lippényi, Maas, and van Leeuwen, “Intergenerational Class Mobility”; Sopóci et al. *Social Stratification*.

37 References in round brackets refer to chapters in the volume.

povici) and bureaucrats (Vladimirov, Klečacký et al.) representing two professional categories that have undergone profound transformation since the late eighteenth century. They have become agents of modernization in both nation-states and multinational empires, and until the twentieth century, exhibited greater openness to social mobility.<sup>38</sup> In a sense, representatives of these two professions epitomize the concept of “imperial biographies,”<sup>39</sup> even though, due to the nature of their profession, the work of bureaucrats was typically less transnational or even trans-imperial than that of academics.

Members of parliament (Adlgasser; Vranić and Marić; Sima and Eppel) constitute a highly diverse group whose elite status, collectively, derives from the amalgamation of the powerful symbolism associated with their official representative role and the decision-making authority and influence, both formal and informal, vested in political positions. However, as several contributions in this collection illustrate, the advent of universal suffrage and the concomitant democratization of the political landscape significantly transformed not only the professional but also the social makeup of parliaments during the early twentieth century, paving the way for social mobility to permeate even the upper echelons of the political elite. In some instances, these reconfigurations were so profound that they challenged the very public perception and elite standing of the institution itself (Vranić and Marić).

Each of the aforementioned groups, typically regarded as elite within the broader society, exhibits internal hierarchies, distinctions, and its own apex elite. As we ascend the ranks of a social or professional hierarchy, upward mobility becomes increasingly intricate to discern historically, demanding finer tuning to the historian’s interpretative framework and measurement tools. These challenges are compounded by the phenomenon that, as we approach the early twentieth century, on the background of increased professionalization in state-supported occupational fields, the formal distinctions between various positions or even professions tend to diminish, and intangible factors such as prestige, public perception, and contextual details play a more prominent role than in lower social strata, rendering quantification more challenging.

The analysis of social mobility among elites is further complicated by the intricate web of interdependencies that exist between various occupational categories which have proven instrumental in facilitating both professional and social advancement and serving as a recruitment pool for other professions. One notable example is the relationship between bureaucrats and politicians, where a dynamic interplay of subordination (political loyalty being in many cases a prerequisite for career advancement) and interdependence has emerged, particularly with the professionalization of political organizations and the rise of party bureaucracy.<sup>40</sup> In many regions of Central and Eastern Europe, electoral success has traditionally relied heavily on the support of local of-

---

38 Lipset and Bendix, *Social Mobility*, 72–4; Surman, *Universities*.

39 Rolf and Tondera, “Imperial Biographies Revisited”; Buchen and Rolf, *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich*.

40 Dogan, “Les professions”; Marton, “Becoming Political Professionals.”

ficials, who in turn executed tasks assigned by political superiors. However, a significant portion of future members of parliament were drawn from this same pool of civil servants,<sup>41</sup> many of whom sought to enter parliament solely to ensure their re-entry into the bureaucracy at a higher level of authority.<sup>42</sup> This career advancement, while significant at individual level, may not necessarily constitute actual vertical social mobility.

The concept of social mobility in the study of elites cannot be applied universally, merely by relying on the overarching notion of “elite.” Instead, it requires contextualization within specific socio-professional milieus, taking into account their unique characteristics and the social and historical realities that shape their dynamics. This is one point in which the historians’ view challenges the large-scale sociological and even social science history analyses. For instance, in predominantly rural societies or ethnic groups within the Habsburg Monarchy, a substantial portion of what might be regarded as the local/ group elite during the first half of the nineteenth century consisted of clergymen and lower-level intellectuals, extending down to the rank of archpriests or even village priests.<sup>43</sup> The subsequent two generations witnessed a shift towards domination by civil servants and various types of jurists, particularly lawyers, many of whom hailed from clerical families (Sima and Eppel), however, the representation of clergy among parliamentary elites of the nationalities remained significant (Vranić and Marić). At the macro-societal level, on the other hand, few representatives of these ethnic elites could be considered truly provincial elites. The majority were simply members of the middle class, often from the petty bourgeoisie, who were associated with the concept of “elite” due to their political activism within their respective ethnic groups or, less commonly, due to public prominence garnered through their involvement in various social or cultural initiatives.

From a methodological standpoint, the studies adopt a generational approach in various forms, complemented by prosopographical datasets encompassing hundreds or even thousands of individuals spanning multiple decades. While the contributions rely primarily on prosopography and refrain from employing more advanced statistical methods, the discernible shifts in elite composition driven by social mobility allow a few overarching observations. One of the most significant insights concerns the impact of generational turnover at the elite level; the rise of representatives from a new generation to leadership positions brings about a relatively rapid transformation of the elite’s composition, as it incorporates members of the same generation who are closely

---

<sup>41</sup> Pap, *Parliamentary Representatives*, 124–5; Marton, “Becoming Political Professionals.” National findings are by and large consistent with the wider European trends identified by Cotta and Tavares de Almeida, “From Servants of the State,” although national specificities might increase the share of public employees and especially civil servants among representatives.

<sup>42</sup> Heindl, *Josephinische Mandarine*, 99–105; Iudean, *The Romanian Governmental Representatives*.

<sup>43</sup> Hitchins, *A Nation Affirmed*, 101–10; Hučko, *Sociálne zloženie*.

aligned with and supportive of the new leaders. This phenomenon has the potential to trigger a wave of social mobility, at least in the associated micro-environments.<sup>44</sup>

## 2.a Factors Influencing Social Mobility

Among the factors influencing social mobility identified in the literature, the studies in this volume focus on occupation and available career paths, education, geographic area of origin, ethnicity, religion, and, to a lesser extent, social background and related family networks, prestige, and public visibility. All of these, however, depended, in whole or in part, on the most important agent of elite social mobility of the time: state policies. The state's objectives, expressed through legislation, contributed decisively to the successive reconfiguration of several elite occupational categories, including the metamorphosis of the political elite. The latter was dependent on electoral legislation (Adlgasser; Pál), on the need of the state to cooperate with the regional elite (Vladimirov), or, in exceptional situations, even on subjective momentary decisions of the group in power (Vranić and Marić for the situation in Croatia in 1918).

