



School of Social Science

“Innovation Management and Entrepreneurship”

Postgraduate Dissertation

“Business Plan for the Development of an Online Learning
Platform for Students with Learning Disabilities”

Angeliki Delistrati
A.M 533333

Supervisor: Dr. Ioanna Deligianni

Patras, Greece, June 2026

Theses / Dissertations remain the intellectual property of students (“authors/creators”), but in the context of open access policy they grant to the HOU a non-exclusive license to use the right of reproduction, customisation, public lending, presentation to an audience and digital dissemination thereof internationally, in electronic form and by any means for teaching and research purposes, for no fee and throughout the duration of intellectual property rights. Free access to the full text for studying and reading does not in any way mean that the author/creator shall allocate his/her intellectual property rights, nor shall he/she allow the reproduction, republication, copy, storage, sale, commercial use, transmission, distribution, publication, execution, downloading, uploading, translating, modifying in any way, of any part or summary of the dissertation, without the explicit prior written consent of the author/creator. Creators retain all their moral and property rights.



“Business Plan for the Development of an Online Learning Platform for Students with Learning Disabilities”

Angeliki Delistrati
A.M 533333

Supervising Committee

Supervisor:

Dr. Ioanna Deligianni
Hellenic Open University, Patras

Co-Supervisor:

Dr. Panagiota Athanasia Sapouna
Hellenic Open University, Patras

Patras, Greece, June 2026

*I dedicate this dissertation to my family, who have always been my source of strength,
inspiration, and purpose...*

Abstract

This dissertation examines the development and business viability of an innovative e-learning platform designed to support learners with learning disabilities. The study is based on the idea that digital education can become more inclusive when technology is combined with personalised learning, accessible content and specialised educational support. The proposed business concept focuses on offering online learning services that respond to the needs of students who face difficulties such as dyslexia, attention-related challenges or other learning barriers. The dissertation analyses the business idea through a structured entrepreneurial approach. First, it presents the vision, mission, services, target audience, revenue model and competitive advantage of the proposed platform. It then examines the wider e-learning market, with emphasis on the growing demand for flexible, digital and inclusive education. Special attention is given to the needs of learners with disabilities, the segmentation of the target market, competitor activity and current market opportunities.

The study also applies the Business Model Canvas in order to organise the main elements of the venture, including value proposition, customer segments, communication channels, revenue streams, key activities, resources, partners and cost structure. In addition, the dissertation develops a marketing strategy based on branding, digital promotion, customer acquisition, retention and partnerships. The operational and financial plans further examine the practical requirements of the platform, including technology, human resources, service delivery, revenue forecasts and financial sustainability. Finally, the dissertation considers market, operational, financial, legal and ethical risks, while also presenting a research methodology based on questionnaire data. Overall, the study argues that the proposed e-learning platform can be a viable and socially valuable business idea, provided that it combines educational quality, technological accessibility, strong partnerships and careful financial planning.

Keywords

e-learning, learning disabilities, inclusive education, business model, digital platform

“Επιχειρηματικό Σχέδιο για την Ανάπτυξη μιας Ηλεκτρονικής Πλατφόρμας Μάθησης για Μαθητές με Μαθησιακές Δυσκολίες”

Αγγελική Δελιστρατή

A.M 533333

Περίληψη

Η παρούσα διπλωματική εργασία εξετάζει την ανάπτυξη και τη βιωσιμότητα μιας καινοτόμου πλατφόρμας ηλεκτρονικής μάθησης, η οποία έχει ως στόχο την υποστήριξη μαθητών και φοιτητών με μαθησιακές δυσκολίες. Η βασική ιδέα της εργασίας είναι ότι η ψηφιακή εκπαίδευση μπορεί να γίνει πιο συμπεριληπτική, όταν η τεχνολογία συνδυάζεται με εξατομικευμένη μάθηση, προσβάσιμο εκπαιδευτικό υλικό και εξειδικευμένη υποστήριξη. Η προτεινόμενη επιχειρηματική ιδέα εστιάζει στην παροχή διαδικτυακών εκπαιδευτικών υπηρεσιών για άτομα που αντιμετωπίζουν δυσκολίες όπως δυσλεξία, προβλήματα συγκέντρωσης ή άλλα εμπόδια στη μαθησιακή διαδικασία.

Η εργασία αναλύει την επιχειρηματική πρόταση μέσα από μια οργανωμένη προσέγγιση. Αρχικά παρουσιάζονται η ιδέα, το όραμα, η αποστολή, οι υπηρεσίες, το κοινό-στόχος, το μοντέλο εσόδων και το ανταγωνιστικό πλεονέκτημα της πλατφόρμας. Στη συνέχεια εξετάζεται η αγορά της ηλεκτρονικής μάθησης, με έμφαση στη ζήτηση για πιο εύελικτες, ψηφιακές και προσβάσιμες μορφές εκπαίδευσης. Παράλληλα, αναλύονται οι ανάγκες των ατόμων με μαθησιακές δυσκολίες, η τμηματοποίηση της αγοράς, ο ανταγωνισμός και οι βασικές ευκαιρίες που προκύπτουν.

Σημαντικό μέρος της εργασίας αποτελεί η εφαρμογή του Business Model Canvas, μέσα από το οποίο οργανώνονται τα βασικά στοιχεία της επιχείρησης, όπως η πρόταση αξίας, τα τμήματα πελατών, τα κανάλια επικοινωνίας, οι σχέσεις με τους πελάτες, οι πηγές εσόδων, οι βασικές δραστηριότητες, οι πόροι, οι συνεργασίες και η δομή κόστους. Επιπλέον, αναπτύσσονται η στρατηγική μάρκετινγκ, το λειτουργικό σχέδιο, το χρηματοοικονομικό πλάνο και η ανάλυση κινδύνων. Συνολικά, η εργασία υποστηρίζει ότι η προτεινόμενη

πλατφόρμα μπορεί να αποτελέσει μια βιώσιμη και κοινωνικά χρήσιμη επιχειρηματική πρόταση, εφόσον συνδυάσει ποιότητα, προσβασιμότητα, συνεργασίες και σωστό οικονομικό σχεδιασμό.

Λέξεις – Κλειδιά

ηλεκτρονική μάθηση, μαθησιακές δυσκολίες, συμπεριληπτική εκπαίδευση, επιχειρηματικό μοντέλο, ψηφιακή πλατφόρμα.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	v
Περίληψη	vi
Table of Contents	viii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Abbreviations & Acronyms	xii
CHAPTER 1: BUSINESS CONCEPT.....	1
1.1 Introduction to the Idea	1
1.2 Vision and Mission	2
1.3 Description of Services.....	4
1.4 Target Audience	5
1.5 Revenue Model.....	9
1.6 Competitive Advantage	11
1.7 Value Proposition Summary.....	13
CHAPTER 2: MARKET ANALYSIS	15
2.1 Overview of the E-learning Market	15
2.2 Learning Disabilities Market Needs.....	16
2.3 Target Market Segmentation	18
2.4 Competitor Analysis.....	19
2.5 Market Opportunities and Trends	21
CHAPTER 3: BUSINESS MODEL CANVAS	23
3.1 Introduction to the Model.....	23
3.2 Value Proposition.....	24
3.3 Customer Segments.....	26
3.4 Channels	27
3.5 Customer Relationships.....	28
3.6 Revenue Streams.....	30
3.7 Key Activities	31
3.8 Key Resources	32
3.9 Key Partners.....	33
3.10 Cost Structure.....	34

CHAPTER 4: MARKETING STRATEGY	35
4.1 Branding Strategy.....	35
4.2 Digital Marketing	37
4.3 Customer Acquisition Strategy	39
4.4 Retention Strategy	42
4.5 Partnerships.....	45
CHAPTER 5: OPERATIONAL PLAN.....	48
5.1 Platform Functionality	48
5.2 Technology Requirements	49
5.3 Human Resources.....	50
5.4 Service Delivery Process	52
CHAPTER 6: FINANCIAL PLAN	54
6.1 Cost Structure Analysis	54
6.2 Revenue Forecast	56
6.3 Break-even Analysis	59
6.4 Financial Sustainability	60
CHAPTER 7: RISK ANALYSIS	63
7.1 Market Risks	63
7.2 Operational Risks	63
7.3 Financial Risks	64
7.4 Legal and Ethical Issues	65
7.5 Risk Mitigation Strategies	66
CHAPTER 8: METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONNAIRE	68
8.1 Research Design.....	68
8.2 Questionnaire Development	68
8.3 Sample Description	69
8.4 Data Analysis	71
8.5 Key Findings.....	72
CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS.....	73
9.1 Summary of Findings	73
9.2 Business Viability	74
9.3 Future Recommendations	75
References	77

Appendix A: The questionnaire	86
-------------------------------------	----

List of Tables

Table 1: Estimation of the Target Market in Greece	6
Table 2: Estimated Annual Market Size Based on Subscription Revenue	8
Table 3: Revenue Streams and Pricing Structure.....	49
Table 4: Summary of the proposed Business Model Canvas	24
Table 5: Practical Branding Positioning of the Platform.....	35
Table 6: Digital Marketing Action Plan	37
Table 7: Digital Marketing Performance Indicators.....	39
Table 8: Customer Acquisition Funnel.....	40
Table 9: Practical Customer Acquisition Channels and Cost Assumptions	41
Table 10: Practical Retention Actions	43
Table 11: Retention Performance Indicators	45
Table 12: Practical Partnership Plan.....	46
Table 13: Approach for user groups.....	49
Table 14: Service Delivery Process.....	52
Table 15: Estimated Start-up Costs	54
Table 16: Cost-structure Analysis	55
Table 17: Pricing and Revenue Assumptions	57
Table 18: Revenue Forecast, Realistic Scenario	66
Table 19: Scenario-Based Revenue View	70
Table 20: Break-even Analysis	71
Table 21: Cash-flow Forecast and Project Evaluation	61
Table 22: Investment Evaluation Indicators	61
Table 23: Risk Mitigation Strategies	66
Table 24: Sample Profile	70
Table 25: Key descriptive indicators.....	71

List of Abbreviations & Acronyms

ADHD - Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder

AI - Artificial Intelligence

B2B - Business to Business

B2C - Business to Consumer

COVID - Corona Virus Disease

UDL - Universal Design for Learning

CHAPTER 1: BUSINESS CONCEPT

1.1 Introduction to the Idea

Today's schools have a considerable and ever-growing group of students with disabilities which is neither niche nor marginal. Information from some empirical data suggests that learning disabilities, one of the largest categories of students identified with disabilities receiving special education services, represents a large, persistent educational need (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024). Unless this group, especially pertaining to the digital sphere, is targeted, there will be no enhancement in educational outcomes. Still, there is a huge gap between the size of the need and the adequacy of the solutions currently available in the market.

