

July 2020

Early (1997- 2007) Papers of the Financial Security Group

These are the ten published papers of the Financial Security Group, Purdue University, from 1997 to 2007. The comments offered below are intended only as annotation, to indicate what the paper is about, so you can decide whether you might want to read it. Your comments and suggestions on the annotation or the publication would be appreciated. Don't hesitate to ask for more information, including copies of the more obscure publications.

Published Papers

These first three papers are based on our analysis of the New Beneficiary Study: a national sample of people who began receiving Social Security in 1980-1981.

The first paper (below, which is quite brief—almost a research note) compares white and black men (currently married in 1982 survey) on models predicting social security, private pension, and asset earnings with (fairly crude) class and work status measures. Most interesting are the net effects of race in predicting SS, the interaction of race and education in predicting assets, and the interactions of class and education (as in Wright and Perrone 1977) in predicting pension and asset income.

1. "Racial Inequality in Men's Employment and Retirement Earnings," *Sociological Quarterly*, 1997, Vol. 38 No. 3(summer): 431-438 (Richard Hogan, Meesook Kim, and Carolyn C. Perrucci).

This second paper (below) extends the analysis to gender, estimating separate models for white men, white women, black men, and black women. This paper documents the fact that the gender earnings gap is greater in employment, while the racial gap is greater in retirement. It also looks at interactions of marriage and self-employment with race and gender.

2. "Producing and Reproducing Class and Status Differences: Gender and Racial Gaps in U.S. Employment and Retirement Income," *Social Problems*, 1998 Vol. 45, No. 4 (November):528-549 (Richard Hogan and Carolyn Perrucci).

This third paper (below) summarizes and concludes the first round of analysis but focuses on white male privilege: core sector employers who are white males earn outrageous fortunes, but white women who are similarly privileged earn less than white female workers in the periphery. These findings are supported with OLS.

3. "Gender Inequality in Employment and Retirement Income: Effects of Marriage, Industrial Sector, and Self-employment." In Vasilikie Demos and Marcia Texler

Segal (editors), *Advances in Gender Research*, Vol. 4 Greenwich, CT: JAI, 2000 (Richard Hogan, Carolyn Perrucci, and Janet Wilmoth).

This fourth paper (below) is more theoretical and historical. It applies Tilly (Durable Inequality) to the question of what are race, class, and gender inequality and how are they more or less salient and more or less confounded in the U.S. from 1776-1930.

4. "Class, Race, and Gender Inequality," *Race, Gender & Class*, 2001, Vol. 8, No. 2: 61-93 (Richard Hogan).

These more recent papers use the first wave of the Health and Retirement Survey (HRS: a national sample of households in which target respondent is 51-61 in 1992). These papers extend and reproduce (with varying degrees of success) the findings reported above

This fifth paper indicates how class and status (particularly marital status and union membership) interact with race and gender in predicting employment income.

5. "Disentangling Disadvantage: Race, Gender, Class, and Occupational Effects on the Employment Earnings of Older U.S. Workers" (Autumn Behringer, Rich Hogan, and Carolyn C. Perrucci), *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*, 2004, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Oct.):147-162.

This sixth paper essentially reproduces Hogan, Perrucci, and Wilmoth 2000 (cited above) with the HRS data. White women do not earn as much as white men, in general, and do not get the phenomenal earnings boost associated with the most privileged class relations (self-employed professionals). Nevertheless, the marital penalty for women seems to be somewhat smaller than it had been during the working careers of the 1980-81 retirement cohort. Furthermore, marriage does not seem to be an advantage for the self-employed professional men at this point in their life course (in their mid-fifties), when one would expect the burden of marriage to have lessened (as it apparently has for the women).

6. "Enduring Inequality: Gender and Employment Income in Late Career" (Richard Hogan, Carolyn C. Perrucci, and Autumn Behringer), *Sociological Spectrum* 2005 Vol. 25, No. 1:53-77.

This seventh paper focuses on white men and explores the difference between managerial and professional workers (the "expertise" dimension of class location, as represented by occupational title) in predicting earnings. There are significant gross and net effects and interactions with other dimensions of class (property ownership and authority).

7. "Was Wright Wrong? High Class Jobs and the Professional Earnings Advantage" (Richard Hogan), *Social Science Quarterly* 2005, Vol. 86, No. 3:645-663.

This eighth paper compares white men and women on the advantages that accrue to managers and professionals as a function of educational credentials. It essentially adds women to “Was Wright Wrong?” (above).

8. “Gender, Educational Credentials, and Income Inequality in Late Career” (Richard Hogan, Carolyn C. Perrucci, and Autumn Behringer), *International Journal of the Humanities* 2006, Vol. 2, No. 3:1915-1925.

This ninth paper examines wave five (2000) of the Health and Retirement Survey to show that white women actually earn more than their male counterparts in retirement (after controlling for employment earnings and the gender bias in choosing retirement), while black men are not distinguished from white men (net of education, employment earnings, etc.). Black women (unlike their white counterparts) are disadvantaged in retirement and employment.

9. “Black Women: Truly Disadvantaged in the Transition from Employment to Retirement Income” (Richard Hogan and Carolyn C. Perrucci), *Social Science Research* 2007, Vol. 36:1184-1199.

This last paper summarizes and updates our work on the size of race and gender gaps and adds a critical analysis of changes in the last three decades of the twentieth century.

10. "Racial and Gender Income Gaps" (Richard Hogan and Carolyn C. Perrucci) in Robert Perrucci and Carolyn C. Perrucci (editors), *The Transformation of Work in the New Economy: Sociological Readings* (Roxbury Press, 2007)

More Recent Efforts (2013-2020) toward a Financial Security Group

Hogan became professor emeritus (in May 2019), and Hogan and Perrucci have been working on separate project but have some new papers, which could become a series of papers. Maybe it is time to think about Asian or Native American earners. Maybe Purdue will develop its social inequality section along those lines.

Meanwhile, these are the first four papers that attempt to apply the theory of race, class and gender inequality from Hogan (2001 [#4 above]). These papers use the Current Population Survey March Supplement (which includes annual earnings and self-employment). These papers move back and forth in time—from 1993-2016, adding the Latinx population in the most recent paper (#14).

11. "Deconstructing Race, Class, and Gender Inequality in Personal Earnings" (Richard Hogan) *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 2013, 50, 2:159-186.
12. "Who Gets the Daddy Bonus and Who Pays the Cost?" (Richard Hogan and Carolyn C. Perrucci) *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 2014, 51, 2:117-144.
13. "We Know about Reagan, but Was there a Clinton Effect? Earnings by Race, Gender, Marital and Family Status, 1993 and 2000" (Richard Hogan and Carolyn Cummings Perrucci) *Critical Sociology* 2020, Vol. 46 (1): 97-117.
14. "Earnings Inequality in 2016 Among Anglos, Latinxs, and Blacks" (Richard Hogan and Carolyn C. Perrucci), *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 2020, Vol. 42 (3): 363-380.