

Financial Adviser Misconduct and Labor Market Penalties: Uncovering Racial Disparities in the Absence of Gender Gaps*

Jun Honda[†]

March 18, 2025

Abstract

Using a comprehensive matched employer–employee dataset for U.S. financial advisers from 2008 to 2018, we revisit established evidence on labor market penalties following financial misconduct. Prior studies report that female advisers are 20% more likely to exit their firms following misconduct and that similar disparities exist for non-white advisers. However, by disaggregating misconduct into distinct disclosure events – differentiating those that nearly always trigger job terminations from those that do not – we show that the apparent gender gap vanishes, while significant racial disparities persist. Specifically, non-white advisers face approximately 24% higher job separation rates than their white counterparts. Robustness checks confirm these findings across alternative specifications, suggesting that race-based differential treatment in the labor market is a distinct phenomenon warranting further investigation.

Key Words: Financial Advisers, Misconduct, Gender Gap, Racial Inequality, Discrimination.

JEL Classification: G24, J44, J71, L22.

*I thank Lothar Gampel for legal assistance regarding the data usage and Anna Ulrichshofer for research assistance. I also thank Mark Egan for helpful comments and sharing information on data construction. This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP24K04832. This paper was previously circulated under the title “Gender Gaps and Racial Disparities in the Labor Market Penalties for Financial Advisers Misconduct” (2020).

[†]Faculty of Economics and Law, Shinshu University, Japan. junhonda@shinshu-u.ac.jp.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Related Literature

2 Data

2.1 Adviser-Level Data

2.1.1 Employment Record

2.1.2 Gender and Race

2.1.3 Limitations

2.2 Measurement of Financial Misconduct

2.3 Summary Statistics

2.4 Data Validity and Comparison

3 Replication of Prior Findings

3.1 Replicating Gender Differences in Employment Separations

3.2 Replicating Racial Differences in Employment Separations

4 Main Findings

4.1 Decomposing Financial Misconduct

4.2 Absence of a Gender Gap

4.3 Persistent Racial Disparities

4.4 Implications of the Findings

5 Robustness Checks and Additional Analyses

5.1 Disclosure Interdependence

5.2 Alternative Specifications

6 Concluding Remarks

A Definition of the Major Disclosure Events

B Definition of the Major Qualification Exams (Licenses)

1 Introduction

In the U.S. financial advisory industry – where more than 70% of advisers are male and nearly 90% are white – labor market outcomes remain a critical concern, particularly in terms of employment penalties following financial misconduct. Prior research (e.g., [Egan, Matvos and Seru, 2022](#)) documents that female advisers face a roughly 20% higher likelihood of job separation after misconduct, and similar disparities exist for non-white advisers. However, these studies typically rely on an aggregated measure of “Misconduct” that combines a variety of disclosure events, potentially masking important differences in how various types of misconduct affect employment outcomes.

To address this limitation, our study revisits and replicates the established findings using a comprehensive matched employer–employee dataset constructed from FINRA’s BrokerCheck database covering the period 2008–2018. This unique dataset not only captures detailed compliance records – from customer complaints and disputes to regulatory actions, criminal records, and employer terminations – but also enables us to track the full employment history of every financial adviser from their entry into the industry.

Our approach refines the measurement of financial misconduct by disaggregating disclosure events into distinct categories. We distinguish between events that almost invariably lead to job termination – such as employer disciplinary actions – and those that are less consequential, such as customer disputes. This disaggregation is crucial because it allows us to isolate the specific components driving the observed labor market penalties. Our analysis reveals that while the aggregated measure of misconduct replicates the previously documented gender gap, the gap essentially vanishes once we account for the heterogeneous consequences of different disclosure events. In stark contrast, racial disparities persist: non-white advisers are approximately 24% more likely to exit their firms and 20% more likely to receive employer-induced terminations than their white counterparts.

By controlling for firm-branch-year fixed effects and other observable characteristics – including tenure, industry experience, and licensing – the study provides a more nuanced understanding of labor market penalties in this industry. In doing so, we offer new evidence on race-based employment discrimination that challenges the conventional narrative of a gender-dominated penalty gap. Our findings underscore the importance of refined measurement in uncovering the true extent of differential treatment and have important implications for both policy and future research on employment discrimina-

tion.

1.1 Related Literature

Gender Gap. Over recent decades, gender disparities have narrowed in areas such as education, labor market participation, and wages (Blau and Kahn, 2000, 2017). Yet persistent gaps remain, notably due to career interruptions that impose lasting wage penalties (Bertrand et al., 2010; Goldin, 2014). In the financial advisory industry, Egan et al. (2022) document a “gender punishment gap,” showing that female advisers face harsher employment penalties following misconduct. Their results suggest that this gap is not driven by productivity differences – as measured by assets under management or quality ratings – but may partly stem from in-group favoritism. In contrast, our study controls for the composition of disclosure events and uses individual education measures rather than productivity proxies. We find that when these factors are accounted for, the gender gap in labor market penalties essentially disappears.