Although less addressed in the individual chapters, the process of professionalization also played its part in the social mobility of elites. Since the mid-nineteenth century, the selection of political elites has involved occupational groups that became over-represented in parliamentary institutions. Therefore, in the given historical context, certain professions such as lawyers, journalists, civil servants, writers, and members of the clergy – most of them fully or largely professionalized and institutionalized – became vehicles for social ascension to elite status, even if the profession or position of the respective individuals in their professional circles were not elite *per se* (Adlgasser; Vranić and Marić; Sima and Eppel). The situation is very similar to what was defined in the early 1970s as “collective social mobility,” i.e., the social advancement of a whole professional field, due to specific historical factors, bestowing upon its practitioners a rather uniform status. At the time, scholars saw the process as intertwined with the “embourgeoisement,”<sup>45</sup> with university professors falling into the same category (Urbanitsch). Interestingly enough, most of these professions are directly related to the functioning of public authority or can exert a strong influence in this regard (e.g., journalists and public intellectuals).

The transition from “professionals involved in politics” to “professional politicians” started a few decades later, towards the end of the nineteenth century. Traditionally, based on Max Weber's work, the process was seen as rooted in democratization and the emergence of mass political parties. Weber's vision was to be confirmed by the historiography in the 2000s through analyses which underlined the increasingly impor-

---

<sup>44</sup> On the topic of “generation” and related historical changes in the former Habsburg lands, see also Fasora et al. (eds.), *Generationen*.

<sup>45</sup> Parry and Parry, *The Rise*, 3–19, 76–103.

tant (although far from exclusive) role played by mass political parties in the recruitment of the representatives, especially after 1918.<sup>46</sup>

Education, supported by the state, was a key vehicle for social mobility and played a crucial role in the rise of modern elites.<sup>47</sup> In the field of politics, this was especially true until the introduction of universal male suffrage, but in other fields it became apparent as early as the mid-nineteenth century. Even traditional elites adapted to the new requirements, as specialized training became increasingly important for career advancement (Vladimirov). Education created new professional elites, including academic ones, broadening the spectrum of top societal occupational categories (Urbanitsch), with many new members of the political elite gaining the right to elect and be elected due to their studies (Adlgasser). Finally, the period of study, including pre-university education, became crucial for the socialization process of individuals from lower social strata and for the formation of future networks, often achieved through participation in pupils' or students' reading societies. Another important aspect reflecting the role of education in social mobility is the institutionalization of various occupational fields and subfields based on specific qualifications.<sup>48</sup> Although less discussed in the enclosed chapters, such professional associations also flourished in Central Europe supporting their members' networking, mediating the relation with the public authority, and impacting their occupational and social mobility.<sup>49</sup> Even so, throughout the period, there were also exceptions, people for whom education played little to no role in their political ascent. They came initially from the traditional elite and later, after the extension of the right to vote, from representatives of the lower social classes who assumed a political role (Adlgasser; Vranić and Marić).

In some cases, normative changes and new state expectations led to a generational succession of emergent professions or forms of education within the elite category. Such is the case of the transition of the provincial bureaucratic elite in Russian Poland from a predominantly military to a civilian one, with specialized university education (Vladimirov), or the transition from a priestly to a legal career path of the Romanian ethnic political elite in Transylvania (Sima and Eppel).

Geographical location was another factor that impacted the composition of the elite and, consequently, social mobility. The disparities between urban and rural regions, which can be understood in terms of center and periphery,<sup>50</sup> were evident in the over-representation of cities, particularly the capital, in parliament (Adlgasser). This was due to a combination of demographic growth – largely through migration – and higher living standards, which contributed to the formation of an upper-middle

---

46 Fiers and Secker, "A Career through the Party," 136–59; Cotta and Verzichelli, "Paths of Institutional Development," 471.

47 Cohen, *Education and Middle Class Society*; Kaelble, *Historical Research on Social Mobility*, 81–112; Kaelble, *Social Mobility in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, 34–41.

48 Millerson, *The Qualifying Associations*, esp. 120–30.

49 For Germany see McClelland, *The German Experience*, esp. 73–127.

50 For a recent overview of this conceptual binomial, see Kaps and Komlosy, "Introduction," esp. 251–3.

class that was interested and engaged in politics (Vranić and Marić) and civil service (Klečacký et al.). In some regions, the socio-professional profile is characterized by slow development in certain occupational branches, inevitably influencing the political elite representing the region, such as Croatia and Transylvania, where technical professions were still underdeveloped. However, the social composition of the “elite” also reflects the differences between the center and periphery. For instance, in the central parliament of Austria, industrial and agricultural workers remained absent even after the universal franchise (Adlgasser). In contrast, the Croatian parliament included representatives of peasants and smallholders as soon as the franchise was enlarged (Vranić & Marić).

Even for MPs who come from “privileged” social categories in terms of political representation, access to the central parliament often becomes available only after years of activity in regional or local representative forums (Adlgasser). The transition from regional parliaments or municipal assemblies to the central one can be seen as both geographical (i. e., from the periphery to the center) and vertical mobility (i. e., local, regional, and central/ state), with both processes representing social ascension and individual success, with associated symbolic and practical benefits. The relationship between the regional and central levels is evident in the bureaucracy of the Russian Empire, where certain positions in specific provinces were temporary but necessary steppingstones to other bureaucratic offices at the central level (Vladimirov).<sup>51</sup> Despite criticisms, the methodological perspective based on the center-periphery relationship retains sufficient explanatory power, particularly when integrated with specific factors.<sup>52</sup>

In some instances, new state-level legislative rules led to variations in political representation, resulting in changes to the composition of the political elite. These changes occurred amidst economic and developmental imbalances, as well as material differences between the traditional elites of different regions. For example, the reform of the House of Magnates in the Hungarian Parliament in 1885 impacted the Transylvanian aristocracy heavier than the Hungarian one (see Pál). Other examples of the geographical factor’s impact refer to the rotten boroughs, with these small-scale parliamentary constituencies enjoying their status based on the perpetuation of early modern privileges, forming solid electoral bases for the ruling party for decades, due to the small number of voters and the low financial investment required to buy votes.<sup>53</sup> Geography’s influence was evident not only in the parliamentary elite but also in the leadership structure of the political parties of the time, with the proximity of the leaders’ residence to the official party center strongly influencing the parties’ board membership.<sup>54</sup>

---

51 See also Rolf, *Imperial Russian Rule*, 29–57, esp. 53; for the Austrian case: Urbanitsch, “The High Civil Service Corps.”

