NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES

FINTECH AND CUSTOMER CAPITAL

Bianca He
Lauren Mostrom
Amir Sufi

Working Paper 34710
http://www.nber.org/papers/w34710

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
January 2026

This essay has been prepared for the 2026 American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings. Xi Wang provided excellent research support. We thank Jean-Pierre Dube, Kilian Huber, Yueran Ma, Suproteem Sarkar, Amit Seru, Laura Veldkamp, and Xavier Vives for comments. We are grateful to the University of Chicago Booth School of Business and the Fama Miller Center for financial support. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER working papers are circulated for discussion and comment purposes. They have not been peer-reviewed or been subject to the review by the NBER Board of Directors that accompanies official NBER publications.

© 2026 by Bianca He, Lauren Mostrom, and Amir Sufi. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

FinTech and Customer Capital
Bianca He, Lauren Mostrom, and Amir Sufi
NBER Working Paper No. 34710
January 2026
JEL No. G23, M3

ABSTRACT

Financial Technology ("FinTech") firms invest significantly more in customer capital relative to traditional financial firms, and such investment builds valuable customer capital. Higher investment by FinTech firms is not accounted for by sectoral focus or differences in firm age. Reasons for higher customer capital investment are explored, including the need to build trust with customers, the focus on downstream segments of the financial marketplace, the operation of platform-based business models, and a heavier reliance on valuable customer data.

Bianca He
University of Chicago
bianca.he@chicagobooth.edu

Lauren Mostrom
University of Chicago
lmostrom@chicagobooth.edu

Amir Sufi
University of Chicago
Booth School of Business
and NBER
amir.sufi@chicagobooth.edu

FinTech and Customer Capital*

Bianca He
Chicago Booth

Lauren Mostrom
Chicago Booth

Amir Sufi
Chicago Booth & NBER

January 2026

Technological advancement in business practices over the last decade has been remarkable, and the financial services industry is no exception. The growth in the number of firms specializing in using financial technology to deliver financial services—the "FinTech" industry—has spurred a large body of research, which has been summarized by several excellent recent reviews (e.g., Agarwal and Zhang (2020); Allen, Gu and Jagtiani (2021); Berg, Fuster and Puri (2022); Seru (2020); Thakor (2020); Vives (2019)). The existing literature focuses on how FinTech firms utilize digital technology to improve the delivery, quality, and customer experience of financial services.

This essay complements this literature by presenting evidence that we believe is previously undocumented: FinTech firms spend far more resources on sales and marketing efforts than traditional financial firms. In the language of He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024), substantial investment in customer capital is an instrumental component of the FinTech business strategy. This essay demonstrates this robust pattern and offers a preliminary assessment of the economics behind why customer capital is so critical for FinTech.[1]

1 The Growth in FinTech

The baseline sample for the analysis includes U.S.-based firms in the Compustat data set with a GICS code in the financial sector (40) from 1997 to 2022. More details on the sample are available

*This essay has been prepared for the 2026 American Economic Association Papers and Proceedings. Xi Wang provided excellent research support. We thank Jean-Pierre Dube, Kilian Huber, Yueran Ma, Suproteem Sarkar, Amit Seru, Laura Veldkamp, and Xavier Vives for comments. We are grateful to the University of Chicago Booth School of Business and the Fama Miller Center for financial support. Contact information: He: bianca.he@chicagobooth.edu; Mostrom: lmostrom@chicagobooth.edu; Sufi: amir.sufi@chicagobooth.edu.

