

Conversion Review and Known Weaknesses

Business Vision Academy · affiliate program
Document 8.1

An honest assessment of what these pages will and will not do, and what would improve them most. Written so that money goes to the highest-impact fix rather than the most visible one.

A. The single largest gap: no social proof

There is not one testimonial, review score, student count, screenshot or logo anywhere in this kit. That is deliberate — see 6.1 \$D — but it is also the biggest conversion cost.

In consumer education, social proof is normally the **second-strongest element on the page after the price**. Its absence is worth an estimated 20–40% of conversion rate against an otherwise identical page that has it.

It was left out because FTC rules since 2023 require, for any testimonial:

1. The person exists and achieved the stated result
2. Written consent for name, likeness and result
3. Documentary evidence of the figures
4. The **typical** result stated alongside the exceptional one
5. Records retained for the publication period plus three years

Inventing a "Sarah M., Marketing Manager" is the single fastest way to lose a ClickBank account and attract an FTC complaint. It is common in this niche and it is unlawful.

Highest-return action available: get the vendor to supply three or four documented, consented testimonials plus a median outcome figure. Adding a compliant proof block will almost certainly outperform every other change in this document combined.

Until then, the pages substitute what proof they legitimately can: specificity (named tasks with before-and-after times), a "who this isn't for" section on the review variant, and explicit acknowledgement that the material is available free elsewhere. Specificity is a weak substitute for proof, but it is a real one.

B. Second gap: no video

Every high-performing offer in this category uses video, usually a VSL of 8–20 minutes. These are text pages. Text converts, but at this price point video normally converts better, particularly for the \$260 product where the decision is larger.

What would help most, in order:

1. A 60–90 second explainer on each landing page, showing the actual course interface
2. A screen recording of one real task being done — the spreadsheet cleanup is the best candidate, because it is the one people assume requires skills they lack
3. Testimonial video, once consents exist

The `v2-story` and `v3-listicle` pages have obvious insertion points after the third item.

C. Third gap: no imagery at all

The pages are pure typography. That is fast and clean, and it is also unusual for the US consumer market, where faces and product screenshots are the norm.

No images were included because there is no licensed image library in the kit, and because faces imply a testimonial and trigger the substantiation problem in \$A.

What to add, in order of value:

Asset	Effect	Cost
Screenshots of the actual course platform	High — proves the product exists	Free, needs vendor
A short screen recording of one task	High	Free, needs vendor
Instructor photo with a real name	Medium-high — establishes who is teaching	Free, needs consent
Stock photography of people at desks	Low. Often negative.	\$10–30/image

Generic stock photography of smiling people in offices is the one addition likely to make these pages **worse**. It signals advertisement, and every reader in this demographic has learned to discount it.

D. What was changed in this revision

Three additions, all aimed at mobile, where most of the traffic will arrive.

1. **Sticky bottom price bar on mobile.** Price and a button pinned to the bottom of the viewport below 860px. This is normally the largest single mobile conversion improvement available on a long page, because it removes the requirement to scroll back up to act.
2. **Trust row under the hero.** Three scannable facts — no coding, course count, permanent access — immediately below the first CTA. Answers the three most common disqualifying questions before the reader has to look for them.
3. **Risk-reversal strip above every price block.** Names the cancellation or no-renewal position immediately before the number, rather than leaving it to the FAQ. Price objection and risk objection are usually the same objection, and they should be answered in the same eyeful.

E. Layout and colour: honest assessment

What is working

- **System fonts, no web font request.** Pages load in well under a second. Load time is a real ranking and quality factor on both Google and Meta, and it is where most affiliate landing pages lose 10–20% of their traffic before the page even renders.
- **Single column, one idea per screen.** Correct for mobile-first traffic.
- **Large tap targets, high contrast body text.** Meets accessibility thresholds.
- **Cream background rather than pure white.** Reads as editorial rather than as a sales page, which matters for the native and Reddit traffic where the advertorial variants run.

What is arguable

- **Gold and black is a luxury palette.** It suits a premium program; it does not obviously suit a \$28 entry price. A more conventional high-contrast palette — white background, a single saturated accent — is the safer direct-response choice and would be a legitimate A/B test. The gold was chosen because it matches the existing brand identity, not because it is optimal for conversion.
- **The serif headline face** reads considered and slightly formal. For the P1 and P5 personas that is probably right. For TikTok traffic a heavier sans might land better. Worth testing on the quiz page specifically.
- **The pages are text-dense** by current standards. That is a deliberate trade for the advertorial variants and probably wrong for `v6-express`, which could lose another 30% of its length.