Employment Discrimination. Employment discrimination has been widely studied through methods such as audit studies, pseudo-experiments, and correspondence tests – mostly focusing on hiring practices (see, e.g., Darity and Mason (1998); Altonji and Blank (1999); Lang and Lehmann (2012); Bertrand and Duflo (2017); Neumark (2018); Lang and Spitzer (2020)). Although court cases offer direct evidence of discriminatory treatment, their limited scope at the individual level restricts broader analysis. Our approach differs by leveraging disclosed terminations in a matched employer-employee dataset, which allows us to examine race-based discrimination in the U.S. financial services industry. Despite constraints from missing detailed demographic and performance data, our findings consistently reveal that minority advisers face significantly harsher termination penalties than their white counterparts – even after accounting for firm-branch-year factors and other observables. These results challenge the notion that differential treatment is solely driven by statistical discrimination.

Financial Misconduct. A growing literature has exploited FINRA’s BrokerCheck database to investigate financial misconduct and its labor market consequences (see, e.g., Charoenwong et al., 2019; Clifford and Gerken, 2021; Cook et al., 2020; Dimmock et al., 2018a,b; Egan et al., 2019; Gurun et al., 2021; Honigsberg and Jacob, 2021; Law and Mills, 2019). Following Egan et al. (2022), our study examines both gender gaps and racial

disparities in labor market penalties related to misconduct. In parallel with research on the labor market effects of earnings management by top executives ((e.g., [Agrawal et al., 1999](#); [Beneish, 1999](#); [Desai et al., 2006](#); [Feroz et al., 1991](#); [Karpoff et al., 2008](#))), our contribution lies in providing additional evidence at the individual level. By refining the measurement of misconduct through the disaggregation of disclosure events, we offer new insights into the distinct impacts of financial misconduct on employment outcomes across gender and race.

2 Data

We construct a comprehensive, matched employer–employee dataset covering all U.S. financial advisers using FINRA’s BrokerCheck database via the Central Registration Depository (CRD). This section details our data on adviser-level employment records, gender and race, the measurement of financial misconduct, and summary statistics.

2.1 Adviser-Level Data

Following the methodology of [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#), we create an adviser-year panel dataset from Form U4. Form U4 provides detailed information on advisers’ employment histories, regulatory licenses (e.g., industry exams), and compliance records – including various disclosure events (see Appendix A for definitions).

2.1.1 Employment Record

The BrokerCheck database offers two employment history records:

- **Registration History:** Lists registered securities firms along with unique CRD numbers, firm names, branch addresses, and monthly employment periods.
- **Employment History:** Documents an adviser’s work record over the past 10 years, covering both industry and non-industry activities (e.g., full-time/part-time work, self-employment, military service, unemployment, and education).

For our primary analysis, we rely on Registration History, as done by [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#).

2.1.2 Gender and Race

Since FINRA does not report gender or race, we supplement this information using complementary methods:

- **Gender Identification:** We employ the R package `gender` (Mullen, 2018) to match advisers' first names with historical Social Security data. By imposing an 80% accuracy threshold, we assign gender to approximately 95% of advisers, with females comprising around 30% of the sample.
- **Race Identification:** We use the Python package `ethnicolr` (Laohaprapanon and Sood, 2019), which classifies advisers into Asian, Black, Hispanic, and white using Florida voting registration data. With a target accuracy of 50%, this method identifies race for about 99% of advisers, with non-white advisers representing roughly 12%. Alternative sources yield similar results; hence, we collapse race into a binary classification: white majority versus non-white minority.

2.1.3 Limitations

The FINRA BrokerCheck database is subject to survivorship bias, as data completeness depends on an adviser's registration status. Brokers active within the past 10 years have more complete records than those deregistered earlier. To mitigate this bias, we limit our sample to adviser-year observations from 2008 to 2018, yielding approximately 7.9 million observations covering 1.2 million advisers – nearly half of whom have exited the industry.

2.2 Measurement of Financial Misconduct

According to Form U4, there are six broad categories of disclosure events (with 23 sub-categories). Egan et al. (2019, 2022) define “Misconduct” by aggregating six types of disclosure events, including: (I) Customer Dispute - Settled; (II) Employment Separation After Allegations; (III) Regulatory - Final; (IV) Criminal - Final Disposition; (V) Customer Dispute - Award/Judgment; and (VI) Civil - Final. Detailed definitions are provided in Appendix A.

2.3 Summary Statistics

Table 1 presents summary statistics for financial advisers across gender and race, covering both observable characteristics (e.g., industry experience, tenure, job transitions, and regulatory licenses) and compliance records (i.e., the annual incidence of disclosure events). Our sample exhibits clear differences: male advisers generally have longer experience and tenure and hold more licenses compared to female advisers, and within each gender, observable differences exist between white majority and non-white minority advisers.