[1]We refer the reader to He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024) for more details on theoretical motivation, data sources, and empirical framework underlying the idea that sales and marketing expense should be viewed as an investment in customer capital. That study focuses uniquely on non-financial firms, whereas this study focuses on the financial industry.

in the online appendix. The beginning sample covers 25,324 observations. We define a firm-year observation as "FinTech" based on the text of Item 1 of the firm's 10-K SEC filing, processed with the help of Gemini 2.5 flash-lite. In the first, more narrow, classification of a FinTech firm, we ask Gemini to determine whether the firm *describes itself* as a "financial technology company", or using synonymous language.[2] In the second broader classification, we present Gemini with the definition of a FinTech firm from the Financial Stability Board, and ask it to determine whether the firm's business description is consistent with this definition.[3] Firms classified as FinTech according to both measures include well-known firms such as Block Inc (the parent of Square), Rocket Cos Inc, Coinbase Global Inc, and the buy-now-pay-later firm Affirm Holdings Inc.[4]

The left panel of Figure 1 shows the fraction of publicly-traded financial firms over time that are classified as "FinTech." For the narrow measure, the fraction of financial firms classified as FinTech increased dramatically from 2015 to 2022, reaching 10% by the end of the sample. For the broader measure, by 2022, over 20% of financial firms are classified as FinTech firms. The right panel shows the fraction of financial firms classified as FinTech according to the narrow measure, where firms are weighted by either revenue or enterprise value. When weighted by enterprise value, FinTech firms make up 11% of the publicly-traded firms in the financial industry by 2022.

2 FinTech Investment in Customer Capital

Table 1 shows the median, average, and revenue-weighted average sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio for non-financial firms, non-FinTech financial firms, and FinTech firms. The sample is limited to 2018 and afterward, when FinTech firms are prominent in the economy. FinTech firms spend substantially more on sales and marketing relative to non-FinTech financial firms across all

[2]The full text of all Gemini prompts are included in Appendix Table A1.

[3]The Financial Stability Board's definition of a FinTech company is: "Technologically enabled innovation in financial services that could result in new business models, applications, processes or products with an associated material effect on financial markets and institutions and the provision of financial services." This definition is highlighted in survey pieces by Agarwal and Zhang (2020) and Thakor (2020).

[4]We do not believe there is an agreed-upon measure in the academic literature on whether a firm is "FinTech". In a seminal study, Buchak, Matvos, Piskorski and Seru (2018) classify a mortgage lender as FinTech if "it has a strong online presence and if nearly all of the mortgage application process takes place online with no human involvement from the lender."

measures and across both definitions of FinTech. Our preferred measure is the median sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio, given that it is less influenced by outliers. FinTech firms spend three times more on sales and marketing than non-FinTech financial firms. They spend slightly more than non-financial firms.

Appendix Table A2 shows the largest 30 companies by revenue as of 2022 that are classified as FinTech firms according to the narrow measure. Also shown is their sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio for 2022 and their industry code. The list includes older companies such as Visa and Mastercard in addition to younger firms such as Block Inc and Rocket Cos Inc. Two InsurTech companies are on the list: Selectquote Inc and Root Inc.

One explanation for these differences could be that FinTech firms are concentrated in certain segments of the financial sector. Appendix Table A3 shows that FinTech firms spend more on sales and marketing than non-FinTech firms across almost all industries of the financial sector. Banks classified as FinTech firms spend almost the same on sales and marketing compared to banks not classified as FinTech firms. But across all other segments—financial services, consumer finance, capital markets, and insurance—FinTech firms spend substantially more. The insurance industry is particularly striking, where FinTech insurance firms (often called InsurTech firms) spend 40 to 60% of revenue on sales and marketing compared to much more modest spending by non-FinTech insurance companies.

FinTech firms are on average much younger than non-FinTech financial firms; as of 2022, the median non-FinTech financial firm is 72 years old since initial establishment whereas the median FinTech firm is 23.5 years old. One explanation for the higher sales and marketing to revenue ratio of FinTech firms could be that they are simply younger, and younger firms must spend more aggressively on sales and marketing. Appendix Table A4 isolates the sample to financial firms as of 2022, and it splits financial firms into groups based on age since establishment. As the results show, FinTech firms spend more on sales and marketing for any given age group. For example, there are 13 FinTech firms (according to the broader definition of FinTech) that are between 30 and 40 years old as of 2022 for which we have sales and marketing information. This group includes WisdomTree

Inc, Rocket Cos Inc, and Fleetcor Technologies Inc. The median sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio among this group is 9.0%, compared to only 1.5% for similarly aged non-FinTech financial firms.