The rapid rise in e-learning leads to more ways to access, utilize and personalize learning (UNESCO, 2023). While literature indicates that not all learners benefited from these opportunities. Students with learning disabilities generally find it hard to study online. According to Cinquin, Guitton, and Sauzéon (2019), this stems from a lack of cognitive accessibility, personalization, and organized pedagogical support. Many platforms do not adapt their approach to a learner's needs and instead focus on delivery of content. As a result, even with tremendous improvements in technological infrastructure, the credibility of online education still presents uneven inclusive issues.

This limitation is revealed much more through the larger framework of education. The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2022) argue that ensuring inclusion requires much more than simply providing access to technology. In particular, inclusion also requires teaching strategies that are differentiated, accessibility principles and ongoing support for learners. Although the elements are important, most existing platforms do not systematically incorporate them. Unfortunately, many organizations don't prioritize accessibility features while designing their tools and applications. They consider it merely an add-on as opposed to a core principle, which limits their effectiveness in practice (UNESCO IITE, 2024).

Moreover, we may think that the COVID-19 pandemic and its subsequent lockdowns brought a significant shift in online education before and after and research conducted during and after the pandemic makes it clear that an automatic shift in online education was

not enhanced educational outcome with respect to students with learning disabilities. Despite digital tools ensuring continuity of education, these have exposed weakness in the structure, which includes a few things such as poor teacher training, no individualized feedback and limited interaction (Petretto et al., 2021). According to these findings, the challenge is not merely to expand digital learning, but rather to re-design it in ways that meet the needs of different kinds of learners.

A visible economic gap and a visible educational gap appear. There is an increasing demand for flexible, learning solutions that are accessible and personalized (OECD, 2023). The existing offerings, on the other hand, fail to take a holistic perspective on learning disabilities often. There's a gap in the market for an online educator platform with built-in accessibility; custom learning paths; and advice on educational disability issues. This business idea that is being proposed seeks to fill this void. The aid, designed for pupils experiencing learning disabilities, employs pedagogical tool, which refers to technological gadgets made available by teachers. Designed differently from mass-produced e-learning tools, the platform centers on cognitive accessibility and actively adapts content based on students' progress. The goal is to transform learners with improved learning outcomes, enabling them to engage more confidently in future education. As a result, the idea lies at the intersection of an educational need and a market opportunity; it addresses a well-defined problem with a defined target market and theory.

1.2 Vision and Mission

The platform proposed is not to be operational as a digital learning tool in a saturated edtech space. Instead, its vision is focused on contributing to a more fairer and equitable education system. To be more specific, an accessible, flexible and supportive space for students with learning disabilities is created through this platform where they can participate in the learning process considerably better. The approaches used nowadays in inclusive education highlight the importance of designing places of learning for all types of learners from the beginning, instead of retrospectively through adaptation (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022; UNESCO IITE, 2024).

Simultaneously, the vision goes beyond accessibility with a narrow technical meaning. The concept of significant participation in this case explains that students can access content meaningfully and act upon it according to their appropriate and unique learning profiles.

The learning disability has changed from a deficit perspective to a different perspective. While recognizing that some generalizations are possible. On this note, the platform aims to integrate technological advancement with the quality treatment of students.

Essentially, the platform's purpose provides substance to this vision and defines concrete and operational objectives. The primary objective is to offer Internet lessons that can be easily accessed by students who have learning or intelligence disabilities. Facilitating customized learning paths, implementing assistive technology and continuous feedback with tracking of progress are included in the process. The combination of these various components will enable the offer to stimulate continuous and lasting learning development rather than merely providing static content (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022; McNicholl et al., 2021).

The platform targets the application of principles emanating from Universal Design for Learning (UDL). Under the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework, the learning environments can be designed to accommodate various forms of student variability. Three key zones are representation, engagement and expression (Cumming and Rose, 2022). Built into the platform rather than an add on, UDL principles make inclusion possible. The empirical research evidence shows that intervention related to UDL (Universal Design for Learning) can help improve the learning outcomes along with the engagement of diverse learners (Almeqdad et al., 2023).

Yet not all instances of real-world application of these frameworks are straightforward; they can be challenging too. Research implies that while there are strong theoretical underpinnings of UDL, it is quite resource-demanding in terms of training and institutional support (Cumming and Rose, 2022). As a result, the platform's aim should also help teachers and caregivers as we do not learn alone but within an ecosystem of support (Atanga et al., 2020). Additionally, it seeks to reconcile pedagogical quality and user-friendliness. Research clearly reveals usability in design. As cited by Cinquin, Guitton and Sauzéon (2019), the best resources will fail if the user or the nature of design variegates causes a cognitive overload. Because of this, the platform has a user-friendly interface, clear maps and adaptable doors to support usability as well as teaching (Choi and Seo, 2024).

1.3 Description of Services

The proposed platform provides a comprehensive learning platform that brings together pedagogical design, supportive devices and human-centred apparatuses to meet the needs of the students suffering from learning disabilities. The remedy is layered in the sense that it does not just provide tools or off-the-shelf content but rather synchronous support, an asynchronous element, accessibility and incorporates stakeholders. There is evidence to suggest that effective digital interventions have the appropriate combination of instructional, technological, and contextual features rather than just one of those features (Doğan and Delialioğlu, 2020; Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022).

Expert educators offer live online classes that provide synchronous support which offers integrated support. The purpose of these sessions is to create an individualized learning experience, instant feedback, and structure, which is essential for pupils with a cognitive impairment. According to research by Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon (2017), guidance and adaptive instruction improve engagement and learning. Despite the delivery method, quality and the effectiveness of content are not guaranteed. The value of pedagogy depends on the teachers' pedagogic competence as well as their ability to adapt during instruction. If these conditions are absent, live interaction could simply become an aesthetic and a superficial add-on.

The asynchronous support offers recorded lessons, structured activities, and progress tracking guide. With the help of these study materials, students can learn at their own pace and repeat the contents again. Despite the fact that it allows learners to learn at their own pace and also allows for repetition, it could lead to motivation problems and limited guidance (Doğan and Delialioğlu, 2020). To achieve this, it offers structured pathways and monitoring mechanisms to prevent asynchronous learning from becoming fragmented and to keep it aligned with system intent.

A major new feature of the platform is the addition of assistive and accessible features like a text-to-speech interface, simplified and adaptable content. For years, researchers have been investigating how useful assistive technologies could be to increase accessibility and learner autonomy (McNicholl et al., 2021; Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022). Nevertheless, their effectiveness is limited to the extent to which they meet users' needs and context (Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon, 2017). Many solutions already available fail to do so

as they treat accessibility as an afterthought and not as a core design. Conversely, the approach taken in the design of the proposed platform was accessibility-by-design, which means that in the early-stage usability and cognitive load issues were considered (Friedman and Bryen, 2007). Even with assistive tools and techniques, badly designed interfaces may impose extra barriers.

Consequently, usability and user experience considerations are essential. Learning would be effective if the design allows easy navigation, simplicity of content and a reduced cognitive load particularly for those with cognitive disabilities (Choi and Seo, 2024). The aim of the platform is to facilitate physical interactions and to provide comprehensive guidance. A major issue that system designers face is ensuring that complex systems perform as required while remaining simple as a designer adds more and more components to one system.

The final item covering parents and teachers is directed at the full suite of communication tools, reporting mechanisms, and guidance materials. The systems around a learner are the cause of learning outcomes. According to Atanga et al. (2020), it is not only students whose effectiveness of educational technologies are determined by the teachers and caregivers too. Reasons that prevent the implementation include lack of training and feeling a lack of confidence. The community has mechanisms to help project stakeholders and hopes that they can reduce those limitations. However, how much this can be leveraged will depend on actual usage.

1.4 Target Audience

The target audience is one of the most important elements of a business idea because it directly influences service design and platform positioning. The umbrella term “students with learning disabilities” gives a first orientation, but it is not yet specific enough for strategizing. In particular, what is required is greater clarity for definitional purposes concerning the age group, the type of learning difficulty, the level of support required, and the distinction between users and paying customers as highlighted in segmentation theory (Wedel and Kamakura; 2000; Yankelovich and Meer, 2006).

The platform is primarily targeted at primary and lower secondary school students aged 6 to 15 who are having learning difficulties involving dyslexia, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), dysgraphia, dyscalculia and other reading and writing difficulties (RD).

This emphasis is supported by data showing that specific learning disabilities are among the most common categories of special educational needs, particularly in the early and middle phases of education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024; Wagner et al., 2020). It is strategically relevant to target this age group, as research has shown that early intervention improves educational outcomes in the long run (Grigorenko et al., 2020).

In business terms, this target group can be estimated more concretely. In Greece, primary education included 574,047 pupils in 2022/2023, while lower secondary education included 320,822 pupils in 2023/2024 (ELSTAT, 2025; ELSTAT, 2026). Therefore, the broad school-age population relevant to the platform is approximately 894,869 pupils. Since international evidence suggests that 5%–15% of school-age children struggle with a learning disability, the potential learner base in Greece can be estimated between 44,743 and 134,230 pupils (American Psychiatric Association, n.d.). A more conservative working estimate of 8% gives a potential target group of around 71,590 pupils.

Table 1: Estimation of the Target Market in Greece

Basis of calculation	Number / percentage	Interpretation for the platform
Primary school pupils in Greece	574,047	Core age group, because primary education is a key stage for early intervention.
Lower secondary school pupils in Greece	320,822	Additional age group, because the platform also targets students aged 12–15.
Total relevant school-age population	894,869	Broad potential population connected with the proposed platform.
Estimated percentage of school-age children with learning disabilities	5%–15%	International estimate of children who may struggle with learning disabilities.