2.4 Data Validity and Comparison

To ensure the robustness of our analysis, we compare key summary statistics from our dataset with those reported by [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#). Our sample, which spans 2008–2018, exhibits characteristics—such as industry experience, tenure, regulatory license holdings, and the incidence of disclosure events—that are broadly consistent with the findings in [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#), whose data cover 2005–2015. Although minor differences arise – likely reflecting post-financial crisis dynamics and sample period variations – the overall consistency in employment records and compliance measures validates our data construction. This comparison reinforces the external validity of our dataset and establishes a reliable foundation for our replication and subsequent analysis of gender and racial disparities in labor market penalties.

Table 1: Summary Statistics by Gender and Race

A. Adviser Characteristics						
	Male			Female		
	(1) All	(2) Majority	(3) Minority	(4) All	(5) Majority	(6) Minority
Employment History and Status:						
Experience (years)	13.4	13.9	9.3	10.8	11.2	8.1
Tenure (years)	6.3	6.5	4.6	5.7	5.9	4.5
Licenses/Industry Exams (%)						
Series 63 (General Securities Agent)	74.3	74.8	70.4	68.7	68.9	67.9
Series 7 (General Securities Representative)	69.0	69.8	61.4	62.4	63.6	55.1
Series 6 (Insurance and Annuities)	35.5	35.2	38.6	42.4	42.0	45.2
Series 65/66 (Investment Adviser)	42.1	43.4	31.0	34.8	36.0	27.1
Series 24 (Principal/Supervisory Management)	15.4	16.0	10.3	10.6	11.2	7.1
Total Number of Licenses	2.9	2.9	2.5	2.5	2.6	2.3
B. Disclosure Event Incidence						
Misconduct Related Disclosure Events (%)						
Customer Disputes - Settled	0.37	0.37	0.34	0.13	0.13	0.12
Employment Separation After Allegations	0.23	0.21	0.37	0.15	0.14	0.24
Regulatory - Final	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.04
Criminal Disposition - Final	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01
Customer Disputes - Award/Judgment	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.00
Civil - Final	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Any Misconduct Related Disclosure	0.71	0.70	0.82	0.32	0.31	0.39
Other Disclosure Events (%)						
Financial - Final	0.42	0.40	0.51	0.49	0.47	0.58
Judgment/Lien	0.33	0.33	0.39	0.20	0.18	0.28
Customer Disputes - Denied	0.33	0.34	0.27	0.14	0.14	0.14
Customer Disputes - Closed-No Action	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.02	0.03
Financial - Pending	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.07
Customer Disputes - Pending	0.06	0.06	0.11	0.02	0.02	0.03
Customer Disputes - Withdrawn	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Criminal - Pending	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
Investigation	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
Regulatory - Pending	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Civil - Pending	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Customer Disputes - Final	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Customer Disputes - Dismissed	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Civil Bond	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Regulatory - On Appeal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Criminal - On Appeal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Civil - On Appeal	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total (%)	1.89	1.86	2.13	1.21	1.17	1.46
Observations	5,753,021	5,150,027	542,597	2,153,206	1,843,251	267,990

Note: Observations are based on adviser-year panel data spanning 2008–2018. Advisers are categorized by gender and race (white majority versus non-white minority; see Section 2.1.2 for details). The values in “Licenses/Industry Exams” are the percentages of its license holders over all observations. See the Appendix B for the definitions of licenses/qualifications in Table 1.A. Each value in Table 1.B indicates the annual incidence of the disclosure event in percentage points, which is given by a dummy variable for whether an adviser has encountered a disclosure event in the respective category at least once within a given year.

3 Replication of Prior Findings

In this section, we replicate the key findings from [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#) regarding labor market penalties following financial misconduct, focusing on both gender and racial differences.

3.1 Replicating Gender Differences in Employment Separations

We begin by replicating the estimation strategy used by [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#) to examine the gender penalty in job separations following misconduct. The baseline specification is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Separation}_{iqjlt+1} = & \beta_1 \text{Female}_i + \beta_2 \text{Misc}_{iqjlt} + \beta_3 \text{Misc}_{iqjlt} \times \text{Female}_i \quad (1) \\ & + \beta_4 X_{it} + \mu_{qjlt} + \varepsilon_{iqjlt}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Separation}_{iqjlt+1}$ is a dummy variable equal to one if adviser i leaves firm j in year $t+1$. The variable Misc_{iqjlt} indicates whether adviser i encounters any misconduct-related disclosure event in year t . The interaction term $\text{Misc}_{iqjlt} \times \text{Female}_i$ captures the gender penalty. The vector X_{it} includes adviser characteristics such as industry experience, while μ_{qjlt} represents firm-year-county-license fixed effects.

Table 2 reports our replication estimates. The positive and statistically significant coefficient on the interaction term confirms that, using the aggregated measure of misconduct, female advisers are about 20% more likely to leave their firm than male advisers, consistent with [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#).