To formally test the statistical robustness of the differences in the sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio, Table 2 presents coefficients from firm-level regressions of the ratio on an indicator variable for whether a firm is classified as a FinTech firm. Standard errors are double-clustered by firm and year, and year, sector, age, and size fixed effects are progressively included in the regression. Across all specifications, FinTech firms are shown to have a sales and marketing to expense ratio that is 6 to 10% more than other financial firms.[5]

FinTech firms' expenditures on sales and marketing also contribute to higher customer capital value, as demonstrated in the value paid for their intangible assets in acquisitions.[6] As shown in Figure 2, the median value of customer-related intangible assets (including core deposit intangibles) scaled by net sales is 0.03 for non-FinTech financial firms, compared to 0.41 for FinTech firms. If we restrict attention to only target firms that were public before being acquired, the median for non-FinTech financial firms is 0.03, compared to 0.16 for FinTech firms. Not only do FinTech firms invest heavily in customer capital, but this investment generates a valuable asset from the firm's perspective.

3 Why Do FinTechs Invest so Heavily in Customer Capital?

FinTech Firms Must Establish Trust and Credibility: Trust and credibility are central for financial firms. Clients rely on financial firms to keep their money and sensitive data safe, in an environment with high switching costs for both borrowers (e.g., Ioannidou and Ongena (2010)) and savers (e.g., Drechsler, Savov and Schnabl (2017)). Customers are therefore selective in choosing

[5]Given that revenue may not be comparable between FinTech and non-FinTech financial firms, Appendix Tables A5 and A6 show that all key results are robust to the use of an alternative measure of customer capital investment, which is salaries paid to sales and marketing employees scaled by total salaries paid by the firm. This measure is independent of revenue, but not as closely linked to theoretical models as the sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio.

[6]Please see He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024) for more details on the purchase price allocation (PPA) data used in this section, and the classification of assets into customer-related intangibles. As before, the analysis in He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024) focuses uniquely on non-financial firms, whereas the analysis here focuses on the financial industry.

a financial intermediary that they perceive to be reliable and long-lasting.

Banks and other incumbents have long used branches and prominent office locations as signals of permanence and credibility.[7] FinTech firms, by contrast, operate almost entirely online and therefore cannot draw on these traditional, location-based trust cues. Instead, they build credibility through sales and marketing activities, which serve as the online analog of securing "prime real estate": rather than paying for a branch on a busy street corner, FinTechs pay for prime web traffic to signal a reputation of permanence and trust in a fully digital setting.

As shown in Figure 3, FinTech firms are much more likely to reference the importance of brand value and advertising in their overall sales and marketing strategy, compared to non-FinTech financial firms. This evidence is based on the content of firms' business descriptions, processed using Gemini exactly as described in He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024).[8] Consistent with the importance of establishing trust in the brand, 54% of FinTech firms emphasize the importance of brand value, compared to only 14% of non-FinTech firms. Industry estimates suggest that this approach is expensive; for example, First Page Sage estimates that business to business Financial Services/FinTech has a customer acquisition cost (CAC) of $1200 to $1450, higher than any other B2B industry.

FinTech Firms Partner Vertically with Banks: It is well-known among policymakers and industry practitioners that banks and FinTech firms frequently enter into vertical partnerships in the production of financial services. These partnerships were the topic of a research report by CCG Catalyst in 2021[9] and a joint report by Synctera (a FinTech company) and Cornerstone Research in 2023.[10] In a survey of 290 bank and credit union executives conducted by Cornerstone in 2021, 65% of banks and credit unions entered into at least one partnership with a FinTech firm between 2019 and 2021; of those that did not, 37% said they planned to partner in 2022. Bank-FinTech

[7] In related work, Chen, Hu and Ma (2025) document that 53% of bank advertisements appeal to building trust, and that banks emphasize trust when advertising loan products in local markets where they already possess substantial market share.