Basis of calculation	Number / percentage	Interpretation for the platform
Low scenario	44,743 pupils	Estimate based on 5% of the relevant school-age population.
Base scenario	71,590 pupils	Conservative working estimate based on 8% of the relevant school-age population.
High scenario	134,230 pupils	Estimate based on 15% of the relevant school-age population.

However, this does not mean that all these students will become paying users of the platform. Users and buyers are two different sets of consumers for the product. While students are the predominant users of the platform, in the initial phase the major paying customers will be the parents or guardians. This is a common behaviour in the education market, where parents decide on and pay for extra educational support. Parents of students with learning disabilities usually look for out-of-school support when they perceive that the existing educational provision is not sufficient (Petretto et al., 2021). Therefore, the platform's design must consider users as well as buyers, enabling students to learn efficiently while also addressing parents' concerns about effectiveness, ease of use and value for money.

For this reason, the serviceable available market should be estimated more cautiously. If 25% of the estimated target group is considered commercially reachable, willing to pay for private online support, the realistic available market is between approximately 11,186 and 33,558 potential paying customers (base-case 17,897 customers). The offered month price is €49, which implies the annual subscription market in low scenario is €6.58 million, the base scenario is €10.52 million and high scenario is €19.73 million. This estimate does not account for additional revenues from live tutoring sessions or institutional licenses, suggesting that the total commercial opportunity may be larger.

Table 2: Estimated Annual Market Size Based on Subscription Revenue

Scenario	Estimated students with learning disabilities	Assumption for commercially reachable families	Potential paying customers	Annual subscription price per customer	Estimated annual market size
Low scenario	44,743	25%	11,186	€588	€6.58 million
Base scenario	71,590	25%	17,897	€588	€10.52 million
High scenario	134,230	25%	33,558	€588	€19.73 million

Additionally, the platform is capable of identifying other secondary target groups. The educational practitioners that would leverage the platform include schools, learning support centres and special education teachers. A consideration of these stakeholders indicates the possibility of entering the institutional market. Also brings other challenges such as training along with curriculum alignment and system integration. According to Atanga et al. (2020) and Shard, Kumar and Koul (2024), just like students, teachers must also adopt technology that they consider to be useful, easy to-use and supported adequately. The fundamental design features of the platform should include student needs and educator usability and readiness.

Also, the target audience is very heterogeneous. Given the differences in learning profiles, the support required, and expectations of families, it seems that a single solution won't be enough to address learning disabilities. Therefore, the platforms design should adaptable and target specific users. Segmentation encourages a strategic tension: targeting customers too broadly gives away value, while targeting customers too narrowly limits the market (Smith, 1956). In this sense, the platform takes on a focus. That is, it is targeting a small segment with a specific set of needs but is also capable of scaling to adjacent segments. The platform will thus be powerful enough for small users whilst still allowing powerful users to use it, making it scalable.

This positioning is also supported by the future market trend. In the year 2025 the worth of the online learning market in Europe is USD 83.02 billion. It is expected to reach USD 91.38 billion by 2026 (the year before the collection of this first study) and about USD 182.89 billion by 2034 with a probably annual growth rate (CAGR) of 10.06% (Market Data Forecast, 2026). While this growth does not guarantee the new platform will succeed, it indicates that online learning is expanding and that families, schools and institutions are becoming more comfortable with such services. Thus, the platform does not target the entire e-learning market, but rather a more specialised, underserved segment within it. Online learning support for students with learning disabilities.

1.5 Revenue Model

The proposed platform must have a sustainable revenue model. Otherwise, it may create educational value but not become commercially viable. According to the business model literature, value creation and value capture are processes that, although distinct, are interdependent. It is possible for a solution to generate high value for users. However, if it cannot monetise this value, it will be difficult to sustain the business (Teece, 2010). Accordingly, the platform must have a revenue model that reflects the requirements of users, as well as the cost of providing specialised and high-quality services.

According to business model frameworks, revenue streams should be aligned with customer segments, value propositions and cost structures (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). The target audience heterogeneity, particularly differences in willingness to pay, intensity of use and required support, would make a single pricing model inadequate (Smith, 1956). Families of students with learning disabilities differ in financial capacity, as well as in the form and frequency of support they require. To approach this, the site adopts a hybrid revenue model. A subscription-based mechanism provides access to core components, such as asynchronous learning content, assistive tools and tracking of educational progress. In light of continuous income generation and the possibility of establishing a long-term relationship, subscription models are attractive (Gassmann, Frankenberger and Csik, 2014). However, in educational situations where results are not easy to see immediately, a subscription can be considered a fixed cost instead of an investment by customers, increasing the risk of cancellation.

Table 3: Revenue Streams and Pricing Structure

Revenue stream	Price	Main content / logic
Basic Plan	€29/month	Access to core learning material, assistive tools and basic progress tracking.
Standard Plan	€49/month	Personalised learning pathways, monthly educator feedback and parent progress reports.
Premium Plan	€89/month	All Standard features plus two live online support sessions per month.
One-to-one tutoring	€25 per 45-minute session	Flexible extra support from a specialised educator.
Four-session tutoring package	€90/package	Discounted package for families needing regular live support.
Institutional licence	From €2,500/year	Up to 30 student accounts for schools or learning support centres.
Additional institutional user	€70/student/year	Extra access beyond the first 30 student accounts.

Charges for synchronous services, that is, tutoring, are the second element. Consumers are free to choose the amount of live support they need, and this brings flexibility while linking prices more closely to variable cost. It also allows a distinction between users needing low assistance and those needing higher assistance. For example, a family may use only the Standard Plan at €49 per month, while another family may add one-to-one tutoring sessions at €25 per session. Operational problems may be caused by this model because of resource balancing, teacher availability and price transparency.

Another business option could be partnering with schools, learning centres and institutions. Agreements may take the form of licences, bulk subscriptions or other service agreements. Gaining greater diversification of revenues is likely to increase resilience and may assist in

reducing the risk of reliance on individual customers (Johnson, Christensen and Kagermann, 2008). However, when a new enterprise extends its business market to organisations, it may face longer sales cycles, institutional constraints and system integration issues, which can delay revenue generation. For this reason, B2B revenue should be treated as a medium-term opportunity rather than the main source of income in the first year.

The hybrid model allows for increased accessibility without sacrificing financial viability. In this respect, accessibility needs have not only educational meaning but also economic meaning. If pricing is too rigid, some users, especially those with limited resources, may be excluded. If pricing is too flexible, the reliability of revenue generation may be compromised. One important consideration is the model's recognition of the need for both social and economic value (Osterwalder et al., 2014). However, there is also a risk in the proposed model. Take-up may be limited due to price sensitivity, subscription fatigue or competition from free and lower-cost alternatives. Furthermore, the perceived value of the site is reliant on its effective demonstration of impact, although this may not be immediately measurable. Teece (2010) states that business models should capture value without degrading the value proposition. Consequently, the revenue model would thrive not merely on its pricing structure, but on the platform's ability to deliver the service and clearly communicate measurable outcomes.

1.6 Competitive Advantage

A clear and easily defensible competitive edge is now vital for e-learning firms. Businesses must define their methods of differentiation in such a way that it is difficult for competitors to imitate in future. According to Porter (1985), a competitive advantage can be realized by providing a value which competitors cannot easily replicate. In this situation, the platform competes based not on low cost but rather on a differentiated quality with specialisation.

The initial aspect of differentiation functions achieved by integrating accessibility and usability into the design of a product. Most of the times, the features of different platforms are made available after the development. Research has shown that the insufficient factoring in of cognitive accessibility remains an important barrier to digital learning, and in particular for students with learning disabilities (Cinquin, Guitton and Sauzéon, 2019). From the start, the platform's accessibility-by-design approach will aim to minimise cognitive load, enable simplified navigation and adaptable content. Related research stresses that 'usability' plays

a key role in developing inclusive learning design (Choi and Seo, 2024; Friedman and Bryen, 2007). However, the hard part is in execution. As the systems are complex ones, balancing simplicity and functionality could be tough.

There's a shared focus on combining pedagogy and technology. Numerous edtech solutions view technology as an end rather than a means of implementing content. Students with learning disabilities can learn effectively, but need explicit instruction, feedback, and modification. The platform intends to align technological tools with pedagogical practices, which a review of literature found not to be the case (Atanga et al., 2020; Cumming and Rose, 2022). Nonetheless, this integration is closely linked to the quality of instructional design, as well as the ability of the educator, which are not necessarily easy to standardize and scale.

Another element is the emphasis on personalization and progress monitoring. Even personalization is popularly suggested nowadays, however, it is merely limited to content. The goal of the platform is personalization through adaptive pathways, feedback and progress monitoring. With high-end data capabilities and instructional design, this approach can increase engagement and outcomes for most learners (Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon, 2017). While these assets can generate diversity, they also elevate intricate nature and expenditure, thereby questioning their scalability.

The fourth dimension is the growth of the surrounding ecosystem including parents and educators. According to Atanga et al. (2020), learning outcomes of students with learning disabilities depend on joint and coordinated efforts by stakeholders. When communication, reporting and guidance options are available, it helps to extend the platform's value from individual users. This also creates a dependency on external actors, whose involvement and willingness we cannot ultimately control.

Significantly, the reason competitive advantage cannot be found in individual features is because of their combination. According to Stalk, Evans and Shulman (1992), often sustainable advantage is based on capabilities of the organisation and not a product. The capability of integrating accessibility, pedagogy, personalization and stakeholder support are harder to replicate than stand-alone features. However, it remains to be seen if this advantage is sustainable. The edtech market is highly innovative and features low barriers to entry. That makes it easy for competitors to copy similar features (Teece, 2010). Larger platforms

might have more resources to incorporate similar features. Hence, differentiation cannot become static. The platform's sustainable competitiveness will depend on continuous innovation, implementation, along with its capacity to transform designs into results. Competitive advantage is not something which is permanent but is rather a process which is accomplished through execution.

1.7 Value Proposition Summary

The proposed project has a clear and effective business logic for educational effectiveness and aims to address a well-defined gap in the e-learning market. At its core, the platform provides students with learning disabilities access to individual online learning. Parents and educators, in turn, derive practical value from an experience that is organized, flexible and measurable. Importance of a dual focus as value is not generated only by the learners during the process of learning (for instance, educational services and experiences) but by a slew of other stakeholders like caregivers, teachers and the institution itself (Osterwalder et al., 2014).