52 See also Kaps and Komlosy, “Introduction.”

53 Pál, “Parliament,” 15–44, esp. 35–40.

54 Popovici, *Studies*, 30–1.

Even the new elites were subject to geographical conditioning, which is evident in the changing structure of the teaching staff at the University of Vienna over time (Urbanitsch). It is also apparent in the increased chances of professional advancement enjoyed by Russian bureaucrats in the vicinity of provincial centers (Vladimirov). In certain cases, local elite networks may have had an advantage over representatives and networks from more geographically distant areas that were less connected to the power dynamics and expectations of the center. This advantage may have been due to the geographical location and the role as an economic and cultural hub (Popovici, the case of Braşov/ Kronstadt/ Brassó). Geographical centrality, rather than just symbolic centrality, appears to have been a factor that promoted professional advancement and, consequently, social mobility.

Attaining elite status often required a standardized career path, whether for university professors (Urbanitsch), civil servants (Vladimirov; Klečácký et al.), or politicians. This career path involved transitioning through a geographical area or a proxy institutional position before entering the elite, even its lower layers. It was a way of gaining experience and becoming acquainted with the rules of the professional field, as well as receiving ideological validation (see Vladimirov: superintendents). Even within the elite, certain positions functioned as mandatory steppingstones for higher or more lucrative offices; Andrei Sora highlighted in his works how the institution of prefect in modern Romania was often the easiest path for retired law magistrates and senior army officers to perform their political socialization before advancing into a more prestigious and lucrative seat of parliamentary representative or mayor of a large city.<sup>55</sup>

Ethnicity and denomination also played a role in occupational and social mobility. They influenced identity and loyalty choices,<sup>56</sup> imposed limitations or glass ceilings on representatives of certain ethnicities or religions (Vladimirov; Urbanitsch; Popovici), and perpetuated power positions (see Adlgasser for the ethnic German dominance of the *Reichsrat's* presidency). Some national or religious minorities embraced careers in the liberal professions to a greater extent due to their political position in relation to the state and the lower chances of being integrated into public services (Sima and Eppel; Vladimirov). Geographical distribution of professional body members also reveals religious or ethnic discrimination, which overlaps with center-periphery differences. However, discrimination appears to be less prevalent at the top of the professional hierarchy (Vladimirov).

The chapters in the volume also highlight that professional ascension and related social mobility are often accompanied by prestige markers, such as titles, orders, and medals, which are usually regulated and offered by the state (Urbanitsch; Vladimirov). The latter, which were equivalent to the prestige markers of the traditional elite, did not influence social mobility; rather, they identified it and contributed to strengthening

---

<sup>55</sup> Sora, *Servir l'État roumain*, 361–3.

<sup>56</sup> Iudean, *The Romanian Governmental Representatives*.



the members' sense of belonging, and loyalty to the state, and to the professional and elite group they were part of.

## 2.b Limits of Social Mobility Among the Elite

During late modernity, an increased number of people attained positions that could be considered part of the "elite." However, this process was limited by various factors, including the material conditions of the starting social stratum, the immobility of the traditional elite, differences in occupational status and income, and the structural and functional changes of the political elite. Not to be overlooked remains the mere fact that, even if we agree to the perspective of "collective social mobility," not everyone exercising a social mobility-supporting profession necessarily got to climb up the social ladder due to the increasingly competitive nature of such occupational fields.<sup>57</sup>

Even among the "privileged" professions (such as the legal and medical ones),<sup>58</sup> material support remained crucial for social advancement. This was true not only during studies, when needs and expectations were comparatively lower and scholarships were available, but also during the period of professional debut, which was often associated with minor hierarchical positions and lower wages. Immediate professional opportunities sometimes hijacked a virtual career that required financial investment, effort, and hardship in the medium and long term, limiting social mobility but offering day-to-day security and the possibility of supporting a family. In this situation, representatives of the local elite chose to remain in their original social environment, sometimes perpetuating their parents' professions and foregoing ascension to the upper strata of the elite (Vladimirov). The choice was all the more present because, in practice, social mobility rarely involved a linear upward path, but more often a succession of horizontal segments aimed at reaching a key position/hub from which vertical advancement could take place, but which did not exclude stages of regression (Urbanitsch; Vladimirov).

For traditional elites, social mobility was typically a slow and mostly horizontal process, involving gradual metamorphoses and adaptations, but rarely fundamental changes, as they were already at the societal apex. For those coming from below, access to these levels required the accumulation of experience and a long period of professional activity, as well as integration into and assumption of a specific community of values (Vladimirov; Pál). Research suggests that 100 years later the situation was (and probably still is) largely the same in terms of the need for a mandatory period of pro-

---

<sup>57</sup> The situation appears to be true even in highly specialized occupational fields, such as medicine, where only a small number of practitioners actually get into the elite societal layers, while on the other hand, some percent even experienced downward mobility. See Ackroyd et al., *Advancing with the Army*, esp. 257–94; Tomkins, *Medical misadventures*. For the situation in Hungary in the first half of the nineteenth century see Simon, "Mesterségből hivatás", esp. 94–5.

<sup>58</sup> Millerson, *The Qualifying Associations*, 6–7.

fessional socialization which was essential for building a sense of belonging to the high bureaucracy.<sup>59</sup> Back in late modernity, this additional filter generally favored the self-reproductive tendencies of the elite, particularly its peaks, by maintaining narrow criteria or a limited selection pool (Adlgasser), or even family promotion (Pál; Vladimirov; Urbanitsch, Popovici).

Situations where members of the traditional elite reached top positions without meeting standard characteristics of their colleagues from other social strata (Adlgasser), or where they continued to dominate political life of a region for decades despite changes in franchise and overall social and economic metamorphoses, only strengthen the argument. Until the turn of the century, the combination of wealth, networks, and a solid grasp of the local institutions served as a lifeline for the deferential society (Pál).