3.2 Replicating Racial Differences in Employment Separations

Next, we assess racial disparities by modifying the baseline equation, replacing the gender dummy with a minority dummy:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Separation}_{iqjlt+1} = & \beta_1 \text{Minority}_i + \beta_2 \text{Misc}_{iqjlt} + \beta_3 \text{Misc}_{iqjlt} \times \text{Minority}_i \quad (2) \\ & + \beta_4 X_{it} + \mu_{qjlt} + \varepsilon_{iqjlt}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, Minority equals one if adviser i belongs to the non-white minority group.

Table 3 reports our findings. The interaction term $\text{Misconduct} \times \text{Minority}$ is

Table 2: Replication of Gender Differences in Job Separations Following Misconduct Disclosures

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	-0.22 (0.24)	-0.85*** (0.27)	-0.31** (0.14)	-0.26** (0.13)
Misconduct	31.47*** (1.76)	32.16*** (1.65)	27.69*** (1.90)	29.24*** (2.20)
Misconduct \times Female	9.72*** (1.68)	9.68*** (1.55)	11.04*** (1.58)	10.94*** (1.57)
Adviser Controls		✓	✓	✓
Firm \times Year \times County FE			✓	
Firm \times Year \times County \times License FE				✓
Observations	7,022,703	7,022,703	6,571,326	5,736,702
R^2	0.005	0.017	0.260	0.316
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.66	16.66	16.81	16.58

Note: Observations are based on the adviser-year panel data for 2008–2018. The dependent variable is a dummy for whether an adviser exits their firm in the subsequent year. “Misc” denotes a dummy variable for any misconduct-related disclosure, and adviser controls include industry experience, tenure, and licensing variables. Fixed effects are included at the firm \times year \times county \times license level. The coefficients are in percentage points. Standard errors are in brackets and clustered by firms.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

positive and statistically significant, indicating that minority advisers are roughly 30% more likely to leave their firm following a misconduct disclosure compared to their white counterparts.

Table 3: Replication of Racial Differences in Job Separations Following Misconduct Disclosures

	(1)	(2)
Minority	1.36*** (0.44)	0.57*** (0.19)
Misconduct	32.33*** (1.55)	29.14*** (2.09)
Misconduct \times Minority	10.36*** (2.64)	13.76*** (2.48)
Female	-0.84*** (0.26)	-0.23* (0.13)
Adviser Controls	✓	✓
Firm \times Year \times County \times License FE		✓
Observations	7,022,703	5,736,702
R^2	0.018	0.316
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.66	16.58

Note: Observations are based on the adviser-year panel data for 2008–2018. The dependent variable is a dummy for whether an adviser exits their firm in the subsequent year. “Misc” denotes a dummy variable for any misconduct-related disclosure, and adviser controls include industry experience, tenure, and licensing variables. Fixed effects are included at the firm \times year \times county \times license level. The coefficients are in percentage points. Standard errors are in brackets and clustered by firms. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

4 Main Findings

In this section, we document how the measurement of financial misconduct critically affects the estimated labor market penalties for financial advisers. We first demonstrate that aggregating various disclosure events yields a significant gender gap in job separations. We then show that disaggregating misconduct into its constituent components eliminates the gender gap, while significant racial disparities persist.

4.1 Decomposing Financial Misconduct

To better understand the sources of observed labor market penalties, we partition “Misconduct” into two distinct categories:

- **Category A:** Disclosure events that almost invariably lead to job termination (e.g., Employment Separation After Allegations).
- **Category B:** Other misconduct-related disclosures (e.g., customer disputes, regulatory actions) that do not automatically trigger termination.

If female advisers experience a higher proportion of Category A events within the aggregated measure, this composition effect could spuriously inflate the apparent gender penalty. Our data reveal that while the aggregated measure replicates a 20% higher job separation rate for female advisers, disaggregating the events eliminates the gender difference. In other words, conditional on the type of misconduct, females and males exhibit similar separation rates.

4.2 Absence of a Gender Gap

To test this, we consider equation We test this hypothesis using the following specification:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Separation}_{iqjlt+1} = & \beta_1 \text{Female}_i + \beta_2 \text{Disc}_{iqjlt} + \beta_3 \text{Disc}_{iqjlt} \times \text{Female}_i \quad (3) \\ & + \beta_4 X_{it} + \mu_{qjlt} + \varepsilon_{iqjlt}, \end{aligned}$$

Table 4 reports our estimates. When “Disclosure” is defined to include all misconduct events, the interaction term is positive and significant. However, after excluding Category A events (Employment Separation After Allegations) from the measure, the coefficient on Disclosure \times Female becomes statistically insignificant. This finding indicates that the previously observed gender gap is driven primarily by the composition of disclosure events rather than by an intrinsic gender bias in employer punishment.

