Conversion & CRO 19 min read June 2026 Updated 22 September 2026 By Charlton Jones

Why Forex Brokers Are Paying to Drive Traffic Into a Dead End

A performance marketing audit of the brokerage industry, drawn from 40 broker websites reviewed across FX Expo and iFX Expo. The details change. The failures do not.

Jupiter Tech Journal · https://jupitertech.io/blog/brokers-paying-for-traffic-into-a-dead-end · Markdown version: https://jupitertech.io/blog/brokers-paying-for-traffic-into-a-dead-end.md

Key takeaways

- Across 40 broker websites audited around FX Expo and iFX Expo, the same four failures recurred: generic messaging, no differentiated UVP, CTAs that ask before trust is earned, and ad-to-page collapse.
- Fewer than a quarter of the audited brokers could answer "why here instead of anywhere else" from their homepage alone.
- Routing every campaign to one generic homepage makes message-match impossible by design; the fix is a dedicated page per campaign, and per IB.
- The landing page is the most important variable in the conversion equation and the cheapest one to fix: a purpose-built page costs a fraction of one month's media spend.
- The standard: the message must hold from ad to page to next step, for a specific audience, without breaking.

SECTION 01

How I built the list, and why the audit mattered

The audit covered 40 brokers, chosen for flat management structures, each reviewed the way a performance marketer reads a funnel. Before the findings, the methodology. The quality of the list shaped the quality of the conclusions.

Ahead of both FX Expo and iFX Expo, I built a list of the brokers exhibiting at or attending each, then applied a single filter to thin it down: if there is more than one layer of management between me and the person who makes the call, the company comes off the list. Flat or near-flat structures only. After filtering each event and consolidating

the two into one research set, the list came down to 40 brokers. Companies operating in the right markets, with the right structure, and with enough of a digital footprint to audit meaningfully.

The CRO and psychological journey audit

For each broker, I went through their website not as a visitor but as a performance marketer, asking a specific set of questions at each stage:

- Does the hero section communicate a clear, differentiated value proposition?
- Does the messaging match the audience this broker is actually targeting?
- Is there a logical narrative flow from the first section to the next?
- Are the CTAs specific, contextually relevant, and placed at the right moment?
- Does the ad-to-landing-page journey maintain message and visual continuity?
- Is there any evidence of segmented funnel thinking, or is everything routed to one generic page?

The results were consistent enough to be a pattern, not a coincidence.

SECTION 02

The four failures showing up across the industry

Four failures recurred across the 40 brokers: generic messaging, an undifferentiated UVP, CTAs that ask too early, and ad-to-page collapse.

Failure 01: Generic messaging that talks to no one

The most common problem across the audited brokers was messaging so broad it effectively addressed no one. Hero sections declaring things like "Trade with confidence" or "Your trusted partner in global markets" or "Advanced technology for the modern trader."

These lines are not wrong. They are just meaningless. They could appear on any broker's website, in any market, targeting any trader, and they would be equally applicable and equally forgettable.

The principle at work is simple: when you try to speak to everyone, you end up resonating with no one. Psychographics matter more than demographics. Two traders who are demographically identical, same age, same country, same income bracket, can have completely different motivations for trading. One is a retail speculator chasing leverage and fast withdrawals. The other is a semi-professional who cares about execution quality and interbank spreads. The same message will not convert both of them. Trying to write copy that covers both will convert neither.

Strong messaging requires a decision. You pick an audience, you understand what they actually care about at a psychological level, and you write directly to that. The narrower and more specific the address, the stronger the resonance with the right person.

Failure 02: No clear or differentiated UVP

A unique value proposition is not a tagline. It is the answer to a very specific question: why should this trader open an account here instead of anywhere else?

In the audit, fewer than a quarter of the brokers could answer that question clearly from their homepage alone. The rest defaulted to capability statements: tight spreads, fast execution, regulated, MT4/MT5 available, and, as the trend has shifted, social trading and more gamification. These are table stakes. They are the minimum requirement to be taken seriously, not reasons to choose you.