[8] More specifically, based on a manual reading of 150 business descriptions from 10-K filings, He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024) classify five key sales and marketing strategies. Gemini is then asked to find evidence of whether the strategy in question is an important element based on the business description in its 10-K filing.

[9] The CCG Catalyst report is available at this link

[10] The Synctera and Cornerstone joint report is available at this link

partnerships are becoming a defining feature of this sector.

In a 2023 publication by the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, they highlight three main classes of bank-FinTech partnerships:[11] operational technology partnerships, customer-oriented partnerships, and front-end FinTech partnerships. Under the latter two classes of partnerships, the bank outsources some or all of its customer acquisition and customer service operations to the FinTech partner. This is consistent with our analysis of the text of business descriptions—as shown in Figure 4, 31% of FinTech firms indicate that their primary customers are households, rather than businesses or the government, compared to only 18% of non-FinTech firms. FinTech firms, as the farthest downstream producer in these industries, invest heavily in customer capital in order to lease this capital stock to upstream financial firms, primarily traditional financial intermediaries.

FinTech Firms Operate Platform Business Models: He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024) show that the fraction of firms using a platform-based business model, in which the firm earns profits by connecting two different types of users, is one of the strongest predictors of industry-level customer capital investment. Jullien and Pavan (2019) provide an intuitive theoretical justification for this result: firms can increase their profits by communicating information to customers that increases their expectation of take-up by the other side of the market. Environments such as these, which exhibit network effects in demand, feature multiple equilibria (e.g., Katz and Shapiro (1985); Rochet and Tirole (2003)), and as such the firm can earn large profits by convincing potential customers that it will have the largest market share.

Of course, almost all financial firms have some degree of a platform-based business model: banks bring together borrowers and savers, exchanges bring together buyers and sellers, and payment services companies bring together customers and merchants. However, within these industries, FinTech firms are far more likely to emphasize the "platform" nature of their business model in their business descriptions. As shown in Figure 4, 75% of FinTech firms were classified by Gemini as using a platform business model based on their business descriptions, compared to only 16%

[11] Federal Reserve Board of Governors, "Community Bank Access to Innovation Through Partnerships," October 2023. Available at https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/community-bank-access-to-innovation-through-partnerships-202109.pdf

of non-FinTech financial firms. FinTech firms' emphasis on the platform nature of their business likely suggests that these firms pursue methods of amplifying the network effects nature inherent in their business, contributing to a high return on customer acquisition in these firms' investment decisions.

FinTech Firms Rely Heavily on Customer Data: Optimal spending on customer acquisition is likely higher in FinTech than for other non-FinTech firms given that customer data is a prominent source of value for these firms. FinTech is a primary example of the data economy (e.g., Farboodi, Mihet, Philippon and Veldkamp (2019); Farboodi and Veldkamp (2021)); in particular, FinTech firms heavily emphasize the acquisition and use of customer data in their filing text. As shown in Figure 3, 51% of FinTech firms highlight this strategy, compared to only 8% of non-FinTech financial firms. Data may be valuable to FinTechs by enabling improvements in product quality (e.g. Farboodi, Mihet, Philippon and Veldkamp (2019)), or by facilitating price discrimination (Dubé and Misra, 2023). The latter may be particularly salient in the FinTech setting, where many products such as loans and insurance policies are priced separately for each consumer.

Additionally, Bergemann and Bonatti (2024) demonstrate that a platform-based business model has the potential to amplify the benefits of customer data, by using it to extract additional surplus from upstream suppliers of the platform. The platform's data on its customers is valuable to the upstream sellers, enticing them to compete to be featured on the platform. FinTech platforms' data on customers may therefore be valuable to upstream partners, such as banks, traditional insurance companies, or merchants, who may be willing to accept less favorable terms in their transactions with FinTechs as a result. Due to FinTechs' position in the production chain of financial services, customer data can benefit the firm in two ways: by enabling price discrimination and product quality improvements downstream, and earning favorable terms in upstream transactions as well.