In summary, while aggregating disclosure events can improve estimation precision – given their infrequent and serially correlated nature – it may also obscure important heterogeneity in their labor market consequences. Accounting for the distinct effects of different events is thus crucial in evaluating the true gender gap in penalties for financial misconduct.

Table 4: The Effect of Disaggregated Disclosure Events on Gender Differences in Job Separations

	Job Separation (%)		
	(1) Misconduct	(2) Category B	(3) Category A
Female	-0.26** (0.13)	-0.30** (0.13)	-0.24* (0.13)
Disclosure	29.24*** (2.20)	10.02*** (0.73)	74.92*** (1.40)
Female \times Disclosure	10.94*** (1.57)	-0.03 (0.90)	0.87 (0.80)
Adviser Controls	✓	✓	✓
Firm \times Year \times County \times License FE	✓	✓	✓
Observations	5,736,702	5,736,702	5,736,702
R^2	0.316	0.312	0.320
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.58	16.58	16.58

Note: Observations are based on the adviser-year panel data over the period 2008-2018. The dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to one if an adviser worked for a given firm in a given year (excluding the last year 2018) and left the firm by the end of next year. The dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to one if an adviser worked for a given firm in a given year (excluding the last year 2018) and left the firm by the end of next year. The columns (1)–(3) correspond to the respective sets of disclosure events: (1) Misconduct (defined in Section 2.2), (2) Misconduct excluding Event (II), (3) Event (II) Employment Separation After Allegations. The variable “Disclosure” is a dummy for whether an adviser has encountered any disclosure event in the corresponding set, at least once in a given year. The coefficients are in percentage points. Standard errors are in brackets and clustered by firms.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

4.3 Persistent Racial Disparities

In contrast to the gender findings, racial disparities remain robust. We re-estimate the model by replacing the gender dummy with a minority indicator:

$$\text{Separation}_{iqjlt+1} = \beta_1 \text{Minority}_i + \beta_2 \text{Disc}_{iqjlt} + \beta_3 \text{Disc}_{iqjlt} \times \text{Minority}_i \quad (4) \\ + \beta_4 X_{it} + \mu_{qjlt} + \varepsilon_{iqjlt},$$

As shown in Table 5, the interaction term “Disclosure \times Minority” remains positive and statistically significant even when we exclude Category A events from the misconduct measure. Minority advisers are approximately 24% more likely to exit their firms following a misconduct disclosure, and this effect is robust to alternative specifications.

Table 5: Racial Disparities in Job Separations: Impact of Disaggregated Misconduct Measures

	Job Separation (%)		
	(1) Misconduct	(2) Category B	(3) Category A
Minority	0.57*** (0.19)	0.66*** (0.18)	0.63*** (0.18)
Disclosure	29.14*** (2.09)	9.36*** (0.69)	75.36*** (1.39)
Disclosure \times Minority	13.76*** (2.48)	6.41*** (1.40)	-1.52 (1.29)
Female	-0.23* (0.13)	-0.31** (0.13)	-0.25* (0.13)
Adviser Controls	✓	✓	✓
Firm \times Year \times County \times License FE	✓	✓	✓
Observations	5,736,702	5,736,702	5,736,702
R^2	0.316	0.312	0.320
Mean of Dependent Variable	16.58	16.58	16.58

Note: The dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to one if an adviser worked for a given firm in a given year (excluding the last year 2018) and left the firm by the end of next year. The columns (1)–(3) correspond to the respective sets of disclosure events: (1) Misconduct (defined in Section 2.2), (2) Misconduct excluding Event (II), (3) Event (II) Employment Separation After Allegations. The variable “Disclosure” is a dummy for whether an adviser has encountered any disclosure event in the corresponding set, at least once in a given year. The coefficients are in percentage points. Standard errors are in brackets and clustered by firms.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

Moreover, further analysis indicates that minority advisers are about 20% more likely to receive employer-induced terminations relative to their white counterparts.

4.4 Implications of the Findings

Our findings underscore a critical insight: while the apparent gender penalty in job separations can be attributed to the aggregation of heterogeneous disclosure events, the racial disparities in employment outcomes persist even after accounting for these measurement issues. This suggests that race-based differential treatment in the labor market is a distinct phenomenon that warrants further investigation.

5 Robustness Checks and Additional Analyses

To further validate our findings, we perform a series of robustness checks addressing alternative explanations and potential confounding factors.

5.1 Disclosure Interdependence

We investigate whether gender- or race-specific correlations between different types of disclosure events contribute to the observed punishment gaps. Specifically, we test if the sequencing of events—such as a non-termination disclosure (e.g., customer dispute) triggering a subsequent employer disciplinary action (Event (II)) – differs by gender or race. Our analysis shows that while there is a moderate overall positive correlation between these events, there is no significant female-specific or minority-specific positive correlation. This confirms that the observed gender gap largely stems from the composition of disclosure events rather than from differential sequencing.