A real UVP requires an honest internal conversation about what the broker actually does better than its competitors, for a specific type of trader, in a specific context. That answer might be regional payment infrastructure. It might be a particular asset class depth. It might be a genuinely differentiated education offering for newer traders. Whatever it is, it needs to be stated plainly, above the fold, in language the target trader actually uses, not in marketing language that sounds impressive but communicates nothing.

The hero section of a landing page has one job: answer the question the visitor is already asking. That question is almost always some version of "Is this for me, and is it worth my time?" A generic UVP fails that test immediately.

Failure 03: CTAs that ask for everything and promise nothing

The call-to-action is the moment of conversion. It is the point at which everything the page has communicated either lands or dissolves. And across the audited brokers, the CTAs were almost universally weak.

The most common offenders:

- "Open an Account" placed at the top of the page before any trust or value has been established
- "Get Started" with no context about what getting started involves
- Multiple competing CTAs on the same page with no hierarchy or sequencing
- CTAs that do not match the offer or campaign that drove the traffic in the first place

A CTA is not just a button. It is a micro-promise. It tells the visitor what happens next and implicitly signals whether that next step is worth taking. "Open an Account" at the top of a cold-traffic page asks for a high-commitment action from someone who has not yet been given a single reason to trust you. The conversion logic is backwards.

The correct approach sequences the page so that trust is established before commitment is requested. The visitor needs to believe the brand is legitimate, understand the value proposition, and see some form of proof before they are asked to act. Jumping to the ask before that groundwork is laid loses cold traffic before they even engage. Every section of a page must answer the next question the visitor has in their head, and the CTA should only arrive when the visitor has run out of reasons to hesitate.

Failure 04: Ad-to-page collapse, and the generic homepage that makes it inevitable

This is the failure that sits underneath all the others, and it has two symptoms that brokers tend to treat as separate problems when they are actually one.

The first symptom is message discontinuity between the ad and the landing page. The ad and the landing page must read as one continuous conversation. The visitor who clicked on your ad arrived with a specific expectation set by that ad. The hook they saw, the offer that was teased, the language that was used, all of that created a context. The landing

page they arrive on must continue that context immediately, within the first scroll, or the click momentum is gone. When it breaks, the visitor does not think "this page must have more information." They think "this is not what I clicked for" and they leave. Google scores this directly: its landing page experience assessment weighs "the expectations users have about your landing page based on the clicked ad creative", so a broken hand-off costs Quality Score as well as conversions.

The second symptom is the mechanism that makes the first one almost unavoidable: every campaign, regardless of audience, offer, or message, routes to the same generic page. Usually the homepage.

These are not two separate failures. A generic homepage receiving all traffic is precisely why message-match is impossible by design. You cannot maintain a specific conversation with a South African retail trader chasing a deposit bonus on oil CFDs if the page they land on was built to speak to every trader about everything. The architecture guarantees the mismatch before a single word of copy is written.

The fix requires both things to change together. Dedicated landing pages built for specific campaigns, with hero copy that echoes the ad's core claim in recognizable language, body copy that speaks to the actual motivations of that specific audience, and a CTA that matches the offer. The ad and the page must feel like the same sentence.

This is not a creative luxury. It is the basic operating standard of performance marketing, and it is almost entirely absent from the broker landscape right now.

A note for IB-driven brokerages. Everything above applies just as much to your introducing brokers as it does to paid campaigns. An IB sends you a specific audience, usually tied to a region, a language, and a relationship that already exists. Route all of that into the same generic homepage and you waste it the same way a mismatched paid campaign does.
The fix is the same one: a dedicated page per IB. The reason brokers never bothered was cost. Building and maintaining a tailored page for every partner at scale was not realistic. That has changed. With AI you can now spin up a clean, on-brand landing page for each IB you work with, tuned to their audience and their market, in a fraction of the time it used to take. The conversion lift on their traffic is the obvious win. The one that gets overlooked is what it signals to the IB: that you built something specifically for them. An IB who feels the partnership actually matters to you sends more your way.