A value proposition should be used to explain how a product or service solves a specific problem or meets a need better than what is currently being offered (Osterwalder et al., 2014). Within this framework, the platform overcomes the noted shortcomings of many existing digital learning platforms which do not adequately support learners who are cognitively and learning disabled (Cinquin, Guitton and Sauzéon, 2019). The platform's design integrates accessible and personalized features so that they are not "added on" later. This leads to a differentiated solution that meets pedagogical and user needs.

At the level of student, it enhances the student's interaction with the learning content. Cognitive overload, lack of structure, and limited individualization may be impediments. Involving assistive technologies, flexible learning pathways and continuous feedback mechanisms (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022; McNicholl et al., 2021). However, their successful practical functioning depends on the effective teaching system of such features as well (Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon, 2017). As a result, the technology-enhanced learning receives the double benefit: the effect of technology on technology-enhanced learning. Parents want visibility, control, peace of mind and reassurance. By keeping a proper check on the progress at stages, a clear reporting of the outcomes so as to inform the parents well about their child and making the services flexible and accessible for the most

part, the platform can help parents to understand their child better. This frequently occurs where the existing options are not very good for the person, which forces the parent to look at some other solution (Petretto et al., 2021). Through the establishment of flexible and responsible bilateral relations, the platform positions itself as a trustworthy partner in the educational process.

Likewise, it will be a great help to teachers and potential institutions as they will get tools that can help them teach communicate and monitor. The platform is more like an educational support service rather than just a content supplier. According to Johnson, Christensen and Kagermann (2008), an organization's value proposition, key resources and key processes must align in order to consistently deliver value on scale. The integration of teaching skills, the technological equipment and the support mechanisms strengthen the coherence of the overall offer (Atanga et al., 2020).

At a strategic level, the value proposition indicates how the platform plans to capture value. According to Teece (2010), a business model must create and capture value in a sustainable manner or else it cannot be effective. Providing accessibility, personalization, and measurable results, the platform enhances its perceived value and refines its revenue model. Nonetheless, the platform is heavily reliant on the improvements of the learning platform. When learning improvements are not established, the platform becomes less valuable irrespective of its capabilities.

CHAPTER 2: MARKET ANALYSIS

2.1 Overview of the E-learning Market

E-learning refers to the use of electronic technology to access educational curriculum outside of a traditional classroom. Furthermore, e-learning is learning utilizing electronic technologies to access educational curriculum outside of a traditional classroom. Moreover, the e-learning concept is on-line learning using easy to-use learning systems and the Internet. This is a component of a broader digital education infrastructure that includes learning management systems (LMS), educational software, data analytics tools, and online communication infrastructure (OECD, 2023). Over the past twenty years, especially during and post COVID-19 pandemic, the e-learning sector has expanded rapidly (UNESCO, 2023). This has been possible due to technological development and institutional acceptance along with changing user experience/expectations.

One major contributor that caused this growth is the flexibility that online learning environments offer. Unlike conventional learning carried out face to face, e-learning allows the learner to access the content at all times and at any place. It reduces geographical and time constraints. The advantage of this flexibility is great in areas where equitable access to educational resources is not always available. Digital platforms can help mitigate inequality in education (UNESCO, 2023). Simultaneously, the improvement of digital infrastructure, such as internet and mobile accessibility, has enabled e-learning solutions to scale up and reach a wider audience.

The e-learning market is also being developed by Learning Management System and data-based educational tools gaining more popularity. Through the organization and delivery of content and tracking of students, LMS platforms play an important role in the education system. With the help of data analytics, institutions will be able to track learners and see how they interact with the courses and materials. Adaptive learning technologies have created opportunities for personalized learning in education, which helps in customizing learning experiences to suit individual needs (Shard, Kumar and Koul, 2024). The evolution of e-learning does not constitute only the digitisation of content. It conveys a more extensive change in the design, delivery and evaluation of learning.

The pandemic of COVID-19 was a large enabler of online learning. It accelerated enablers which were already on track. All educational institutions were forced into remote teaching, and online platforms witnessed a sudden increase in their use with all stakeholders. This change brought many more users to e-learning and helped in making this a normalized mode of education as well. Consequently, both learners and educators are becoming acquainted with digital tools, while acceptance of online learning has drastically increased (OECD, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

Still, it is prudent to have a critical outlook towards its impact when we look at e-learning. There is a belief that technology is always good for learning, but research has shown otherwise. Research reveals that the success of e-learning largely rests on other factors such as instructional design, learner engagement, digital literacy, and quality of interaction (Akpen et al., 2024). As many e-learning platforms were built with scale and access in mind, many times quality suffers in various shapes and forms. Moreover, the uptake of e-learning has brought to light existing inequities, especially relating to access to technology, skills, and support (UNESCO, 2023). While technology can be used to ‘de-risk’ education, at the same time, it can also compound the faults that are already in the system. This is even more so for those learners with specific needs who may face additional barriers in the digital world.

2.2 Learning Disabilities Market Needs

Students with learning difficulties constitute a significant subset of users in the overall e-learning marketplace, with distinct needs that are often unmet. Learning disabilities is one of the most prevalent forms of special educational needs within primary and secondary education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024). This growth rate contradicts evidence that this population is realized niche. It is pertinent to education and commerce. European data also reveal persistent inequalities in access to education for people with disabilities, indicating that structural barriers continue to affect participation and outcomes (Eurostat, 2025; European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022). As online training is on the rise, their inequalities can be replicated or even reinforced if platforms are not inclusively designed.

Although e-learning platforms have grown rapidly, available research indicates that many of these platforms are ill-equipped to cater to learners suffering from cognitive and learning

challenges. Digital technologies often overlook various problems including cognitive accessibility, usability as well as pedagogical alignment, according to Cinquin, Guitton and Sauzéon (2019). According to Starks and Reich (2023), teachers are faced with systemic barriers involving a lack of teacher training, lack of tools and weak technology-instruction connection.

According to the findings, it is not just about technology; the structural dimension is also important, i.e. platforms are not designed to meet what learners need (UNESCO IITE, 2024). Cognitive load has become an essential issue. Students with learning disabilities require a learning environment that is uncomplicated, systematic, and highly structured. But many online education platforms are aiming at a ‘typical’ user with complicated interfaces and content structure. For that reason, an integration of design must include accessibility in any ways, not an addition. If this is not integrated, then digital platforms may create new barriers while removing the old ones (Friedman and Bryen, 2007).

Customization is another important requirement. A uniform pattern cannot be adopted as the learning profiles of this group are different. As explained by Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon (2017), adaptive content, individual feedback and flexible pacing are important. However, in practice, most platforms only offer a limited form of personalization, only recommending basic content. Due to design and technology constraints, there is a gap between what is theoretically possible and its delivery. Assistive technology such as text-to-speech and speech recognition is often presented as a panacea for support of accessibility. These tools can be useful in increasing participation and performance; however, this can only happen if they are integrated into overall teaching and supported at all levels (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022). The adoption of assistive technologies is significantly constrained by limited training, low awareness and system usability barriers as shown by the studies (Atanga et al., 2020; McNicholl et al., 2021). Assistive technologies need to be backed up with something broader to be effective.

In addition, structured support and human interaction were highly emphasized in literature. Scaffolded instructions, continuous feedback and guided learning processes are beneficial for learning disabled students (Cumming and Rose, 2022). Nonetheless, the conversion of the lesson online has mostly compromised these elements which led to lesser engagement

and effectiveness (Petretto et al., 2021). This raises the question of whether different learners will be able to engage with self-directed learning models.

All in all, parents and educators must be involved in effective support. This means that digital resources with embedded accessibility can assist in the efforts of many parties (European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022). While learning disabilities include such conditions as dyslexia, ADHD amongst many more, they require workable solutions to be successful (Wagner et al., 2020). The main need is not better digital tools, but better, more integrated, contextualized and smarter solutions that can address individual level as well as systemic challenges.

2.3 Target Market Segmentation

For marketing theories, markets are heterogeneous by nature, that is, consumers differ in needs and behaviours as well as willingness to pay. The failure of strategies and the weakness of value propositions often stem from treating them as homogeneous. Thus, segmentation enables firms to find meaningful subgroups of consumers to which they direct offerings (Smith, 1956). Recent advocates of segmentation recommend less reliance on simple demographic criteria and more use of underlying needs, behaviors, and decision-making processes (Yankelovich and Meer, 2006; Wedel and Kamakura, 2000). This is especially true in multi-faceted service contexts like education, which are conducive to the emergence of highly differentiated user needs.

For an online learning platform for students with learning disability, segmentation is essential as well as useful. The category is highly heterogeneous with various cognitive profiles, difficulties with learning and needs support. A one-size-fits-all approach will likely not be successful. Segmentation should not only be theorized but also be practical and based on scientific evidence. A multi-dimensional segmentation framework can apply to five different axes. The first consideration is age group, which is crucial and where the learning needs, curriculum expectations, levels of autonomy and so on, varies greatly among primary students, lower secondary students and upper secondary students. Young learners tend to require more structure and parental support, whereas older learners may engage more independently (Grigorenko et al., 2020). Different learning difficulties can include dyslexia, ADHD, learning difficulties, and mixed learning difficulties. The development of these conditions and the support required would be different in many ways (Wagner et al., 2020).

Level of support required is the third key segmentation variable. Educational provision can take the form of low intensity, asynchronous use of materials or high intensity where one can receive personalized guidance over regular communications with educationists. The aspect has high business relevance because it affects the service design and pricing directly. Fourthly, the importance of differentiating between the user and buyer. Although parents may not actively use software, they are usually the ones who determine the software children use. According to Petretto et al. (2021), parents seek out further help when schooling is not enough. As a result, value propositions should support parents regarding efficacy, transparency and affordability issues. The fifth challenge is the setting of use; home based, school based or hybrid. Every situation has its own unique expectations of structure, interaction and support. It becomes complicated, though it assists in targeting. If a company has too many segments, they will have an experience that is disjointed due to an inefficient and chaotic approach. However, too few may be oversimplification (Wedel and Kamakura, 2000).