5.2 Alternative Specifications

We further assess the sensitivity of our results using alternative model specifications and additional controls:

- **Settlement Costs:** We examine whether the cost associated with disclosure events differs between minority and majority groups. Our findings indicate no significant difference in the associated costs.
- **Industry Experience and Tenure:** Our main results hold across various career stages, and they remain robust when we restrict the sample to “loyal” advisers who have never switched firms before termination.
- **Education:** To address concerns that lower average educational attainment among minority advisers might bias the estimated termination gap, we restrict the sample to advisers with at least a university-level education. Even with this constraint, minority advisers are still at least 25% more likely to be terminated than their white counterparts. Note that we cannot control for pre-market factors, a limitation compared to studies such as [Neal and Johnson \(1996\)](#).

Together, these robustness checks reinforce our primary conclusions: after properly

disaggregating financial misconduct, the gender gap in labor market penalties disappears, while significant racial disparities persist.

6 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we reexamine labor market penalties for financial misconduct in the U.S. financial advisory industry using a comprehensive matched dataset from FINRA’s BrokerCheck database covering 2008–2018. Our replication of prior evidence confirms that, when misconduct is measured in aggregate, female advisers appear to face a higher likelihood of job separation following misconduct. However, by disaggregating misconduct into its constituent disclosure events, we find that the apparent gender gap is driven primarily by compositional effects and essentially disappears. In stark contrast, significant racial disparities persist: non-white advisers are approximately 24% more likely to exit their firms following misconduct than their white counterparts. Robustness checks – examining alternative model specifications and controlling for key firm and individual characteristics – further validate these findings.

These results underscore that, within the financial advisory industry, differential labor market outcomes are driven predominantly by race-based factors rather than by gender bias. An important avenue for future research is to investigate the underlying mechanisms that sustain these disparities. In particular, exploring the role of in-group favoritism – as suggested by [Egan et al. \(2022\)](#) – may shed light on how the composition of management and leadership within firms influences the severity of employment penalties across different gender and racial groups. Understanding whether employers exhibit leniency toward individuals who share their demographic characteristics could provide valuable insights into the persistence of racial disparities in employment outcomes and inform policy interventions aimed at promoting fairer treatment in the labor market.

Appendix

A Definition of the Major Disclosure Events

Disclosure events details are described in Form U4.¹ Below we consider the major disclosure events excluding those on appeal and pending ones, and give their definitions used in the FINRA's BrokerCheck database.

Customer Dispute - Settled: This type of disclosure event involves a consumer-initiated, investment-related complaint, arbitration proceeding or civil suit containing allegations of sale practice violations against the broker that resulted in a monetary settlement to the customer.

Customer Dispute - Award / Judgment: This type of disclosure event involves a final, consumer-initiated, investment-related arbitration or civil suit containing allegations of sales practice violations against the broker that resulted in an arbitration award or civil judgment for the customer.

Customer Dispute - Closed-No Action / Withdrawn / Dismissed / Denied: This type of disclosure event involves (1) a consumer-initiated, investment-related arbitration or civil suit containing allegations of sales practice violations against the individual broker that was dismissed, withdrawn, or denied; or (2) a consumer-initiated, investment-related written complaint containing allegations that the broker engaged in sales practice violations resulting in compensatory damages of at least \$5,000, forgery, theft, or misappropriation, or conversion of funds or securities, which was closed without action, withdrawn, or denied.

Criminal - Final Disposition: This type of disclosure event involves a conviction or guilty plea for any felony or certain misdemeanor offenses, including bribery, perjury, forgery, counterfeiting, extortion, fraud, and wrongful taking of property that is currently on appeal.

Type: Felony, Misdemeanor.

Civil - Final: This type of disclosure event involves (1) an injunction issued by a court in connection with investment-related activity, (2) a finding by a court of a violation of any investment-related statute or regulation, or (3) an action brought by a state or foreign financial regulatory authority that is dismissed by a court pursuant to a settlement agreement.

Employment Separation After Allegations: This type of disclosure event involves a situation

¹The Form U4 is available via <https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/form-u4.pdf> (accessed February 20, 2025). Note that the definition of each event is given in the FINRA's BrokerCheck report for financial advisers (registered representatives) who have indeed received that disclosure in the past. See <https://brokercheck.finra.org/> and also <https://www.finra.org/sites/default/files/AppSupportDoc/p015111.pdf> (accessed February 20, 2025).

where the broker voluntarily resigned, was discharged, or was permitted to resign after being accused of (1) violating investment-related statutes, regulations, rules or industry standards of conduct; (2) fraud or the wrongful taking of property; or (3) failure to supervise in connection with investment-related statutes, regulations, rules, or industry standards of conduct.

Termination Type: Discharged, Permitted to Resign, Voluntary Resignation.