SECTION 03

The South African oil trader, made concrete

A deposit-bonus campaign aimed at South African oil traders failed because its landing page spoke to a different trader entirely. Let me make the messaging failure specific, because abstract principles are easy to agree with and easy to ignore.

A broker is running a paid campaign. The offer is a deposit bonus. The asset is oil CFDs. The target audience is retail traders in South Africa.

Now let's think about who that audience actually is.

South African retail traders are, broadly speaking, at the more speculative end of the retail spectrum. They are attracted to high-leverage products. They want to know their funds are safe, and they want very fast local withdrawals. When they make money, they want to get it out quickly and without friction. They want leverage that makes meaningful positions accessible on a smaller account. They are not, as a primary concern, thinking about interbank pricing transparency or latency infrastructure.

This is not a judgment. It is an audience insight. And it is the kind of insight that should be driving every word on the landing page this campaign routes to.

Instead, the landing page this broker was running talked about transparent pricing, fast execution, and reliable infrastructure. These are messages for a different audience entirely. They are the concerns of a more sophisticated trader, someone who is already past the question of "can I make money here" and is asking "how efficiently does this platform execute my strategy."

The result is a complete mismatch between message and audience. The ad spoke to the right person with the right offer. The page spoke to a different person about different things. The click momentum built by the ad was spent on reorientation rather than conversion, and the trader bounced.

The fix is not complicated in principle. You build a dedicated page for this campaign. The hero headline echoes the bonus offer in language that mirrors the ad. The body copy speaks directly to fund safety, fast local withdrawals, high leverage, and the specific asset.

The CTA is tied to the action you want. The visual register matches what the ad established. The page feels like the next sentence of the conversation the ad started.

That is what conversion looks like. It is not a creative flourish. It is the minimum standard.

SECTION 04

The economics of leaving the funnel broken

Fixing the conversion rate before touching the budget is the highest-return decision a broker marketing team can make. This is where the conversation usually ends inside broker marketing teams, and it is where it should actually begin.

Assume a broker is spending 10,000 dollars a month on paid traffic. That traffic is going to a homepage with a conversion rate in the range typical of generic financial services pages receiving cold paid traffic, somewhere in the low single digits, and in my experience often closer to 1%. For comparison, Unbounce's 2024 benchmark, drawn from more than 57 million landing page conversions, puts the median for investing landing pages at 3.9% and for financial services overall at 8.3%: pages built for a campaign, not homepages absorbing everything. At that rate, 10,000 dollars of traffic produces a modest number of registrations and an even smaller number of funded accounts. The cost per funded account is high. The ROAS is difficult to justify. The marketing team reports the numbers, leadership expresses concern, and the conversation turns to either increasing the budget or cutting it.

Neither of those is the right answer.

The right answer is to fix the conversion rate first.

A well-built, campaign-specific landing page with message continuity from the ad, a clear UVP, properly sequenced CTAs, and audience-matched copy can meaningfully outperform a generic homepage on the same cold traffic. In my experience working across financial services campaigns, the gap between an unoptimized generic page and a purpose-built campaign page is not marginal. It is often the difference between a cost-per-acquisition that makes the campaign viable and one that doesn't.

The cost of building a properly structured landing page is a fraction of the monthly media spend. A few thousand dollars, done properly, against 10,000 dollars a month in traffic spend. The math is not complicated. The resistance is not financial. It is organizational, and that is a different problem entirely.

This is also where the prop firm comparison is worth a paragraph. Prop firms run their sales operation like an ecommerce store. They A/B test landing pages, run heatmaps, manage their ad accounts aggressively, and treat data as the decision-maker rather than a post-campaign report. The unit economics of a brokerage are different, and I am not suggesting brokers copy the prop firm model wholesale. But the logic of performance marketing is the same regardless of what you are selling. You model your acquisition cost ceiling. You understand what a converted trader is worth over their lifetime. You build your spend around that number and you optimize the funnel that converts the traffic. Brokers have access to the data to do this, whether they are running A-book, B-book, or hybrid. The will to use it is what's missing.