In certain instances, the preservation of the status and legitimacy of the traditional elite was aided by their identification with, or even leadership in, the process of nation- and state-building, as was the case in Hungary. Here, not only did the share of nobility among parliamentary representatives remain high until World War II,<sup>60</sup> but the economic association with key symbolic elements, such as land ownership (i. e., national territory, *Vaterland*), led to the belief that the economic survival of the traditional elite was necessary for the survival of the state, which was also openly supported by members of the new elite.<sup>61</sup> Additionally, the prestige of the position was closely tied to that of the person occupying it. Until the turn of the twentieth century, the interdependence of the two perpetuated, which attracted members of the traditional elite to important administrative positions, which in turn, given their limited number, narrowed the chances of candidates from other social layers to accede into high public services offices, especially in those under direct political influence. As a result, the pace of social mobility towards elite professional positions was reduced (Pál).

After the systemic changes at the end of the First World War, the situation was reversed. The traditional elite was well-defined both socially and culturally, and access and integration into it often involved a transgenerational process of identity and cultural reconstruction. The formation of modern nations in Central and Southeastern Europe overlapped with the latter and inevitably diluted the supra-national character of the aristocracy, which led to ethnic associations that often affected the political position and, partly, the prestige of the pre-1919 traditional elite in the successor states (Pál). However, the political setback of certain traditional elite groups, such as large landowners (many of whom were aristocrats) or politically active intellectuals, during the early twentieth-century electoral reforms did not necessarily result in a social demotion. Their status and prestige remained largely unaffected, demonstrating that social mobility is “not a zero-sum game,”<sup>62</sup> illustrated by how the economic elite in pre-

---

<sup>59</sup> Kerrouche, “L’apprentissage.”

<sup>60</sup> Rush, “The Decline of Nobility,” 30, Figure 2.1.

<sup>61</sup> Ballabás, “Entailed Lands.”

<sup>62</sup> Kaelble, “Social Mobility,” 428.

1918 Transylvania, primarily composed of Hungarians, Germans, and Jews, maintained their position and social status in post-1918 Romania.<sup>63</sup>

The deceleration of social mobility at the upper echelons of society was not limited to the traditional elite. The upper structures, whether social or professional, such as the aristocracy (Pál), the bureaucratic elite (Vladimirov), or parliamentary leaders (Adlgasser), were considerably less permeable and more resistant to change than those at the bottom. Therefore, social mobility among elites is merely a reflection at scale of the entire societal mobility process.

In addition, the old elites tended to be self-reproducing, managing through informal methods to circumvent the meritocratic norms imposed by the state. The mid-nineteenth century saw the emergence of new elites that were more open and meritocratic, such as the intellectuals which showcased reduced dependence on the old elite networks, including higher rates of marital social exogamy, at least in the initial phases. However, even within this group, over time, there were tendencies towards exclusivity; professional endogamous marriages and dynasties, as well as other strategies for reproducing social status, began to increase (Urbanitsch; Popovici). The overall trend was to restrict the vertical movement towards and within the elite.<sup>64</sup>

The phenomenon was also apparent in the fact that, even within elite professional or social milieus, the overall profile of the members (rather permeable and open to circulation) differed quite conspicuously from the peak (characterized by a much more pronounced and long-lasting immobility). In the Austrian parliament, before the introduction of universal suffrage, social mobility was more visible within the same professional groups than between them, which occurred without significant changes in the leadership of the parliament (Adlgasser). Furthermore, traditional elites are not the only ones to impede mobility; older and established bourgeois political leaders can slow down mobility processes until their physical departure, as visible in some ethnic parties.<sup>65</sup> Only then can a generational turnover in party leadership create the conditions for representatives of social strata that are not typically associated with the term “elite” to ascend to the top.

The combination of various factors, particularly profession, education, and geographical setting, imposed limitations on social mobility, which were evident in the political arena even after democratization through universal male suffrage. While representatives of the petty bourgeoisie and wealthier farmers were able to enter the political elite, agricultural and industrial workers faced greater obstacles in reaching parliamentary positions. Even when they did succeed, it was often only after changing professions, either by pursuing a career in politics or by first joining the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie and agricultural landlords (Adlgasser). In the successor states of the

---

<sup>63</sup> Rigó, “The Long First World War.”

<sup>64</sup> See also the theoretical model and the discussion of demographic vs. social factors by McFarland, “Circulation of Elites,” 152–67.

<sup>65</sup> Popovici, *Studies*, 71–89.

monarchy during the interwar period, their numbers increased (Vranić and Marić),<sup>66</sup> without achieving, however, satisfactory representation. The vast majority of the proletariat, especially the rural kind, was represented by middle-class MPs,<sup>67</sup> and the beginning of the twentieth century brought, alongside the electoral reforms, the ascent of populist politicians and parties, whose public rise was based on the demagogic exploitation of the social and national discontent and the expectations of an electorate with little political experience.<sup>68</sup> The same process is evident in the case of members of the Romanian Academy from Transylvania; the number of those from agricultural families remained small, and quite a few among this minority became members only due to their status as church hierarchs (Popovici).

One issue that raises interpretative difficulties is the extent to which the concept of social mobility can be applied to the particular case of members of representative institutions. The role of education in political ascendancy has partially decreased due to successive enlargements of the franchise and the introduction of universal suffrage, which has paved the way for the emergence of professional politicians.<sup>69</sup> In the early twentieth century and the interwar period, an increasing number of individuals began to enter public life before pursuing a professional career, a trend visible among those who had previously considered both basic professions and public representation roles (Adlgasser). For many, politics became a means of social mobility, often based on prestige, and public recognition and trust, rather than economic strength or professional training. The formation of modern political parties, hierarchically organized in a territory and supported by social, economic, and ideological networks, played an important role in this respect,<sup>70</sup> while the socio-political context of the early-twentieth century sometimes brought high numbers of representatives from the lower classes into the Parliament, yet their influence, impact, and status could hardly be compared with that of the “professional,” top-level politicians (Vranić and Marić).

The transformation of political office from the mid-nineteenth century to the end of the First World War presents a compelling case for analyzing political elites, their status, and social mobility in a nuanced manner, distinct from the approach used for professional or traditional elites. It is important to consider that the group commonly referred to as the “political elite” is rather diverse, more heterogeneous than other elite categories, and that it undergoes rapid internal changes under the influence of various social and natural factors. The extent to which access to the ranks of the parliamentary political elite results in real social mobility, whether horizontal or vertical,

---

66 Schultz and Harre (eds.), *Bauerngesellschaften*; Kubů et al., *Agrarismus und Agrarreliten in Ostmitteleuropa*; Moga, “The Road,” 295–328; Iudean, “The Romanian Parliamentary Elite.”