References

Agarwal, Sumit and Jian Zhang, "FinTech, lending and payment innovation: A review," *Asia-Pacific Journal of Financial Studies*, 2020, *49* (3), 353–367.

Allen, Franklin, Xian Gu, and Julapa Jagtiani, "A survey of fintech research and policy discussion," *Review of Corporate Finance*, 2021, *1*, 259–339.

Berg, Tobias, Andreas Fuster, and Manju Puri, "Fintech lending," *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 2022, *14* (1), 187–207.

Bergemann, Dirk and Alessandro Bonatti, "Data, competition, and digital platforms," *American Economic Review*, 2024, *114* (8), 2553–2595.

Buchak, Greg, Gregor Matvos, Tomasz Piskorski, and Amit Seru, "Fintech, regulatory arbitrage, and the rise of shadow banks," *Journal of financial economics*, 2018, *130* (3), 453–483.

Chen, Xugan, Allen Hu, and Song Ma, "Banks' Images: Evidence from Advertising Videos," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2025.

Drechsler, Itamar, Alexi Savov, and Philipp Schnabl, "The deposits channel of monetary policy," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2017, *132* (4), 1819–1876.

Dubé, Jean-Pierre and Sanjog Misra, "Personalized pricing and consumer welfare," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2023, *131* (1), 131–189.

Farboodi, Maryam and Laura Veldkamp, *A growth model of the data economy* number w28427, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2021.

_ , Roxana Mihet, Thomas Philippon, and Laura Veldkamp, "Big data and firm dynamics," in "AEA papers and proceedings," Vol. 109 American Economic Association 2014 Broadway, Suite 305, Nashville, TN 37203 2019, pp. 38–42.

He, Bianca, Lauren I Mostrom, and Amir Sufi, "Investing in Customer Capital," Technical Report, National Bureau of Economic Research 2024.

Ioannidou, Vasso and Steven Ongena, ""Time for a change": Loan conditions and bank behavior when firms switch banks," *The Journal of Finance*, 2010, *65* (5), 1847–1877.

Jullien, Bruno and Alessandro Pavan, "Information management and pricing in platform markets," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 2019, *86* (4), 1666–1703.

Katz, Michael L and Carl Shapiro, "Network externalities, competition, and compatibility," *The American Economic Review*, 1985, *75* (3), 424–440.

Rochet, Jean-Charles and Jean Tirole, "Platform competition in two-sided markets," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2003, *1* (4), 990–1029.

Seru, Amit, "Regulation, technology and the banking sector," *Macroeconomic Review*, 2020.

Thakor, Anjan V, "Fintech and banking: What do we know?," *Journal of financial intermediation*, 2020, *41*, 100833.

Vives, Xavier, "Digital disruption in banking," *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 2019, *11* (1), 243–272.

Figure 1: The Growth of FinTech Firms Over Time



Note: The left panel shows the fraction of financial firms classified as FinTech over time, using both the narrow and broad definitions. The right panel shows the fraction of financial firms classified as FinTech (narrow definition), weighted by either revenue or enterprise value.

Figure 2: Customer-Related Intangibles in PPA Transactions: FinTech vs. Non-FinTech Targets



Note: This figure plots the median ratio of customer-related intangible assets to net sales for public target firms and all target firms, across FinTech and non-FinTech financial firms. Intangible assets are taken from purchase price allocation data and classified into customer-related categories following He, Mostrom and Sufi (2024). FinTech status is assigned using textual analysis of target business descriptions based on the FSB definition.

Figure 3: Sales and Marketing Strategies Emphasized by FinTech and Non-FinTech Firms



Note: This figure compares the fraction of FinTech and non-FinTech firms whose business descriptions highlight specific sales and marketing strategies.