What is likely a real weakness

- **No above-the-fold price on four of the six variants.** `v1`, `v2`, `v3` and `v4` require scrolling before a number appears. This is standard advertorial practice, but it costs conversion on high-intent traffic. The sticky mobile bar partially fixes this; on desktop it is unaddressed.
- **No exit-intent capture, no email capture anywhere.** Every visitor who leaves is gone. The quiz page in particular is a natural email capture point and does not use it. Building a list would compound over time in a way that paid clicks do not.
- **No FAQ schema markup**, so the FAQ sections do not generate rich results in search. Irrelevant for paid traffic, relevant if any of these pages are ever indexed.

F. Will the persona strategy work? A per-persona verdict

P1 Stalled Starter — likely yes, with a cash flow problem

Cheapest audience to reach, broadest, lowest price point. This is the right starting persona.

The problem is the arithmetic of the subscription on paid traffic. Worked through:

\$28/month subscription, \$21 commission on the first payment.
At \$1.00 CPC and a 1.5% conversion rate, the cost per sale is \$67.
The first payment returns \$21.

You are \$46 underwater on each sale for roughly three months, and only profitable if the customer stays past month four.

That is survivable with capital and fatal without it. **On paid traffic, send P1 to the one-time product, not the subscription** — \$134 returns \$100.50 against the same \$67 acquisition cost, profitable on day one. Use the subscription for organic, email and content traffic where the click cost is zero.

This is the most consequential point in this document and it partially contradicts the intuitive read of the commission table, where the subscription looks worth 2.3× more.

P2 Overloaded Manager — the LinkedIn plan does not work

LinkedIn CPCs in the US professional segment typically run \$8–15. Commission on AI for Professionals at \$152 is \$114.

At \$10 CPC, break-even requires a 8.8% click-to-sale rate.
Realistic cold-traffic conversion on an offer like this: 1-2%.

That is a factor of five short. **LinkedIn should not be used for this offer** at this price point unless the vendor adds a materially higher-priced product. The document 1.2 LinkedIn section is included for completeness; the honest recommendation is to skip it and reach P2 through Google Search cluster K3 instead, where clicks are \$1–3.

P3 Career Switcher — the strongest economics in the kit

\$260 product, \$195 commission.
Google Search cluster K2 at an estimated \$1-3 CPC.
Break-even at \$2 CPC requires roughly a 1% conversion rate.

That is achievable on high-intent search traffic. This persona has the best ratio of payout to click cost of any combination in the kit, and it is the one to scale first if the early tests are ambiguous.

The constraint is volume, not economics. Search volume for these queries is limited, so this persona will produce reliable but capped revenue.

P4 Solo Operator — plausible, hard to reach cheaply

Good product fit and a buyer who thinks in ROI. The difficulty is that this audience is expensive on Meta and hostile to advertising on Reddit. Treat it as a secondary expansion once P1 or P3 is working, not a launch persona.

P5 Worried Employee — strongest angle, highest policy risk

Employment anxiety is the most emotionally live angle available and would almost certainly produce the best raw response rates. It is also the one most likely to get an ad account restricted, because Meta's personal attributes policy prohibits implying knowledge of a viewer's circumstances.

The copy in this kit is written in the third person for exactly this reason, which blunts the angle to keep it compliant. That is the correct trade, but be aware you are running a deliberately weakened version of the strongest message.

G. Honest overall verdict

These are good pages. They are not maximally converting pages, and nothing that omits social proof and video can be.

What they do well: they load fast, they read as written by a person rather than assembled from a template, they answer objections in the order people have them, and they will not get an account banned. That last point is worth more than it sounds — most affiliate landing pages in this niche carry at least one violation that will eventually cost the operator their traffic source.

What they do not do: prove anything. Every claim on these pages rests on the reader finding the argument reasonable, because there is no evidence available to show them.

Ranked list of what to fix, by expected return:

Rank	Action	Depends on
1	Documented, consented testimonials plus a median outcome figure	Vendor
2	Real course titles replacing the <code>{{VENDOR:}}</code> placeholders	Vendor
3	Screenshots or a screen recording of the actual product	Vendor
4	Refund rate and subscription completion rate, so ROI can be modelled	Vendor
5	A 60–90 second explainer video per product	Vendor or affiliate
6	Email capture on the quiz page	Affiliate
7	A/B test: gold palette vs conventional high-contrast direct response	Affiliate
8	Shorten <code>v6-express</code> by a third	Affiliate

Six of the eight highest-return improvements are blocked on the vendor, not on design work. That is the real finding of this review. Further iteration on layout and colour is low-return until items 1 through 4 exist.