With all these pointers, we will define our priority target segment as parents of children in primary and lower secondary education facing learning difficulties such as dyslexia or ADHD who look for structured and personalized support outside school institutions. The clarity of the requirements and directness of the decisions make this segment attractive. Secondary segments encompass institutions such as schools, special educators, learning support centers, engagement with whom requires negotiating institutional constraints and integration issues. Considering the large share of students that need support (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024), these niches represent a significant opportunity but also a more complex one.

2.4 Competitor Analysis

A useful competitor analysis is more than a mere list. This refers to understanding how different providers solve the same learning problem. Those providing online learning services for students with learning disabilities can have their competitors classified into direct, adjacent and substitutes competitors. There are gaps and other ways that we can critically evaluate the real value that is created through this distinction. Competitors include Lexia Learning and Nessy, directed at building literacy for students with dyslexia and other related difficulties (Lexia Learning, n.d.; Nessy, n.d.). Overall, such companies provide

programs, diagnostics, learning paths and position themselves as research-based specialized solutions. This knowledge is useful but often limiting because professionals often only concentrate on what they can see in writing and reading. They ignore anything else or any learning issue occurring simultaneously (Wagner et al., 2020).

Competitors imitate functionalities from one another, leading to them growing close together as the tools are developed (Dynamo Maths, n.d.). These platforms tend to offer specialized features that can effectively address certain learning needs. However, this narrow scope restricts their utility for learners who require more comprehensive or multi-faceted assistance. This refers to a market situation where something having more depth loses its breadth in one way or the other.

The third category includes Kurzweil and Read&Write, which are assistive technology tools designed to assist with reading writing and comprehension (Kurzweil Educational Systems, n.d.; Everway, n.d.). The instruments can create sound from text and can also recognize speech. However, their effectiveness is limited in other respects, for example, besides being unstructured, they do not have a pedagogical sequence. This means that they need a lot of teacher or caregiver support to work (Atanga et al., 2020). In all these areas, there are some comparative dimensions which show similar limitations. Most solutions offered by competitors tackle individual components of the issue, such as literacy, numeracy, or accessibility, not a holistic solution that provides for the complexity of learning disabilities. Secondly, platforms usually focus on either individual users or institutions, but not both, reducing flexibility and scalability. Thirdly, the delivery mode is mainly asynchronous using very limited synchronous interaction which curtails engagement and personalization (Petretto et al., 2021).

Also, the level of personalization can differ. Many are promoted for adaptive technologies; however, the engineering of such faculties is limited to only basic tweaks. In the same way, support structures are often fragmented. In the literature, the fact that assistive tools, content delivery, and instructional support are rarely integrated into a coherent system is catalogued as one of the shortcomings of current e-learning solutions (Cinquin, Guitton and Sauzéon, 2019). The fragmentation is also reflected in pricing models used. Access to subscription, institutional licensing and one-off software purchases are quite common. However, these types of models don't really align with a lot of different users and their flexibility and

intensity of use (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). Due to the mismatch, there may be reduced accessibility as well as reduced perceived value. In general, there are only partially competitive solutions but not a completely competitive solution. While some are proficient at one or two things, only a few systems combine good design, personalized learning, human support, progress monitoring, and a sound business model. Such a fragmentation indicates a market gap. The intended platform aims to fill this void by integrating values together in one platform. Nonetheless, there is a risk associated with it. Existing firms can also use such measures, while newcomers can follow suit (Teece, 2010). Accordingly, ongoing differentiation will depend not only on the initial design but also the platform's ability to innovate and adapt continuously.

2.5 Market Opportunities and Trends

The development of the e-learning market shows that better data will lead to more tailored solutions which will consequently shape the limitations of the newer solutions. A significant trend now is the ever-increasing importance of personalized learning with digital tools and data. Platforms have recently begun to adopt the needs, preferences and performance of individual learners rather than standard content delivery (Shard, Kumar and Koul, 2024). This trend pertains most notably to the students who present learning disabilities. They need a different approach due to their cognitive profiles (Wagner et al., 2020). However, although personalization might have a major role to play in all marketing stories, it does not have that much role to play in reality.

The development of products and services that assist people is increasingly linked to personalisation. There is growing recognition that accessibility should be considered an integral part of the design of digital learning environments, rather than an optional extra. International policy frameworks require systems that are inclusive and offer assistive devices, flexible content formats and user-centred design (UNESCO IITE, 2024; European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022). Research has empirically shown that assistive technologies can improve learning and participation of students with disabilities (Fernández-Batanero et al., 2022; McNicholl et al., 2021). Yet, their effectiveness depends on their implementation, teaching, and alignment with user needs (Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon, 2017). In many instances, these conditions are not fully met, which limits their practical impact.

Learning analytics and progress monitoring tools are expanding rapidly as another major trend. Learner behaviours and performances can now be recorded and analysed in great detail as a feedback process and for better decision-making (OECD, 2023). Although these capabilities help with personalization and accountability, they have serious implications. The use of data-driven metrics risk simplifying learning processes and prioritising what is measurable over what is meaningful. In many cases, data privacy and interpretation issues are not adequately tackled.

The e-learning market is developing from the blended learning model to a hybrid learning model and getting more mature. Many are not seeing online education as a substitute but rather an emphasis is being laid on the marriage of digital devices with physical interaction. In fact, some students with disabilities are known to learn well from this combination of both guidance and flexible access (UNESCO, 2023). Even so, the efficiency of the hybrid model rests heavily on the coordination of different modes and the ability of the teacher to manage a complex learning environment, which is not always available.

At the same time, parents and teachers are being recognized as active educators. Digital platforms are likely to facilitate communication, observation and cooperation in education, signalling greater ecological approaches (Cumming and Rose, 2022). It is particularly critical for learners with additional needs, where synergistic assistance needs to be in place. Nonetheless, easy integration of systems is difficult with increased use of stakeholder pressure (Atanga et al., 2020). Finally, the market is becoming more specialised and focused on consumer-centricity. As competition becomes more intense, the providers will look for differentiation, targeting their value propositions, especially in special education, thereby creating opportunity as well as competitive pressure.

Challenges nevertheless persist. According to UNESCO (2023), educators' low level of readiness, cost barriers, and digital inequality still limit adoption and effective use. According to Perelmutter, McGregor and Gordon (2017), there is a possibility of over-reliance on tools without the appropriate pedagogies. The present market environment is favourable for the creation of new platforms; however, the success of these platforms will depend on the ability to appropriately place technology, pedagogy and practice.

CHAPTER 3: BUSINESS MODEL CANVAS

3.1 Introduction to the Model

This chapter utilizes the Business Model Canvas as a proactive management system and a business-oriented tool to order and manage the complete online learning platform project proposal as a business. The goal of the model is to bring together everything about the educational problem, users of the educational tool, value proposition, channels for the customer, revenue logic, key resource, partners and cost structure in a single framework. A business model describes the rationale of how an organisation creates, delivers, and captures value (Osterwalder & Pigneur, 2010).

The significance of a business model for the proposed platform is particularly important. Ensuring a successful outcome is not simply creating a socially valuable platform with an educational idea. It has to be accompanied by the execution of the idea into a viable business model. Business models are important as they clarify the rationale of how any business functions and how it financially sustains itself (Magretta, 2002). The platform must prove that students with learning disabilities need better online support, and that the service can be delivered consistently to the right customers with sufficient revenue. A business model must show how value is created and value is captured (Teece, 2010). This distinction is important because a platform may very well add value in a number of ways to learners and their parents. However, if that value cannot be monetised sustainably then it will ultimately fail.

Business Model Canvas must not be accepted at face value. While it is able to structure business logic, the business model can easily become overly static if not grounded in market uncertainty, implementation risks and the dynamic nature of the digital platform. According to Zott, Amit, and Massa (2011) and Baden-Fuller and Haefliger (2013), digital business models must continuously adapt in terms of platform capabilities and value creation/value capture alignment. Thus, the Canvas in this chapter will not be used as a rigid plan but as a flexible framework. Moreover, this framework can enable changes as the platform develops and feedback is received from learners, parents, educators and institutional partners. This is important because with digital transformation, technology, customer expectations, and

organisational capabilities and service delivery models change (Verhoef et al., 2021; Rohn et al., 2021).

Table 4: Summary of the proposed Business Model Canvas

Business Model Canvas element	Application to the proposed platform
Value proposition	Accessible, personalised and structured online learning support for students with learning disabilities
Customer segments	Students, parents, educators, schools and learning support centres
Channels	Website, mobile platform, social media, referrals, webinars, educational partnerships
Customer relationships	Trust-based support, progress reporting, communication with parents and educator guidance
Revenue streams	Subscriptions, session packages and future B2B licensing
Key activities	Platform development, accessible content creation, live sessions, educator training, progress monitoring
Key resources	Digital platform, specialist educators, assistive tools, learning content, data and brand credibility
Key partners	Schools, special educators, learning centres, therapists, accessibility experts and technology providers
Cost structure	Technology, educator payments, content development, marketing, compliance and customer support

3.2 Value Proposition

The fundamental value proposition of the proposed platform is to provide accessible, tailored and organized online learning support for students with learning disabilities. Nevertheless, this value proposition should not be presented as something that all benefit

from. It should blatantly demonstrate how value is created for different stakeholder groups. For students, the benefit is access to appropriate learning materials and support that suit their particular learning profiles. This comprises continual progress tracking, lowered cognitive hurdles, organized activities, customized learning networks, and supporting gadgets. The benefits to parents are transparency, flexibility, measurable progress and reassurance that their child is receiving appropriate help. Communication tools, learning data, scaffolding resources, and other supporting elements that can enhance current practices determine the value of teachers and institutions.

Services must deal with customers' pains, expected gains and the task they are trying to accomplish to be successful (Osterwalder et al., 2014; Payne, Frow and Eggert, 2017). The primary issue identified in this platform is that many learners with learning disabilities struggle in generic digital environments that are not designed around cognitive accessibility, guided instruction and individualised support. The "benefit" that they expect is not access to more digital content; it is access to learning that will be easier, more personalised and more supportive. This distinction is important because e-tech products are often claimed to be innovative, but they produce more content than learning.