Figure 4: Platform and Household Classifications by FinTech and Non-FinTech Firms



Note: This figure shows the share of firms classified as operating a platform business model or serving a household-oriented customer base. Classification is based on Gemini text analysis of business descriptions: Platform business model, indicating classification as a platform firm, and Households, indicating a household-focused customer base. Group means are reported for FinTech and non-FinTech financial firms.

Table 1: Sales and Marketing Expense to Revenue Ratio

	Panel A: Narrow Definition		
	Median	Mean	Weighted Mean
Non-Financial	0.036	0.202	0.047
Financial, Non-FinTech	0.013	0.034	0.040
FinTech	0.038	0.178	0.080
	Panel B: Broad Definition		
	Median	Mean	Weighted Mean
Non-Financial	0.036	0.202	0.047
Financial, Non-FinTech	0.013	0.023	0.037
FinTech	0.040	0.166	0.068

Note: This table reports the median, mean, and revenue-weighted mean of the sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio for non-financial firms, non-FinTech financial firms, and FinTech financial firms. The sample is limited to firm-year observations from 2018 to 2022.

Table 2: FinTech Status and Sales and Marketing Expense

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: Narrow Definition					
FinTech	0.098**	0.099**	0.071**	0.071**	0.069**
	(0.018)	(0.018)	(0.017)	(0.017)	(0.016)
Observations	15,852	15,852	15,852	14,961	14,961
R-squared	0.045	0.050	0.150	0.160	0.177
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel B: Broad Definition					
FinTech	0.088**	0.089**	0.068**	0.059**	0.060**
	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.011)
Observations	15,852	15,852	15,852	14,961	14,961
R-squared	0.136	0.141	0.194	0.188	0.207
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age category FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Size FE	No	No	No	No	Yes

Notes: This table reports coefficients from firm-level regressions of the sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio on FinTech indicator variables (narrow and broad definitions). Standard errors are double-clustered by firm and year.

FinTech and Customer Capital: Supplemental Appendix

More details on sample construction

GICS codes were chosen for the financial industry definitions because they offer a more straightforward interpretation than NAICS in this setting. For example, prominent FinTech firms such as PayPal Holdings Inc and Block Inc have a 2-digit NAICS code outside of 52, even though the GICS code system classifies both of them as financial firms. In general, the GICS classification separates financial firms into categories in a more intuitive manner than NAICS codes. Real estate firms (GICS code 4040) and mortgage REITS (GICS code 402040) are excluded from the analysis. The start point of the sample in 1997 is dictated by the availability of digitized SEC 10-K filings in Edgar, which are used to supplement the data collected by Capital IQ. The Compustat sample includes all firm-year observations in the financial sector with a few standard exceptions. We exclude firm-year observations with missing information on total assets, revenue, end of year stock price, or operating income before depreciation. We also exclude firm-year observations with a negative value of either revenue or total book assets. Finally, given the importance of matching with SEC filings, we drop any firm observation with no central index key (CIK), which is the main identifier used by the SEC.

Revenue is a key scaling variable in the analysis below, and revenue is more complicated for financial firms relative to non-financial firms. Throughout the analysis, the Capital IQ measure of revenue is used, which is defined precisely in the Capital IQ web interactive platform. Specifically, for most financial institutions, the Capital IQ measure of revenue is net interest income plus total non-interest income minus provision for loan loss reserves. For financial firms for which interest income is not a primary source of revenue, revenue is defined similarly to non-financial firms.