SECTION 05

Why brokers resist optimization, and how to fix each reason

Four organisational reasons keep broker landing pages unoptimised, and each one has a specific, practical fix. The resistance is real and it is not entirely irrational. But it is based on the wrong frame.

Reason 01: Compliance and legal friction

In a regulated industry, any change to a website or landing page can trigger a compliance review. That review takes time. By the time a new page is approved, the campaign it was built for may have already run. The perceived cost of the process is high enough that the optimization never happens.

This is a real constraint, but it is manageable. The fix is to build compliance review into the campaign planning cycle, not to treat it as a reason not to build. Develop a library of pre-approved page templates, modular sections, and approved copy blocks that the marketing team can assemble into campaign-specific pages without triggering a full

review each time. The compliance team reviews the components once. The marketing team assembles them as needed. Speed and compliance are not mutually exclusive if the process is designed properly.

Reason 02: Organizational silos

In most brokerages, the marketing team, the technology team, and the compliance team operate in separate lanes. Building a new landing page requires coordination across all three. The friction of that coordination is high enough that it is easier to route everything to the existing homepage and accept the conversion loss as a cost of doing business.

This is an organizational design problem, not a technical one. The fix is a cross-functional brief process that treats campaign landing pages as a standard deliverable with a defined owner, a defined timeline, and a defined approval chain. Not a special project that requires a meeting to initiate. A standard output that the team expects to produce for every campaign above a certain spend threshold.

Reason 03: Misattribution of the problem

Many broker marketing teams look at their paid traffic numbers and attribute poor performance to the ads, the targeting, or the budget. The landing page is rarely the first place they look, because it feels like a fixed asset rather than a performance variable.

This is the most damaging misconception in broker marketing. The landing page is not a fixed asset. It is the most important variable in the conversion equation. The ad gets the click. The landing page gets the conversion. Optimizing the ad without optimizing the page is like training for a race and then showing up in the wrong shoes. The fix is to add landing page conversion rate to the standard performance dashboard, reported alongside CPL and ROAS, so that it is visible as a variable rather than invisible as an assumption.

Reason 04: No testing culture

A/B testing, heatmaps, scroll tracking, session recording, these are standard tools in ecommerce and SaaS marketing. In broker marketing, they are treated as advanced or optional, something to get to eventually, after the "real" work is done.

The fix is to start small and make it structural. You do not need a dedicated CRO team to begin. You need one person with access to a testing tool, a hypothesis written down before the test runs, and a commitment to document what you learned when it ends. The discipline of writing the hypothesis before launch and the next action after results is what converts testing from a one-off experiment into an organizational learning system. One test a month, properly documented, compounds into a body of knowledge that changes how the team makes decisions. That is how prop firms got good at this. They started somewhere and kept going.

"The ad and the page must feel like the same sentence."
Charlton Jones, co-founder, Jupiter Tech

CONCLUSION

The standard, and the audit

The core lesson of everything above is one sentence.

> *The message must hold from ad to page to next step, for a specific audience, without breaking.*

That is the standard. Not a creative aspiration. Not a nice-to-have. The operating standard that every campaign should be evaluated against before it goes live.

If the ad makes a promise the page doesn't keep, you are paying for clicks you cannot convert. If the page speaks to a different trader than the one you targeted, you are paying to confuse the right person. If the CTA arrives before trust is established, you are paying to ask a question the visitor isn't ready to answer yet. Every one of those failures has a cost, and that cost is paid every month the funnel stays broken.

The good news is that none of this requires a full rebrand or a six-month development cycle. It requires a diagnostic first. Before you touch the ads, before you adjust the budget, before you brief a new creative, run the audit on what you already have.