The value proposition can also be viewed through service-dominant logic. As per Vargo and Lusch (2004) value is not just provided by firm and delivered to customer; it happens through interaction between both. Co-creation of value occurs at and through this platform, between students, parents, educators and the platform. Involvement of students happens via participation in learning activities, involvement of parents takes place through monitoring and support, and involvement of educators happens through guidance and feedback and instructional adaptation. According to Payne, Storbacka and Frow (2008), value co-creation derives from interactive processes rather than the product or service being offered (MacMillan et al., 2013). In other words, the platform's worth will depend on the effectiveness of stakeholders' connection.

The value proposition is, critically, both promising and vulnerable. The phrases "personalised learning" and "inclusive education" are commonly used in the edtech market, but they are not necessarily delivered meaningfully. According to studies, a number of online learning platforms do not offer sufficient cognitive accessibility, usability and pedagogical adaptation for learners with cognitive and learning disabilities (Cinquin,

Guitton and Sauzéon, 2019). Thus, it must not become another tech- solution which promises inclusion but offers little in terms of measurable educational impact. Usability and learning experience design should be integrated from the beginning and poor interface design can create new barriers, even when the platform has assistive tools (Choi and Seo, 2024).

Consequently, the platform must be based on evidence and results. The online learning platform is worthy of value for money as it does not only offer a digital learning environment, but moreover, combines accessibility, personalisation, specialist support and measurable progress into one coherent package. If the platform sufficiently proves that it progresses learner engagement, confidence and learning, then its value proposition will be more credible. Unless it can establish these outcomes, differentiation may be more cosmetic than actual.

3.3 Customer Segments

The proposed platform caters to several customers, but a clear distinction must be made between user, buyer as well as institutional stakeholders. It is mainly used by students with learning disabilities, especially those in the primary and lower secondary education sectors. The learning difficulties of these learners may involve dyslexia, ADHD, reading and writing, and mixed learning. However, students are the end users of the service, but they are not generally the paying customers. During the initial stage of business, the primary expected paying customers would be parents since they usually make the decision regarding supplementary educational assistance of this sort for children.

The differentiation is significant from a business model perspective as various stakeholders perceive value in diverse ways. Usability, support, motivation and confidence may be valued. Parents may place importance on progress, trust, safety, and cost. Integration, reporting, pedagogical reliability and ease of use may be valued by educators. Consequently, it cannot consider “students with learning disabilities” as a single broad market. Marketing theory stresses the differences that exist in the market (Smith, 1956; Wedel and Kamakura, 2000; Yankelovich and Meer, 2006). As such they require segmentation that reflects needs behaviour and decision making.

The segmentation of this platform should be based on age group, type of learning difficulty, level of support required, buyer role and learning setting. A student with mild dyslexia who requires occasional help does not have the same needs as a student with more complex learning difficulties requiring regular specialist intervention. Parents in need of home-based support with a flexible nature will behave differently from schools who need institutional solutions that are more structured.

The first segment to be prioritised should therefore be parents of primary and lower secondary students with dyslexia, ADHD or Mixed learning difficulties looking for structured and personal support outside of formal school. The segment is an attractive one to operate in as the need is obvious, the decision-making process is quite straightforward, and the parents are mostly on the lookout for additional learning solutions. Research also shows that learning disabilities amount to a significant special education category, confirming that this is not a fringe category (National Center for Education Statistics, 2024; Wagner et al., 2020).

The secondary customer segment can include schools, special educators, learning centres and therapists. These segments have the potential for growth, but they are more complex. Institutional clients often need curriculum alignment, training, data protection guarantees and longer decision-making processes. A strategic trade-off is created. When a platform casts its net too wide, it loses value. The target market can be less if it is too narrow. It is most feasible to commence with a specific B2C segment, and subsequently a B2B and institutional (Petretto et al., 2021)

3.4 Channels

Channels are the means by which the platform reaches its customers and communicates with them and delivers value. For the platform being proposed, the key direct channels must primarily include the official website, the mobile-friendly platform, search engine visibility, social media pages, educational content marketing webinars and online consultation. These channels are necessary because parents will likely be searching for information about dyslexia, ADHD, learning difficulties and online tutoring before making a purchase decision. Consequently, the platform should be visible at the earlier stage of the customer journey before the parents are ready to pay.

Channels that are not direct also hold significance. Referrals from schools, special educators, learning centres, parent communities, child development professionals and educational networks may be used. Such channels can be particularly useful as education services need trust. Parents of children with learning disabilities probably won't choose a platform based on advertising alone. They tend to rely more on the recommendations of experts, credible information and quality evidence.

Digital channels should not be limited to actual tools utilized for promotion. Channels play a vital role in value proposition, interface, customer engagement and access to data in e-business models and platform-based models (Amit and Zott, 2001; Kannan and Li, 2017). Channels should assist parents in progressing from awareness to understanding, trust, trial and subscription for this platform. According to Chaffey and Ellis-Chadwick (2022), digital marketing is the strategy, implementation, and control of marketing activities that relies heavily on digital technology. Consequently, the channels of the platform must be designed as part of the service experience.

Paid advertising will not be sufficient; the key question is what will. Visibility may be generated but not trust. Credibility-based channels are essential in this market. The resources include professional articles, specialist webinars, case studies, parent experiences, educator profiles and partners with trusted providers. The customer's various touchpoint experience must also be consistent. As Lemon and Verhoef (2016) state, the whole journey rather than one point of contact shapes customer decision. The research paper claims that digital platforms have the ability to facilitate trust and engagement of customers through channel-integrated communication. The platform must combine digital visibility and credibility as well as education and relationship-building.

3.5 Customer Relationships

The business model must have trust, transparency and continuous support in customer relationships. The suggested platform does not provide a low-risk service or merely transactional. It responds to children's learning needs, which means parents are likely to be careful, emotionally involved, and worried about impact. Managers must ensure that customer relations become part of the value proposition of the platform beyond normal customer service. Parents should expect a relationship that is grounded in clear onboarding, an assessment of needs, progress reports, and frequent communication and ongoing support

that is flexible in nature and realistic expectations. Parents ought to better understand the platform's features and limitations. It is important for businesses not to get carried away with what they promise consumers because while it may get them to buy into you it may lose trust later and affect your future sales. The rapport must be that of comfort, encouragement and self-assurance. Students do have learning disability already feel the pressure of learning in various forms. Hence, the platform must not make them feel stressed again. Collaboration, technical assistance, and clear reporting should be actual trainings for institutions and educators.

The relationship marketing theory is applicable in this situation. Morgan and Hunt (1994) state that trust and commitment are important elements for long-term relationships. This is especially true for high-risk and uncertain services. As reviewed by Palmatier et al. (2006), relationship marketing's effects are influenced by relationship quality, communication and trust. On the prospective platform, trust is not an outcome of marketing, but a prerequisite to adopt. Parents must have faith in the school, the facts, the learning and the platform.

Strong ties with customers create costs and scaling challenges. To ensure the effectiveness of personalized support, educator communication, and parent reporting, staff time, training, and quality control are essential components. A platform that relies too much on human support becomes costly to scale. Overly relying on interventions or programmes may reduce trust in society and a sense of care. Thus, it is the need of the platform to automate but not lose human touch. For instance, human teachers can give interpretive feedback and guidance based on the automated updates of progress dashboards. Collaboration in creating value is significant here. The interaction among students, parents and educators create value of the platform (Payne, Storbacka and Frow, 2008). Retention in online services, unlike a customer's satisfaction with a one-time purchase, is based on whether they come back for more. As such, customer relations need to be designed as a process. As per the findings of Ramasundaram et al. (2023), customer experience within digital platforms depends on fluid interaction through the ecosystems. The proposed platform must therefore cultivate relationships that are supportive, credible, and scalable.

3.6 Revenue Streams

The suggested platform must adopt a hybrid revenue model rather than a single pricing mechanism. Users should enjoy access to basic platform capabilities like instructional content, essential assistive tools, structured drills, and progress dashboards, with the first revenue stream being monthly subscription charges. This model generates revenue that continues over time and encourages repeated interaction. The value must continue to be apparent over time, or else parents will get subscription fatigue and cancel when they see no value.

The second revenue generator must use package-based pricing for its live sessions. These may comprise one session, a bundle of five or ten or a specific one-off support package. The model, which portrays the higher cost of personal human support, provides families with flexibility according to their needs and budget. In addition, it enables the platform to distinguish between low-intensity users, who primarily require access to the platform, and high-intensity users, who need the educator on a regular basis. Another possible revenue stream can be generated later through B2B licensing or bulk subscriptions for schools and learning centres and educational organisations. It may enhance scale, stability of revenues, but may also involve longer sales cycles, institutional requirements, integration challenges. Hence, B2B revenue should be seen as a medium-term opportunity rather than the only foundation for the business.

The theory behind the hybrid model is that value creation must align with value capture (Teece, 2010; Sjödin et al., 2020). A single pricing model would not reflect the diversity of user needs, user willingness to pay and intensity of support. Subscription formats can create continuous revenue, while packaging shows the pricing volatility of educator-led support (Gassmann, Frankenberger and Csik, 2014). Generating varied stream of revenues may strengthen business resilience by reducing dependence on one group of customers (Johnson, Christensen and Kagermann, 2008). It is necessary for the platform to be affordable and sustainable. A hefty price for the service could make it out of reach for families already buying in extra education. If it is too cheap, it may affect the quality of service. The reason is that specialized educators, accessibility features and consistent support don't come cheap. As a result, the revenue framework must ensure social accessibility and economic feasibility.

3.7 Key Activities

The essential activities of the platform are the processes required for the efficient delivery of its value proposition. The platform development service, creation of easily accessible content, hiring of teachers and training them, learning need assessment, conducting live sessions, monitoring progress and communicating with parents, customer services, marketing, data privacy and continuous improvement in services are some of the services offered. The platform is able to educate people through activities, not just operations or tasks.

Integration of technological developments with service design which implies user engagement and continuous adaptation results in success of digital platforms (Baden-Fuller and Haeffliger, 2013; Verhoef et al., 2021). The technologies employed on this platform depend on a number of things. The platform should ensure that learning materials are age-appropriate, accessible and flexible. The teacher's professional development is also a key issue, as the quality of the online support depends on the teacher's capacities to adapt instruction to individual learners. Progress monitoring has to do more than just collect data but rather turning this data into useful information.