67 Dogan, “L’origine sociale.”

68 For the effects of the rising nationalism during this period, with special regard to the Habsburg Monarchy, see also Judson, *Exclusive Revolutionaries*, esp. 254–72.

69 Offerlé (ed.), *La profession politique*.

70 See also Duverger, *Political Parties*, esp. 4–205.

or merely signals a temporary increase in visibility and prestige generated by the representative office, is a question that should be asked.

Regarding the traditional elite, the concept of social mobility, at least in its vertical meaning, is barely applicable, as they are already at the top of the pyramid. However, two reasons prompted them to enter the political arena. Firstly, the tradition of leadership and political involvement was considered an honorable duty. Secondly, it was a practical means of maintaining their prestige and elite social status by associating themselves with public office and the material benefits that come with it. The double impulse had the consequence of perpetuating the public role of the traditional elite until the First World War, and sometimes even afterwards (Pál). The situation is consistent, by and large, with the general evolutions in Europe, where, before World War I, the nobility was over-represented not only in politics (both in parliaments and ministerial offices), but also in other vital components of the state, such as the high bureaucracy or the senior officers' corps.<sup>71</sup>

In what concerns the new elite, an analysis of Croatian parliament members who continued their careers after 1918 suggests that holding political office did not result in genuine social mobility; instead, it was at most a temporary symbol of prestige (Vranić and Marić), with the high turnover rate of MPs from lower socio-professional backgrounds in the Viennese parliament, compared to those from the upper-middle strata, also supporting this conclusion (Adlgasser). Most of the national minority MPs in the Hungarian Parliament had already reached the middle-class or even upper middle-class professional plateau before they won their seats (see Sima and Eppel for the case of Romanians). They did not experience any changes in social or professional status before the First World War, regardless of their parliamentary mandate. The conditions for genuine professional and social mobility were created for them only after the regime changes of 1918, strongly supported by the needs of the successor states to create a 'national elite' in the newly acquired territories.

### 3 Conclusions

The contributions in this volume, centered primarily on elite samples from Central and Eastern Europe and employing primarily a prosopographical approach, corroborate, for the most part, the prevailing observations in the literature of the past four decades regarding the trajectory of social mobility in nineteenth-century Europe and North America. Since the early nineteenth century, the composition of various elite groups has undergone gradual transformations, largely driven by the influx of individuals from the middle and, to a lesser extent, lower social strata. These shifts stem from either the professionalization of diverse fields (including politics), the acquisition of educational qualifications, or the accumulation of material wealth. Spatial positioning

---

<sup>71</sup> Rush, "The Decline of Nobility," 43–8.

and the hierarchical organization of elites based on geographical administrative criteria appear to have played a crucial role in this process, and the impact of these factors on the likelihood of social mobility, while examined from a broader perspective, remains relatively unexplored in the context of elite studies in East and Central European regions.

Across the various elite categories examined, a shift towards a more professionalized and meritocratic mode of recruitment is evident, however, the pace of this transformation gradually diminished as one ascended the intra-elite hierarchies, with this deceleration primarily attributed to two significant factors. Firstly, the traditional elite exhibited a resistance to change, adapting to the prevailing norms of education and training while leveraging their established informal networks and material and symbolic capital to maintain their social standing. Limited elite membership, despite the sectoral diversification and numerical expansion of late modernity, enabled these adaptive traditionalists to retain a foothold, particularly in “traditional” elite sectors like politics and top-tier bureaucracy. Secondly, resistance arose from the second or third generations of representatives of the new elite, individuals who were developing a heightened consciousness of their own social and professional standing. This burgeoning awareness manifested in the development of endogamous tendencies, as these individuals sought to perpetuate their elite status within the confines of their familial and social circles.

The early twentieth century elite landscape exhibited early signs of a trend identified by H. Kaelble, wherein the extensive social mobility characteristic of the late modern era gradually waned as professions and social structures became more rigid and formalized.<sup>72</sup> Periods of heightened openness and social mobility alternated with periods of consolidation and restriction (Klečacký et al.), suggesting that upward mobility was not always a linear trajectory at the elite level, though it never ceased altogether. This dynamic was partly attributed to the ability of elites, including emerging ones, to rapidly adopt or develop mechanisms to regulate social mobility and maintain control over their ranks. Traditional tactics like occupational endogamy and professional dynasties persisted, but new strategies emerged as well. In the political arena, which seemingly offered the quickest path to elite status between the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, political parties emerged as a crucial tool for regulating access and imposing professionalization.<sup>73</sup> This was achieved through building a party bureaucracy, but also through the implementation of party-list voting systems, which replaced direct franchise (Adlgasser, Vranić, and Marić).

The contributions in this volume clearly demonstrate that the state played a pivotal role in generating and, to some extent, regulating social mobility among elites during this period. The state’s expanding needs necessitated the enlargement of some profes-

---

<sup>72</sup> Kaelble, *Historical Research on Social Mobility*, 110–1.

<sup>73</sup> Fiers and Secker, “A Career through the Party”; Cotta and Verzichelli, “Paths of Institutional Development,” 471.

sional fields associated with the elite and their diversification, both horizontally and vertically, in alignment with administrative regional hierarchies. As a corollary, other occupational fields benefited from less attention, which impacted the social status and mobility of their practitioners, despite the latter's best efforts to balance the scales.<sup>74</sup> The state fostered and supported the education system that facilitated social mobility and, through its regulation of professionalization, established a more meritocratic framework for competition between the new and traditional elites, forcing the latter to adapt. Moreover, the state provided a platform for the new elite to gain a voice and political influence at all levels, stimulating their initiatives while simultaneously allowing them to consolidate their status and impede social mobility. Finally, driven by its statistical requirements, the state created the essential tools for understanding and documenting the emerging professional and social hierarchies, including handbooks and schematism, which form the foundation for contemporary research on these topics.<sup>75</sup>

However, the state also played a role in limiting social mobility, by failing to adequately staff its civil service (Klečáček et al., Vladimirov), neglecting to adhere to bureaucratic career advancement procedures (Vladimirov), or postponing suffrage expansion, in some cases until its own collapse (e. g., Hungary). The imbalance between the growing number of freshly-educated professionals and the job availability in the field also brought in limitations,<sup>76</sup> especially as the state did not place a cap on the number of students, which by 1920s resulted in the opposite of social mobility: extended unemployment of university graduates and the increase in number of “intellectual proletariat.”<sup>77</sup> Given the state's pivotal position in this dynamic, it raises the question whether the deceleration of social mobility among elites in the early twentieth century, alongside other objective economic and social factors, can be attributed to the inherent tendency of the new elite (which by then was not so “new” anymore and already held a great deal of decision power at state level) to wield its power and resist the pressures of radical liberalism (social, political, or nationalist), which was prevalent throughout Central and Eastern Europe at that time, posing a threat to the state's political foundations – a scenario that eventually unfolded across most of Europe during the interwar period.