Table A1: Questions Used for 10-K Analysis

10-K Item	Concept of Interest	Question
Item 1	FinTech (Self-Identified)	"# Instructions -You are a financial analyst specialized in covering the financial services sector. -Your task is to read the following business description from a firm's SEC 10-K filing and determine whether the firm explicitly describes itself as a 'financial technology company,' 'fintech company,' or equivalent language (such as 'technology-enabled financial services' or 'financial innovation platform'). -Note: General mentions of 'technology' or 'innovation' alone do not qualify unless explicitly connected to financial services delivery or business model transformation. # Requested Output -Answer with only one of the following words: Yes, No, or Unclear. # Business Description Text" {item1}
Item 1	FinTech (FSB Definition)	"# Instructions -You are a financial analyst specialized in covering the financial services sector. # Definition -The Financial Stability Board defines 'fintech' as: 'Technologically enabled innovation in financial services that could result in new business models, applications, processes or products with an associated material effect on financial markets and institutions and the provision of financial services.' # Task -Read the following business description. Based solely on the above definition from the Financial Stability Board, please determine whether the firm qualifies as a fintech firm. # Requested Output -Answer with only one of the following words: Yes, No, or Unclear. # Business Description Text {item1}"

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

10-K Item	Concept of Interest	Question
Item 1	Brand value	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the specific factors that the firm spends resources on in their sales and marketing strategy. Based on your reading of the document, please use your best judgement to answer the following question: Is an emphasis on increasing brand value an important element in the firm's sales and marketing strategy? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"
Item 1	Sales force	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the specific factors that the firm spends resources on in their sales and marketing strategy. Based on your reading of the document, please use your best judgement to answer the following question: Is an emphasis on a sales force or a sales staff an important element in the firm's sales and marketing strategy? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"
Item 1	Advertising	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the specific factors that the firm spends resources on in their sales and marketing strategy. Based on your reading of the document, please use your best judgement to answer the following question: Is an emphasis on advertising an important element in the firm's sales and marketing strategy? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

10-K Item	Concept of Interest	Question
Item 1	Customer data usage	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the specific factors that the firm spends resources on in their sales and marketing strategy. Based on your reading of the document, please use your best judgement to answer the following question: Is an emphasis on obtaining and using customer data an important element in the firm's sales and marketing strategy? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"
Item 1	Customer service	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the specific factors that the firm spends resources on in their sales and marketing strategy. Based on your reading of the document, please use your best judgement to answer the following question: Is an emphasis on customer service an important element in the firm's sales and marketing strategy? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"
Item 1	Customers	"We are economists conducting research on the spending done by firms on sales and marketing. Your task is to read the following document and determine the extent to which the firm spends resources on marketing, advertising, product promotion, branding, customer service, sales force, and other closely related activities. Your task is to read the following document and determine the primary customers of the firm in question. Specifically, does the firm primarily market its products to households, businesses, or the government? Please provide an answer that is only a single word: households, businesses, or the government. Here is the document:"

Continued on next page

Table A1 – continued from previous page

10-K Item	Concept of Interest	Question
Item 1	Platform business model	"We are economists conducting research on the underlying business models used by firms. One business model involves building a platform on which individuals or other entities interact. A platform business model involves profiting from a platform that allows two or more groups of users to interact. Your task is to read the following document and answer the following question: Is such a platform part of the business model of the firm? Please provide an answer that is only a single word, either yes or no. Here is the document:"

Table A2: Top 30 FinTech Firms by Revenue, 2022

Company Name	GICS Industry	Sales & Marketing / Revenue
VISA INC	402010	0.046
PAYPAL HOLDINGS INC	402010	0.082
MASTERCARD INC	402010	0.035
BLOCK INC	402010	0.117
NASDAQ INC	402030	0.008
ROCKET COS INC	402010	0.157
COINBASE GLOBAL INC	402030	0.162
TOAST INC	402010	0.117
PROG HOLDINGS INC	402020	0.006
BREAD FINANCIAL HOLDINGS INC	402020	0.081
GREEN DOT CORP	402020	0.206
ROBINHOOD MARKETS INC	402030	0.073
AFFIRM HOLDINGS INC	402010	0.395
MONEYGRAM INTERNATIONAL INC	402010	0.030
LENDINGCLUB CORP	402020	0.156
ENOVA INTERNATIONAL INC	402020	0.382
OPORTUN FINANCIAL CORP	402020	0.128
UPSTART HOLDINGS INC	402020	0.405
SELECTQUOTE INC	403010	0.634
MARQETA INC	402010	0.005
PAYONEER GLBL INC	402010	0.300
CUSTOMERS BANCORP INC	401010	0.004
LIVE OAK BANCSHARES INC	401010	0.021
PAYMENTUS HOLDINGS INC	402010	0.147
CURO GROUP HLDGS CORP	402020	0.073
TRICO BANCSHARES	401010	0.009
ATLANTICUS HOLDINGS CORP	402020	0.162
S&T BANCORP INC	401010	0.015
ROOT INC	403010	0.152
AMERANT BANCORP INC	401010	0.038