It is also an important task quality assessment. In case of multiple resources and teachers used by the platform, the service delivery must be consistent. Customer experience can vary considerably without quality control, affecting customers' trust. The key activities also comprise feedback loops with stakeholders. Student, parent and teacher feedback should shape updates, content additions and service improvements on the platform. As reported by Xie et al. (2022), digital business models require ongoing learning and reconfiguration of capabilities as opposed to a fixed implementation. The key challenge is the complexity of implementation. The platform needs to synchronize the content, technology, educators, learners and parents. When misaligned, the business model might manifest itself to be strong on paper but weak in practice. A platform may fail even if it is designed well such as not training the educators or progress data is not understandable by the parents. Thus, critical activities of the platform must integrate, not just deliver. According to Choi and Seo (2024), services must be designed so that they are accessible, understandable and usable by the target audience.

3.8 Key Resources

The chief resources of the proposed platform include the digital platform, an accessible interface design, specialist educators, pedagogical expertise learning content, assistive technology features, data analytics, brand credibility, and customer support systems. These resources are important to achieve the platform's value proposition and differentiate it from any e-learning platform.

According to the resource-based view, sustainable competitive advantage refers to the possession of resources that are valuable, rare, costly to imitate and organisation-embedded. In this scenario, the key resources of the platform are not technological. Software can be replicated and there are many helper functions that are easily duplicated by competitors. The combination of specialist educational knowledge, accessible learning design, educator capability, trust and the ability to integrate technology with pedagogy and more valuable resources. Direct impact on service quality makes specialist educators a particularly important resource. A platform will make a weaker promise if it says it will provide personalised support without having educators who can make those adaptations in kids. Likewise, inclusive design is not just a technology resource anymore, but also a strategic resource, as it ensures that the platform can work with learners, who may face problems with generic designs. The capacity to conduct data analysis is essential but requires caution. Learning progress, as well as parent communication, must be supported by data, not reduced to data.

The strategic significance of resources only materializes when they are transformed into organizational capabilities. If a platform possesses technology but fails to utilize it, the platform will fail. Digitization requires capabilities rather than digital means, according to Ritter and Pedersen (2020). Herhausen et al. (2020) similarly point out that there is a difference between owning digital marketing tools and having digital marketing capabilities. According to Xie et al. (2022), business-related models may be aided by digital platforms when they enhance the reconfiguration of abilities. The platform does not depend on one asset but on an integration of quite a few resources into a capability system. Competitors can, of course, copy features but it is harder for them to copy an overall ability to provide any accessible design, personalised learning, educator support, stakeholder communication and measurable progress.

3.9 Key Partners

Key partners are integral for strengthening the platform's credibility, reach and delivery capacity. Potential partners could be special educators, schools and learning support centres, a child psychologist, a speech therapist, an occupational therapist, an accessibility consultant, a technology provider, and a parents' association. At the initial stages, the platform may not be able to develop specialist knowledge, referrals, legitimacy and support services internally. These partners may assist with this.

Cooperation of organisations having complementing resources and capabilities can create relational advantages (Dyer and Singh, 1998). This is especially critical for a new educational platform since it might take time for it to be credible. Business partnerships and networks can help newer ventures in acquiring knowledge, customers, legitimacy and expertise (Gulati, 1998). In other words, the partnerships are not merely undertaken for commerce. They are also pedagogical and reputational, as the platform works in an educational field of sensitivity, and involves children with additional learning needs. Learning centers and schools could serve as referral partners or future institutional customers. Special educators and therapists can provide support in service design, assessment and guidance. Accessibility consultants can assist to make platform usable for learners having different types of needs. Technology providers may support the development, hosting, platform security and assistive technology features. Parent associations could assist in conveying users' worries to the platform.

Yet, partnerships create dependency and risk too. In cases where the platform is heavily dependent on external educators or institutions, it must control service quality and ethics. The reputation of the platform may be harmed by poor partnership management. Parents may blame the platform instead of the partner educators, for example, if partner educators deliver inconsistent support. Partner companies should be chosen selectively along with their trustworthiness and competencies, values and accountability. Digital platform ecosystems may see a partner's quality affecting user experience and innovation potential to a large extent. As described by Vieira et al., B2B digital strategies have the ability to create and/or innovate relationship quality. Consequently, the platform must avoid partnerships for quick growth. A credible, controlled network of partners should be built to create value, without impairing service consistency.

3.10 Cost Structure

The pricing of the platform should reflect the distinction between fixed and variable costs. Costs do not vary with output level/efforts. The development of the platform, server hosting and software licenses, design for accessibility, initial content, and branding. These expenses are crucial before the platform can be viable on a large scale. The costs that vary include the payment made to faculty, customer support, advertising, just-in-time delivery, platform maintenance, and content updating.

The platform's value proposition and revenue model should be reflected in the cost structure (Osterwalder and Pigneur, 2010). A generic low touch content platform cannot provide personalized learning, specialist support and accessibility-by-design, which any platform claiming this must have. The different attributes that lead to differentiation also increase costs. Although specialist educators, enabling tracking of progress, parent communication and accessibility design may be value enhancing, they may reduce margins if mismanaged. Quality and scalability were key features of the tension. The platform's educational value proposition must not be compromised by cost-cutting measures. At the same time, it cannot depend only on too costly humans' supporting if wants to scale. Therefore, automation should make use of discretion. For instance, dashboarding, scheduling, basic reporting and resource recommendations should be automated while specialist feedback and instructions should remain human.

It is vital for the platform to scale up gradually. In the first stages, spending should focus on developing up a dependable minimal viable platform, recruiting competent educators and emerging key accessible learning content. Over time, the investment can grow into advanced analytics, institutional partnerships, and greater marketing. This slowly reduces their level of risk and adds feedback from customers to the model. According to Teece (2010), the process of value capturing cannot undermine the value proposition itself. The platform's cost structure must enable sustainable growth without jeopardizing the quality of learning, trust and accessibility. According to Rohn et al. (2021) platform-based business models depend on the synchronisation of three processes, value creation, value delivery and value capture. In other words, cutting costs are useful as long as they do not affect quality.

CHAPTER 4: MARKETING STRATEGY

4.1 Branding Strategy

The marketing strategy for the proposed platform will build credibility, trust and specialist educational value. According to the brand validation, the platform should not use the term “innovative edtech platform”, because it is a common statement used by almost every company in the market. The brand must revolve around inclusive learning, specialist support, accessibility, measurable progress and parents’ reassurance. This is a more suitable positioning because the platform deals with a sensitive issue. Parents are not only buying convenience, but they are making decisions about a child’s learning development.

Table 5: Practical Branding Positioning of the Platform

Branding element	Practical application
Brand positioning	Personalised and accessible online learning support for students with learning disabilities.
Main target decision-maker	Parents of children aged 6–15 with dyslexia, ADHD-related learning barriers, dysgraphia, dyscalculia or reading and writing difficulties.
Core promise	Structured support, accessible learning material, specialist educators and visible progress tracking.
Proof of credibility	Educator profiles, sample learning plans, parent reports, progress dashboard and trial consultation.
Tone of voice	Clear, supportive, professional and careful, without unrealistic promises.
Pricing visibility	Basic Plan €29/month, Standard Plan €49/month, Premium Plan €89/month and extra tutoring at €25 per 45-minute session.
Main call to action	“Book an initial consultation” or “Start with the Standard Plan”.

According to Keller and Swaminathan (2020), it is a branding theory, the strong brand differentiates and helps to reduce perceived risk, and enhances assurance. In this situation, parents perceive the risk as high because they may doubt whether a child who is learning disabled would benefit from online learning. Hence, the brand must reflect state-of-the-art technology but also expert, caring and reliable. The brand identity should communicate that the platform understands all learners do not learn the same way and does not consider them to be average users. The promise of a brand should be specific and credible. A fitting positioning could state that an option is personalized and easily available online learning support for students with learning disabilities, partnering with specialist educators and tracking progress. The purpose here is to create a connection between the emotional value and the functional value of the platform.

There must be more than emotional reassurance in branding. If a platform claims to offer personalised learning, accessibility and measurable progress, the service quality, the teachers and the method of learning must seem real to consumers. Thus, the brand must be underpinned by visible evidence, such as teacher qualifications, map learning activities, clear pricing plans, and parent progress reports. That allows the brand to be more tangible and less ethereal. As noted by Kotler, Keller and Chernev (2022), a good marketing strategy must be consistent with the positioning, customers target, and value delivery. When what's promised isn't what we receive, it can quickly damage trust and relationships. Homburg, Jozić and Kuehnl (2017) contend that customer experience management should be more than communication and organisation processes. As such, the platform's branding optimally runs. The website, educator profiles, parent reports, onboarding of parents/children, visual identity and tone of voice must all express clarity, support, professionalism and inclusion.

It is also vital that the platform does not exaggerate. Stating that a rapid improvement is real may jeopardize parental trust and generate ethical issues. As a result, ethical brands should not overcommit. The brand should not signify instant results, but progressive, supportive and structured development. Although this method may be less commercially aggressive, it is nonetheless more credible and sustainable for the longer term.

4.2 Digital Marketing

A digital marketing plan requires a clear objective that delivers valuable information, builds trust and generates quality leads. Important channels may include a professional website, search engine optimisation, educational blogs, social media, paid search, email, webinars, short educational videos and downloadable parents' guides. The objective is not just to promote the platform, but to help parents and educators understand learning difficulties, what kind of help is available and how the platform works in practice. Modern digital marketing uses many digital touchpoints, data and relationship management instead of one-way promotion of branded messages (Kannan and Li, 2017). According to Chaffey and Ellis-Chadwick (2022), the implementation of digital marketing requires strategy, implementation and performance measurement.