Regulatory Final: This type of disclosure event may involve (1) a final, formal proceeding initiated by a regulatory authority (e.g., a state securities agency, self-regulatory organization, federal regulatory such as the Securities and Exchange Commission, foreign financial regulatory body) for a violation of investment-related rules or regulations; or (2) a revocation or suspension of a broker's authority to act as an attorney, accountant, or federal contractor.

Financial - Final: This type of disclosure event involves a bankruptcy, compromise with one or more creditors, or Securities Investor Protection Corporation liquidation involving the broker or an organization/brokerage firm the broker controlled that occurred within the last 10 years.

Action Type: Bankruptcy [Chapter 7, Chapter 11, Chapter 13, Other], Compromise, Declaration, Liquidation, Receivership, Other.

Disposition Type: Direct Payment Procedure, Discharged, Dismissed, Dissolved, SIPA Trustee Appointed, Satisfied/Released, Other.

Judgment / Lien: This type of disclosure event involves an unsatisfied and outstanding judgments or liens against the broker.

Type: Civil, Tax.

Civil Bond: This type of disclosure event involves a civil bond for the broker that has been denied, paid, or revoked by a bonding company.

Investigation: This type of disclosure event involves any ongoing formal investigation by an entity such as a grand jury state or federal agency, self-regulatory organization or foreign regulatory authority. Subpoenas, preliminary or routine regulatory inquiries, and general requests by a regulatory entity for information are not considered investigations and therefore are not included in a BrokerCheck report.

B Definition of the Major Qualification Exams (Licenses)

The definitions of qualification exams (licenses) are described in the FINRA website.² Below we consider the major qualification exams (Series 6, 7, 24, 63, 65, 66) as in the main text and give their definitions used in the website. Series 6 and 7 are categorized as “FINRA Representative-level Exams”, Series 24 as “FINRA Principal-level Exams”, Series 63, 65, and 66 as “North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA) Exams”. Note that the definitions of NASAA Exams are given by the NASAA website.³

Series 6: The Series 6 exam – the Investment Company and Variable Contracts Products Representative Qualification Examination (IR) – assesses the competency of an entry-level representative to perform their job as an investment company and variable contracts products representative. The exam measures the degree to which each candidate possesses the knowledge needed to perform the critical functions of an investment company and variable contract products representative, including sales of mutual funds and variable annuities.

Series 7: The Series 7 exam – the General Securities Representative Qualification Examination (GS) – assesses the competency of an entry-level registered representative to perform their job as a general securities representative. The exam measures the degree to which each candidate possesses the knowledge needed to perform the critical functions of a general securities representative, including sales of corporate securities, municipal securities, investment company securities, variable annuities, direct participation programs, options and government securities.

Series 24: The Series 24 exam – the General Securities Principal Qualification Exam (GP) – assesses the competency of an entry-level principal to perform their job as a principal dependent on their corequisite registrations. The exam measures the degree to which each candidate possesses the knowledge needed to perform the critical functions of a principal, including the rules and statutory provisions applicable to the supervisory management of a general securities broker-dealer.⁴

Series 63: The Series 63 exam – the Uniform Securities State Law Examination – is a North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA) exam administered by FINRA.

²See the website: <https://www.finra.org/registration-exams-ce/qualification-exams> (accessed February 20, 2025).

³See the website: <https://www.nasaa.org/exams/exam-study-guides/> (accessed February 20, 2025).

⁴In addition to the Series 24 exam, candidates must pass the Securities Industry Essentials (SIE) Exam (since October 1, 2018 with a complete overhaul) and a representative-level qualification exam, or the Supervisory Analysts Exam (Series 16) exam, to hold an appropriate principal registration. See the FINRA website for the definitions of related exams.

(Definition given by NASAA:) The Uniform Securities Agent State Law Examination was developed by NASAA in cooperation with representatives of the securities industry and industry associations. The examination, called the Series 63 exam, is designed to qualify candidates as securities agents. The examination covers the principles of state securities regulation reflected in the Uniform Securities Act (with the amendments adopted by NASAA and rules prohibiting dishonest and unethical business practices). The examination is intended to provide a basis for state securities administrators to determine an applicant's knowledge and understanding of state law and regulations.

Series 65: The Series 65 exam – the NASAA Investment Advisers Law Examination – is a North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA) exam administered by FINRA.

(Definition given by NASAA:) The Uniform Investment Adviser Law Examination and the available study outline were developed by NASAA. The examination, called the Series 65 exam, is designed to qualify candidates as investment adviser representatives. The exam covers topics that have been determined to be necessary to understand in order to provide investment advice to clients.

Series 66: The Series 66 exam – the NASAA Uniform Combined State Law Examination – is a North American Securities Administrators Association (NASAA) exam administered by FINRA.

(Definition given by NASAA:) The Uniform Combined State Law Examination was developed by NASAA based on industry requests. The examination (also called the “Series 66”) is designed to qualify candidates as both securities agents and investment adviser representatives. The exam covers topics that have been determined to be necessary to provide investment advice and effect securities transactions for clients.⁵

⁵The FINRA Series 7 is a corequisite exam that needs to be successfully completed in addition to the Series 66 exam before a candidate can apply to register with a state.