Notes: This table lists the 30 largest FinTech firms (narrow definition) by revenue in 2022, along with their sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio and their GICS financial sector.

Table A3: Sales and Marketing Expense to Revenue Ratio, by Financial Sector

	Narrow Definition		**Broad Definition**	
	Non-FinTech	FinTech	Non-FinTech	FinTech
Banks (401010)	0.013	0.015	0.013	0.013
	(N=421)	(N=6)	(N=419)	(N=8)
Finance Services (402010)	0.013	0.073	0.012	0.044
	(N=54)	(N=23)	(N=33)	(N=44)
Consumer Finance (402020)	0.066	0.130	0.059	0.130
	(N=24)	(N=14)	(N=18)	(N=20)
Capital Markets (402030)	0.005	0.040	0.000	0.068
	(N=149)	(N=10)	(N=123)	(N=36)
Insurance (403010)	0.008	0.656	0.002	0.424
	(N=95)	(N=3)	(N=83)	(N=15)

Notes: This table reports the number of firms and the median sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio by GICS code for FinTech and non-FinTech financial firms. The sample is limited to firm-year observations from 2018 to 2022.

Table A4: Sales and Marketing Expense to Revenue Ratio, by Firm Age

	Narrow Definition		**Broad Definition**	
	Non-FinTech	FinTech	Non-FinTech	FinTech
(0,10]	0.029	0.162	0.003	0.157
	(N=26)	(N=10)	(N=18)	(N=18)
(10,20]	0.006	0.123	0.004	0.138
	(N=72)	(N=17)	(N=64)	(N=25)
(20,30]	0.013	0.079	0.012	0.037
	(N=64)	(N=11)	(N=42)	(N=33)
(30,40]	0.017	0.124	0.015	0.090
	(N=53)	(N=3)	(N=43)	(N=13)

Notes: This table reports the median sales and marketing expense to revenue ratio for FinTech and non-FinTech financial firms as of 2022, grouped by age since establishment.

Table A5: Alternative Customer Capital Measure

	Panel A: Narrow Definition		
	Median	Mean	Weighted Mean
Non-Financial	0.190	0.214	0.188
Financial, Non-FinTech	0.086	0.105	0.128
FinTech	0.181	0.184	0.215
	Panel B: Broad Definition		
	Median	Mean	Weighted Mean
Non-Financial	0.190	0.214	0.188
Financial, Non-FinTech	0.080	0.094	0.124
FinTech	0.176	0.193	0.186

Notes: This table reports the median, mean, and revenue-weighted mean of the salaries of sales and marketing employees scaled by total salaries paid by the firm. The sample is limited to firm-year observations from 2018 to 2022.

Table A6: FinTech Status and Alternative Customer Capital Investment

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel A: Narrow Definition					
FinTech	0.086**	0.085**	0.031**	0.029**	0.029**
	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Observations	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,077	6,077
R-squared	0.051	0.052	0.380	0.383	0.387
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Panel B: Broad Definition					
FinTech	0.100**	0.100**	0.057**	0.055**	0.055**
	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.009)
Observations	6,291	6,291	6,291	6,077	6,077
R-squared	0.222	0.223	0.428	0.426	0.430
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Age category FE	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Size FE	No	No	No	No	Yes

Notes: This table reports coefficients from firm-level regressions of the salaries of sales and marketing employees to total salaries ratio on FinTech indicator variables. Standard errors are double-clustered by firm and year.