Here is the checklist I used across the 40 brokers in this audit. Apply it to your own funnel before the next campaign goes live.

APPENDIX

The funnel audit checklist

Run this against a single live campaign before the next one launches. Each unchecked box is a place you are paying for traffic the funnel cannot convert.

Auditing someone else's funnel? Several of these checks assume you can see the ad behind the page. For a competitor, you usually can. Meta's Ad Library shows every active ad tied to a Facebook Page, and brokers almost always run a separate Page per language and region, so search the brand widely and pull all of the relevant Pages, not just the obvious one. Google's Ads Transparency Center works on the same principle but indexes by verified advertiser, and a single broker often appears as several advertiser records split by legal entity or country. Search by domain rather than brand name to surface them, then cycle the country filter across the markets you care about. Match the ads and messaging you find against the landing pages they point to.

Audience clarity

- Have you defined a specific audience for this campaign, not a demographic bracket but a psychographic profile? Do you know what that person actually cares about, in the context of trading, at the moment they see your ad?
- Is that audience definition written down and shared with everyone who touches the campaign, the media buyer, the copywriter, and the person building the page?

Ad-to-page message continuity

- Does the landing page headline echo the core claim or offer from the ad in recognizable language? Not a paraphrase. The same idea, in the same register.
- Does the visual world of the page continue what the ad established? Color, imagery, tone. A visitor should not feel like they clicked into a different brand.
- Is the offer presented on the page the same offer the ad teased? If the ad led with a deposit bonus, the page should open with the deposit bonus, not with your company history.

UVP clarity

- Can a first-time visitor read your hero section and answer the question "why here instead of anywhere else" within ten seconds? If you are not sure, ask someone outside the company to read it cold and tell you what they understood.
- Is the UVP specific to the audience this campaign is targeting, or is it the same generic statement that lives on every page of your site?

CTA sequencing

- Is the first CTA on the page appearing after trust has been established, or is it the first thing the visitor sees?
- Is there one primary CTA per page section, or are you asking the visitor to make multiple decisions at once?
- Does the CTA language match the action you are asking for and the offer you made? "Claim Your Bonus" on a deposit bonus page. Not "Get Started."

Funnel architecture

- Does every campaign above a meaningful spend threshold have its own dedicated landing page, or are you routing multiple campaigns with different audiences and offers to the same generic page?
- If you are routing to the homepage, can you honestly say the homepage speaks specifically to the audience in this campaign? If not, that is the first thing to fix before the next campaign goes live.

Conversion tracking

- Is your landing page conversion rate visible on your standard performance dashboard, reported alongside CPL and ROAS? If it is not being measured as a variable, it is being treated as a fixed asset, and it will never improve. The event stream described in TRACE is what makes it measurable.
- Do you have at least one active test running on your highest-traffic campaign page right now? If not, you are not optimizing. You are hoping.

Run this before the next campaign. The cheapest conversion lift you have is the one you have already paid for.

Sources

- Google Ads Help, About landing page experience: landing page experience weighs "the expectations users have about your landing page based on the clicked ad creative".
- Unbounce, Conversion Benchmark Report 2024, finance and insurance: median landing page conversion rate of 8.3% for financial services and 3.9% for investing, from more than 57 million conversions.
- Meta, What is the Meta Ad Library and how do I search it?: the library shows the ads running across Meta products, searchable by advertiser or Page.
- Google, Announcing the launch of the new Ads Transparency Center, March 2023: a searchable hub of ads served by verified advertisers across Search, YouTube and Display.

Charlton Jones

Co-founder, Jupiter Tech

Co-founder of Jupiter Tech and of Convertico, the performance marketing and web agency that serves more than 40 clients. Built Passify, which automated trading strategies on behalf of retail traders, brokers and prop firms, more than 70 in all, and turned an obsession with how brokerages actually function into Jupiter Tech.

LinkedIn · **About Charlton**