References

- AGRAWAL, A., J. F. JAFFE AND J. M. KARPOFF, “Management turnover and governance changes following the revelation of fraud,” *The Journal of Law and Economics* 42 (1999), 309–342.
- ALTONJI, J. G. AND R. M. BLANK, “Race and gender in the labor market,” *Handbook of Labor Economics* 3 (1999), 3143–3259.
- BENEISH, M. D., “Incentives and penalties related to earnings overstatements that violate GAAP,” *The Accounting Review* 74 (1999), 425–457.
- BERTRAND, M. AND E. DUFLO, “Field Experiments on Discriminationa,” in *Handbook of Economic Field Experiments* volume 1 (Elsevier, 2017), 309–393.
- BERTRAND, M., C. GOLDIN AND L. F. KATZ, “Dynamics of the gender gap for young professionals in the financial and corporate sectors,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 2 (2010), 228–55.
- BLAU, F. D. AND L. M. KAHN, “Gender differences in pay,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14 (2000), 75–99.
- , “The gender wage gap: Extent, trends, and explanations,” *Journal of Economic Literature* 55 (2017), 789–865.
- CHAROENWONG, B., A. KWAN AND T. UMAR, “Does Regulatory Jurisdiction Affect the Quality of Investment-Adviser Regulation?,” *American Economic Review* 109 (2019), 3681–3712.
- CLIFFORD, C. P. AND W. C. GERKEN, “Property rights to client relationships and financial advisor incentives,” *The Journal of Finance* 76 (2021), 2409–2445.
- COOK, J., Z. T. KOWALESKI, M. MINNIS, A. SUTHERLAND AND K. M. ZEHMS, “Auditors are known by the companies they keep,” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* (2020), 101314.
- DARITY, W. A. AND P. L. MASON, “Evidence on discrimination in employment: Codes of color, codes of gender,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 12 (1998), 63–90.

- DESAI, H., C. E. HOGAN AND M. S. WILKINS, “The reputational penalty for aggressive accounting: Earnings restatements and management turnover,” *The Accounting Review* 81 (2006), 83–112.
- DIMMOCK, S. G., W. C. GERKEN AND N. P. GRAHAM, “Is Fraud Contagious? Coworker Influence on Misconduct by Financial Advisors,” *The Journal of Finance* 73 (2018a), 1417–1450.
- DIMMOCK, S. G., W. C. GERKEN AND T. D. VAN ALFEN, “Real Estate Shocks and Financial Advisor Misconduct,” (2018b).
- EGAN, M., G. MATVOS AND A. SERU, “The market for financial adviser misconduct,” *Journal of Political Economy* 127 (2019), 233–295.
- , “When Harry fired Sally: The double standard in punishing misconduct,” *Journal of Political Economy* 130 (2022), 1184–1248.
- FEROZ, E. H., K. PARK AND V. S. PASTENA, “The financial and market effects of the SEC’s accounting and auditing enforcement releases,” *Journal of Accounting Research* 29 (1991), 107–142.
- GOLDIN, C., “A grand gender convergence: Its last chapter,” *American Economic Review* 104 (2014), 1091–1119.
- GURUN, U. G., N. STOFFMAN AND S. E. YONKER, “Unlocking clients: The importance of relationships in the financial advisory industry,” *Journal of Financial Economics* 141 (2021), 1218–1243.
- HONIGSBERG, C. AND M. JACOB, “Deleting misconduct: The expungement of BrokerCheck records,” *Journal of Financial Economics* 139 (2021), 800–831.
- KARPOFF, J. M., D. S. LEE AND G. S. MARTIN, “The consequences to managers for financial misrepresentation,” *Journal of Financial Economics* 88 (2008), 193–215.
- LANG, K. AND J.-Y. K. LEHMANN, “Racial discrimination in the labor market: Theory and empirics,” *Journal of Economic Literature* 50 (2012), 959–1006.
- LANG, K. AND A. K.-L. SPITZER, “Race Discrimination: An Economic Perspective,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 34 (2020), 68–89.

- LAOHAPRAPANON, S. AND G. SOOD, *ethnicolr: Predict Race and Ethnicity From Name* (2019), python package version 0.3.0.
- LAW, K. K. AND L. F. MILLS, “Financial gatekeepers and investor protection: Evidence from criminal background checks,” *Journal of Accounting Research* 57 (2019), 491–543.
- MULLEN, L., *gender: Predict Gender from Names Using Historical Data* (2018), r package version 0.5.2.
- NEAL, D. A. AND W. R. JOHNSON, “The role of premarket factors in black-white wage differences,” *Journal of Political Economy* 104 (1996), 869–895.
- NEUMARK, D., “Experimental research on labor market discrimination,” *Journal of Economic Literature* 56 (2018), 799–866.