While the studies in the volume only provide a limited glimpse into the socio-professional diversity and hierarchies of elites in Central and Eastern Europe, they represent a greater contribution to understanding the impact of late modernity on the upper echelons of society in a region characterized by distinct historical traditions, social structures, and economic development than those in which social mobility was mainly

---

<sup>74</sup> McClelland, *The German Experience*, 212.

<sup>75</sup> Göderle, “De l'empire des Habsbourg.”

<sup>76</sup> For the situation in the field of historical scholarship in the U.S. during late modernity see Townsend, *History's Babel*, 82–3; for Germany in the late nineteenth century see McClelland, *The German Experience*, 64–5.

<sup>77</sup> McClelland, *The German Experience*, 176; Sdrobiş, *Limitele meritocrației*, esp. 9–87.

researched until now. In the context of the project that this volume supports, these studies serve as both a comprehensive overview and a basis for comparative analysis, laying the groundwork for further research that will have to dig deeper and employ a more elaborated methodology to examine the social mobility of elites in the region.

## Bibliography

### Literature

- Adkroyd, Marcus, Laurence Brockliss, Michael Moss, Kate Retford, and John Stevenson. *Advancing with the Army. Medicine, the Professions, and Social Mobility in the British Isles 1790–1850*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Adlgasser, Franz. *Die Mitglieder der österreichischen Zentralparlamente 1848–1918. Konstituierender Reichstag 1848–1849. Reichsrat 1861–1918. Ein biographisches Lexikon*. Teilband 1–2. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014.
- Ballabás, Dániel. “Entailed Lands. Estate Policy and Nationalism in Hungary at the Turn of the 19th–20th Centuries.” *Historický časopis* 71, no. 3 (2023): 493–511.
- Best, Heinrich, and John Higley, eds. *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Best, Heinrich, and Maurizio Cotta, eds. *Parliamentary representatives in Europe, 1848–2000. Legislative recruitment and careers in eleven European countries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Bottomore, Tom. *Elites and Society*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London; New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. “What Makes a Social Class? On the Theoretical and Practical Existence of Groups.” *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 32 (1987): 1–17.
- Breen, Richard, ed. *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Breen, Richard, and Walter Müller, eds. *Education and Intergenerational Social Mobility in Europe and the United States*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020.
- Buchen, Tim, and Malte Rolf (eds.). *Eliten im Vielvölkerreich: Imperiale Biographien in Russland und Österreich-Ungarn (1850–1918) / Elites and Empire: Imperial Biographies in Russia and Austria-Hungary (1850–1918)*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2015.
- Ceașu, Mihai Ștefan. *Parlamentarism, partide și elită politică în Bucovina habsburgică (1848–1918)* [Parliamentarism, parties and political elite in Habsburg Bukovina (1848–1918)]. Iași: Junimea, 2004.
- Chaussinand-Nogaret, Guy. “Introduction.” In *Une histoire des élites 1700–1848. Recueil de textes présentés et commentés*, edited by Chaussinand-Nogaret Guy, 17–22. Paris: Mouton, 1975.
- Cieger, András. “Politics as a Profession in Nineteenth-Century Hungary?” In *Lebenswelten von Abgeordneten in Europa 1860–1990*, edited by Adéla Gjuríčová, Andreas Schulz, Luboš Velek, and Andreas Wirsching, 105–16. Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 2014.
- Cohen, Gary B. *Education and Middle Class Society in Imperial Austria, 1848–1918*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 1996.
- Cotta, Maurizio, and Heinrich Best, eds. *Democratic Representation in Europe. Diversity, Change and Convergence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Cotta, Maurizio, and Luca Verzichelli. “Paths of Institutional Development and Elite Transformation.” In *Democratic Representation in Europe. Diversity, Change and Convergence*, edited by Maurizio Cotta and Heinrich Best, 417–73. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Cotta, Maurizio, and Pedro Tavares de Almeida. “From Servants of the State to Elected Representatives: Public Sector Background among Members of Parliament.” In *Democratic Representation in Europe*.



- Diversity, Change and Convergence*, edited by Maurizio Cotta and Heinrich Best, 51–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Dogan, Mattei. “Les professions propices à la carrière politique.” In *La profession politique, XIXe-XXe siècles*, edited by Michel Offerlé, 171–99. Paris: Belin, 1999.
- Dogan, Mattei. “L’origine sociale du personnel parlementaire d’un pays essentiellement agraire, la Roumanie.” *Revue de l’Institut de Sociologie*, 2–3 (1953): 165–208.
- Dribe, Martin, Jonas Helgertz, and Bart van de Putte. “Did social mobility increase during the industrialization process? A micro-level study of a transforming community in southern Sweden 1828–1968.” *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 41 (2015): 25–39.
- Duverger, Maurice. *Political Parties. Their Organization and Activities in the Modern State*. Cambridge: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1967.
- Erikson, Robert, and John H. Goldthorpe. *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Erikson, Robert, John H. Goldthorpe, and Martin Hällsten. “No way back up from ratcheting down? A critique of the ‘microclass’ approach to the analysis of social mobility.” *Acta Sociologica* 55, no. 3 (2012): 211–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0001699312447633>.
- Fasora, Lukáš, Ewald Hiebl, and Petr Popelka, eds. *Generationen in der Geschichte des langen 20. Jahrhunderts – methodisch-theoretische Reflexionen*. Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2017.
- Fasora, Lukáš, Ewald Hiebl, Petr Popelka, and Judit Pál, eds. *Elitenforschung in Der Geschichte Des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Erfahrungen und Methodisch-theoretische Inspirationen*. Vienna: LIT Verlag, 2019.
- Fiers, Stefaan, and Ineke Secker. “A Career through the Party: The Recruitment of Party Politicians in Parliament.” In *Democratic Representation in Europe. Diversity, Change and Convergence*, edited by Maurizio Cotta, and Heinrich Best, 136–59. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Fitzpatrick, Sheila. *Education and Social Mobility in the Soviet Union 1921–1934*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Ganzeboom, Harry B.G., Donald J. Treiman, and Wout C. Ultee. “Comparative Intergenerational Stratification Research: Three Generations and Beyond.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 17 (1991): 277–302.
- Göderle, Wolfgang. “De l’empire des Habsbourg à l’État des fonctionnaires, *Beamtenstaat* (1815–1914).” *Histoire & Mesure* 35, no. 2 (2020): 73–104.
- Gusterson, Hugh. “Elites, Anthropology of.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, Volume 7, edited by James D. Wright, 386–9. Elsevier, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.12061-6>.
- Hartmann, Michael. *The Sociology of Elites*. London; New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Heindl, Waltraud. *Josephinische Mandarine. Bürokratie und Beamte in Österreich. Band 2: 1848–1914*. Vienna: Böhlau 2013.
- Hertel, Florian R. *Social Mobility in the 20th Century. Class Mobility and Occupational Change in the United States and Germany*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 2017.
- Higley, John. “Continuities and Discontinuities in Elite Theory.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*, edited by Heinrich Best and John Higley, 25–39. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- Hitchins, Keith. *A Nation Affirmed: The Romanian National Movement in Transylvania 1860–1914*. Bucharest: The Encyclopedic Publishing House, 1999.
- Hučko, Ján. *Sociálne zloženie a pôvod slovenskej obrodenskej inteligencie* [Social structure and origin of Slovakian emancipatory intelligentsia.]. Bratislava: Veda, 1974.
- Iłonszki, Gabriella. *Képviselők és képviselők Magyarországon a 19. és 20. században* [Representatives and representation in Hungary in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries]. Budapest: Akadémiai, 2009.
- Iudean, Ovidiu. *The Romanian Governmental Representatives in the Budapest Parliament (1881–1918)*. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2016.
- Iudean, Ovidiu. “The Romanian Parliamentary Elite from Banat on the Eve of the First World War.” *Romanian Journal of Modern History* 6, no. 1–2 (2015): 41–58.

- Judson, Pieter M. *Exclusive Revolutionaries: Liberal Politics, Social Experience, and National Identity in the Austrian Empire, 1848–1914*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Kaelble, Hartmut. "Eras of Social Mobility in 19th and 20th Century Europe." *Journal of Social History* 17, no. 3 (1984): 489–504.
- Kaelble, Hartmut. *Historical Research on Social Mobility. Western Europe and the USA in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Kaelble, Hartmut. *Social Mobility in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Europe and America in comparative perspective*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1986.
- Kaelble, Hartmut. "Social Mobility, History of." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2nd edition, Volume 22, edited by James D. Wright, 426–9. Elsevier, 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.62022-6>.
- Kaps, Klemens, and Andrea Komlosy. "Introduction. Centers and Peripheries Revisited: Polycentric Connections or Entangled Hierarchies?" *Review (Fernand Braudel Center)* 36, no. 3–4 (2013): 237–63.
- Keats-Rohan, Katharine S.B., ed. *Prosopography approaches and applications: A handbook*. Oxford: Unit for Prosopographical Research, 2007.
- Keats-Rohan, Katharine S.B. "Prosopography." *SAGE Research Methods Foundations*, edited by Paul Atkinson, Sara Delamont, Alexandru Cernat, Joseph W. Sakshaug, and Richard A. Williams. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2019. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781526421036768487>.
- Kerrouche, Éric. "L'apprentissage du rôle de sous-préfet." *Politix. Revue des sciences sociales du politique* 10, no. 38 (1997): 88–110.
- Kocka, Jürgen. "Family and Class Formation: Intergenerational Mobility and Marriage Patterns in Nineteenth-Century Westphalian Towns." *Journal of Social History* 17, no. 3 (1984): 411–33.
- Kubů, Eduard, Torsten Lorenz, Uwe Müller, and Jiří Šouša, eds. *Agrarismus und Agrarreliten in Ostmitteleuropa*. Prague; Berlin; Dokořán: BWV, Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2013.
- Lambert, Paul S., Richard L. Zijdeman, Marco H. D. Van Leeuwen, Ineke Maas, and Kenneth Prandy. "The Construction of HISCAM: A Stratification Scale Based on Social Interactions for Historical Comparative Research." *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History* 46, no. 2 (2013): 77–89. DOI:10.1080/01615440.2012.715569.
- Lippényi, Zoltán, Ineke Maas, and Marco H.D. van Leeuwen. "Intergenerational class mobility in Hungary between 1865 and 1950. Testing models of change in social openness." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 33 (2013): 40–55.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, and Reinhard Bendix. *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*. Berkeley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.
- Luft, Robert. *Parlamentarische Führungsgruppen und politische Strukturen in der tschechischen Gesellschaft: Tschechische Abgeordnete und Parteien des österreichischen Reichsrats 1907–1914. Band 2. Biographisches Handbuch der tschechischen Mitglieder des Abgeordnetenhauses des österreichischen Reichsrats 1907–1914*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012.
- Marton, Silvia. "Becoming Political Professionals. Members of Parliament in Romania (1866–1914)." In *Elites and Politics in Central and Eastern Europe (1848–1918)*, edited by Judit Pál and Vlad Popovici, 267–79. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang, 2014.
- McClelland, Charles E. *The German Experience of Professionalization. Modern Learned Professions and their Organizations from the Early Nineteenth Century to the Hitler Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- McFarland, David. "Circulation of Elites and Constraints on Intergenerational Status Transmission." *International Review of Modern Sociology* 3, no. 2 (1973), 152–67.
- Miles, Andrew. *Social Mobility in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century England*. Houndmills: MacMillan Press, 1999.
- Millerson, Geoffrey. *The Qualifying Associations. A Study in Professionalisation*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Modalsli, Jørgen. "Intergenerational Mobility in Norway, 1865–2011." *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 119, no. 1 (2017): 34–71.

- Moga, Valer. "The Road of Transylvanian Romanian Farmers to Greater Romania's Political Arena." In *Politics and Peasants in Interwar Romania. Perceptions, Mentalities, Propaganda*, edited by Sorin Radu and Oliver Jens Schmitt, 295–328. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017.
- Nielsen, François. "Economic Inequality, Pareto, and Sociology. The route not taken." *American Behavioral Scientist* 50, no. 5 (2007): 619–38.
- Offerlé, Michel, ed. *La profession politique, XIXe–XXe siècles*. Paris: Belin, 1999.
- Pakulski, Jan. "Classical Elite Theory: Pareto and Weber." In *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*, edited by Heinrich Best and John Higley, 17–24. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.
- O'Neill, Ciaran. *Catholics of Consequence. Transnational Education, Social Mobility and the Irish Catholic Elite 1850–1900*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Pál, Judit. "Parliament and the Political System in Hungary during the Dualist Period." In *Parliamentary Elections in Eastern Hungary and Transylvania (1865–1918)*, edited by Judit Pál, Vlad Popovici, Andrea Fehér, and Ovidiu Iudean, 15–44. Berlin: Peter Lang, 2018.
- Pap, József. *Parliamentary Representatives and Parliamentary Representation in Hungary (1848–1918)*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2018.
- Pap, József, Daniel Ballabás, and Judit Pál, eds. *Képviselők és főrendek a dualizmus kori Magyarországon. Vol. 1–2* [Representatives and Magnates in Dualist Hungary. Vol. 1–2]. Eger: Líceum, 2020.
- Parry, Noel, and José Parry. *The Rise of the Medical Profession. A Study of Collective Social Mobility*. London; New York: Routledge, 2019 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1976).
- Popovici, Vlad. *Studies on the Romanian Political Elite from Transylvania and Hungary (1861–1918)*. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2012.
- Recker, Marie-Luise, ed. *Parlamentarismus in Europa. Deutschland, England und Frankreich im Vergleich*. Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004.
- Řezník, Miloš, and Luboš Velek. *Adelsgeschichte als Elitenforschung*. Munich: Martin Meidenbauer, 2012.
- Rigó, Máté. "The Long First World War and the survival of business elites in East-Central Europe: Transylvania's industrial boom and the enrichment of economic elites." *European Review of History. Revue européenne d'histoire* 24, no. 2 (2017): 250–72.
- Rolf, Malte. *Imperial Russian Rule in the Kingdom of Poland 1864–1915*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2021.
- Rolf, Malte, and Benedikt Tondera. "Imperial Biographies Revisited." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 68, no. 2 (2020): 270–81.
- Ruggera, Lucia, and Carlo Barone. "Social closure, micro-class immobility and the intergenerational reproduction of the upper class: a comparative study." *The British Journal of Sociology* 68, no. 2 (2017): 194–214.
- Rush, Michael. "The Decline of Nobility." In *Democratic Representation in Europe. Diversity, Change and Convergence*, edited by Maurizio Cotta and Heinrich Best, 29–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Schultz, Helga, and Angela Harre, eds. *Bauerngesellschaften auf dem Weg in die Moderne. Agrarismus in Ostmitteleuropa 1880 bis 1960*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010.
- Sdrobiş, Dragoş. *Limitele meritocrației într-o societate agrară. Șomaj intelectual și radicalizarea politică a tineretului în România interbelică* [The Limits of Meritocracy in an Agrarian Society. Intellectual Unemployment and Political Radicalization of the Youth in Interwar Romania]. Iași: Polirom, 2015.
- Semenova, Elena, Michael Edinger, and Heinrich Best. "Parliamentary elite formation after Communism. An introduction." In *Parliamentary elites in Central and Eastern Europe. Recruitment and Representation*, edited by Elena Semenova, Michael Edinger, and Heinrich Best, 1–29. London; New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Shumsky, Neil Larry, ed. *Social Structure and Social Mobility*. New York; London: Routledge, 2012 [American Cities. A collection of Essays. Vol. 7].
- Simon, Katalin. "Mesterségből hivatás: sebész-mesterek és orvosdoktorok Magyarországon az egységes orvosi képzés bevezetéséig" [From Trade to Profession to Profession Master Surgeons and Doctors

- of Medicine in Hungary until the Introduction of Uniform Medical Training]. *Korall* 11, no. 42 (2010): 77–102.
- Sopóci, Ján, Daniel Gerbery, and Roman Džambazovič, eds. *Social stratification and social mobility in Slovakia*. Bratislava: Comenius University, 2020.
- Sora, Andrei. *Servir l'État roumain. Le corps préfectoral, 1866–1940*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, 2011.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. *Social and Cultural Mobility*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1959.
- Stekl, Hannes, and Marija Wakounig. *Windisch-Graetz. Ein Fürstenhaus im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1992.
- Surman, Jan. *Universities in Imperial Austria 1848–1918. A Social History of a Multilingual Space*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2018.
- Thernstrom, Stephan. *Poverty and Progress. Social Mobility in a Nineteenth Century City*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: Harvard University Press, 1964.
- Todd, Selina. *Snakes and Ladders. The Great British Social Mobility Myth*. London: Vintage, 2022.
- Tomkins, Alannah. *Medical misadventure in an age of professionalization, 1780–1890*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2017.
- Toth, Adalbert. *Parteien und Reichstagswahlen in Ungarn 1848–1892*. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1973.
- Townsend, Robert B. *History's Babel. Scholarship, Professionalization, and the Historical Enterprise in the United States, 1880–1940*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Treiman, Donald J. *Occupational Prestige in Comparative Perspective*. New York etc.: Academic Press, 1977.
- van Leeuwen, Marco H.D., and Ineke Maas. *HISCLASS: A Historical International Social Class Scheme*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- van Leeuwen, Marco H.D., and Ineke Maas. “Historical Studies of Social Mobility and Stratification.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 36 (2010): 429–51.
- van Leeuwen, Marco H.D., and Ineke Maas. “Social Mobility in a Dutch Province, Utrecht 1850–1940.” *Journal of Social History* 30, no. 3 (1997): 619–44.
- van Leeuwen, Marco H.D., Ineke Maas, and Andrew Graham Miles. *HISCO: Historical International Standard Classification of Occupations*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

## Online resources

Abgeordnete zum Nationalrat seit 1920. Accessed April 10, 2024. <https://www.parlament.gv.at/WWER/NR/ABG/#>.