Table 6: Digital Marketing Action Plan

Channel	Practical action	Monthly budget / cost	Main objective
Website	Present services, educator profiles, accessibility features, pricing plans and booking options.	Included in platform cost	Main conversion point
SEO	Articles on dyslexia support, ADHD learning support and online special education tutoring.	€300	Organic traffic
Google Ads	Paid search campaigns for parents actively searching for learning support.	€700	High-intent leads
Facebook / Instagram Ads	Parent-focused campaigns with short videos, tips and service explanations.	€600	Awareness and lead generation
Webinars	Monthly free webinars with special educators.	€200	Trust-building

Channel	Practical action	Monthly budget / cost	Main objective
Email marketing	Follow-up emails after trial bookings, guide downloads or webinar attendance.	€50	Lead nurturing
Referral programme	One free tutoring session for every successful referral.	Variable, around €25 per referral	Lower-cost acquisition

The website will be the central information hub for the platform. The service must be explained clearly, educator credentials must be presented and accessibility features must be described, together with transparent pricing and an easy path to consultation or trial. The website should also include the three main subscription options: Basic Plan at €29 per month, Standard Plan at €49 per month and Premium Plan at €89 per month. Extra one-to-one tutoring sessions will cost €25 per 45-minute session, while a four-session package will cost €90. This is important because parents should be able to understand the value and cost of the service before making contact.

Search engine optimisation efforts will focus on terms around dyslexia support, ADHD learning support, online special education tutoring and personalised learning for children with learning disabilities. Social media is also an effective way of raising awareness and building community. According to Kaplan and Haenlein (2010), social media creates possibilities for interaction and participation. The content suitable for this platform could be short posts explaining learning differences, videos from teachers, tips for parents, myth-busters and updates on inclusive education. According to Tiago and Verissimo (2014), firms increasingly require a digital presence because customers expect to interact and obtain information online. However, the platform should not turn delicate educational matters into a gimmick that only aims to attract popularity.

Content marketing is extremely valuable. Before they buy, parents are likely to conduct research. According to Hollebeek and Macky (2019), digital content marketing can help improve engagement, trust and value creation. Thus, the platform should publish evidence-

informed content such as “how to support a child with dyslexia at home”, “what progress tracking means”, or “how online tutoring can be adapted for ADHD”. Offering webinars with special educators will also help build credibility and give parents an opportunity to ask questions before they commit.

Table 7: Digital Marketing Performance Indicators

Indicator	Target in the first 6 months
Monthly website visits	3,000-4,000
Consultation booking rate	3%-5% of website visitors
Trial-to-subscription conversion	20%-25%
Cost per qualified lead	€20-€30
Email open rate	30%-40%
Subscription retention after 3 months	65%-75%

Digital marketing can very quickly become a shallow space. High traffic, likes or impressions do not automatically mean trust or conversion. The platform must therefore assess not only reach but also consultation bookings, trial conversions, subscriptions and retention rates. The digital marketing capabilities of a firm are more important than simply having digital tools available to managers. According to Dwivedi et al. (2021), themes of engagement, ethics and customer interaction are also central when using digital and social media. Since the platform communicates about children and learning disabilities, ethical communication is necessary. Marketing should not take advantage of parents’ anxiety, but should provide clear, honest and useful information.

4.3 Customer Acquisition Strategy

The initial focus of the customer acquisition strategy should be the parents of children with learning difficulties who are in primary and lower secondary school. The acquisition process needs to be designed along the journey of the customer because, especially with parents, one advertisement is not enough to make them subscribe. Potential customers may learn

about the platform through an article, a social media post, a Google search or a recommendation from a teacher or specialist. They might then compare this with private tutors, other platforms or school support. Subsequently, they can ask for information, book an initial consultation, complete a short learning needs assessment or try a first session before subscribing.

According to Lemon and Verhoef (2016), customer experience develops throughout the complete customer journey. As a result, acquisition should take place in four stages: awareness, trust-building, trial and conversion. During the awareness stage, search engine optimisation, social media posts and paid ads can help parents find the platform. In the trust-building stage, expert articles, educator profiles and educational content help reduce uncertainty. During the trial phase, the platform offers a free first consultation, a short assessment to identify learning needs or a discounted first session. In the conversion stage, clear pricing, flexible packages and follow-up communication support the purchase decision.

Table 8: Customer Acquisition Funnel

Stage	Main objective	Suggested tools	Practical target
Awareness	Make parents aware of the platform	SEO, social media, Google Ads, educational content	3,000–4,000 website visits per month
Trust-building	Reduce uncertainty and build credibility	Expert videos, webinars, educator profiles, testimonials	100–150 qualified leads per month
Trial	Encourage low-risk first use	Free consultation, initial assessment, first-session offer	3%–5% booking rate from website visitors
Conversion	Turn interest into subscription or package purchase	Clear pricing, flexible packages, follow-up emails	20%–25% trial-to-subscription conversion

An effective acquisition strategy should incorporate paid, organic and referral channels. Paid advertising can help with visibility but can quickly become expensive and is not trustworthy on its own. Creating authoritative organic content takes time to produce effects. Referrals from special educators, schools and learning centres are arguably more credible but also take time and need rapport. The balance is important for a start-up, as small firms often experience resource constraints in adopting digital marketing (Ritz, Wolf and McQuitty, 2019).

Table 9: Practical Customer Acquisition Channels and Cost Assumptions

Channel	Practical action	Monthly cost assumption	Expected result
Google Ads	Target searches such as “online dyslexia support” and “ADHD learning support”	€700	High-intent leads
Facebook / Instagram Ads	Parent-focused campaigns with short videos and service explanations	€600	Awareness and lead generation
SEO and blog content	Two monthly articles on learning difficulties and online support	€300	Long-term organic traffic
Webinars	One free monthly webinar with a special educator	€200	Trust-building and consultation bookings
Email follow-up	Automated emails after trial, webinar or guide download	€50	Lead nurturing and conversion
Referral programme	One free tutoring session for each successful referral	About €25 per referral	Lower-cost acquisition

Acquisition of customers is a costly affair. If the platform invests overly large amounts of money in advertising for acquiring each customer, it can become financially weak. As a

consequence, for the first year, the target cost per qualified lead should be about €20–€30, and customer acquisition cost should remain below €90 per paying customer. Achieving this is only realistic with paid advertising combined with organic content, referrals and professional recommendations. Customer lifetime value should be measured by the platform, as the business is at risk when customer loyalty is weak. Assuming the cost of the Standard Plan is €49 per month, if a customer stays subscribed for six months, the gross subscription value before tutoring upsell revenues is €294. Put differently, a customer acquisition cost of €70–€90 would be acceptable, but a significantly higher cost would render the platform financially unviable.

According to Verhoef et al. (2021), customer expectations are subject to digital transformation that also affects it. To gain community trust, the community members must also trust the process itself. Thus, the strategy of acquisition should not be too broad. Such a campaign launched to all students or all parents will be futile. Messages ought to be targeted at distinct segments like parents looking for dyslexia assistance, ADHD learning strategies or online tutoring in special education. This will help make acquisition more effective and in line with the particular positioning of the platform.

4.4 Retention Strategy

Retention is critical for the platform as the business model relies on repeat use, ongoing engagement and customer trust. In online services, retaining customers is often more valuable than continually replacing them. The reason is that customer lifetime value depends on repeat purchases and the costs incurred when customers leave (Reichheld and Scheffer, 2000). The retention strategy for this platform should not depend only on reminders or discounts. Essentially, learning progress, parent satisfaction, teacher communication and perceived service quality are critical. The theory of relationship marketing states that trust and commitment are the essential foundation of any long-term customer relationship (Morgan and Hunt, 1994). According to Palmatier et al. (2006), relationship quality affects loyalty and engagement level. This is especially the case, as parents need to feel that the platform is benefiting their children. Parents are likely to stop using the service if they do not see gains, do not understand the process, or do not trust the teachers.

Table 10: Practical Retention Actions

Retention area	Practical action	Frequency / offer	Expected impact
Progress visibility	Parent progress report with completed tasks, attendance and learning comments	Monthly	Helps parents understand value
Educator continuity	Same educator for each student where possible	Ongoing	Builds trust and familiarity
Flexible packages	Ability to upgrade, downgrade or pause subscription	Monthly	Reduces cancellation risk
Parent communication	Short feedback message after live sessions	After each session	Improves transparency
Loyalty incentive	10% discount for annual payment	Annual plan	Encourages longer commitment
Referral reward	One free tutoring session for each successful referral	Per referral	Supports retention and acquisition
Re-engagement	Email or call after inactivity	After 14 days	Prevents silent churn

The approach taken for the retention of customers must be multi-faceted. Communicating progress reporting that is understandable by the parents must be efficient. The reports must keep the paying customer and the learner informed about progress, effort and next steps. In addition, the platform should support continuity with the educators, wherever possible, as frequent changes can undermine trust. Flexible packages should allow families to vary the intensity of the support they receive or the amount of support they receive, without leaving the platform entirely. For instance, it would be expected that a family can shift from the Premium Plan, which costs €89 per month, to the Standard Plan that costs €49 per month

instead of dropping the service altogether. Support must also respond quickly and appropriately to technical and educational issues.

It may take learners some time to show gradual learning improvement. Since parents may cancel before seeing long-term gains, this creates a retention threat. As a result, the platform must provide short- and long-term impact indicator. Indicators to measure short-term include completion of tasks, attendance, motivation confidence and participation in online sessions. For a longer-term impact, outcomes might include improvement in fluency reading, gaining more confidence in writing, improved focus or stronger independent learning. As an indicator of retention, they should be looked at through practical indicators. For instance, the three-month retention rate, the monthly churn rate, attendance rate and parent satisfaction score.

Table 11: Retention Performance Indicators

Indicator	Target
Three-month subscription retention	65%–75%
Monthly churn rate	Below 8%
Attendance in live sessions	Above 80%
Parent satisfaction score	Above 4/5
Response time to support requests	Within 24 hours

According to Homburg, Jozić and Kuehnl (2017), when managing customer experience, firms should focus on management rather than communication only. This means the entire service must have retention. Ramasundaram et al. (2023) further elaborate that experiences on digital platforms are based on fluidity among ecosystems. Retention will depend on how coherent and user-friendly students, parents and teachers find the platform. Importantly, marketing alone cannot create retention. It must be earned through service quality, trust and evidence of impact.

4.5 Partnerships

The marketing strategy often incorporates partnerships that can help support credibility, reach and service quality. This platform can collaborate with schools, special educators, learning support centres, child psychologists, speech therapists, occupational therapists, parent associations and education organisations. Such collaborations enable the platform to reach customers, generate trust and increase pedagogical credibility. Partnerships can support the growth of both B2C and B2B activity. The uncertainty of parents can be reduced by referrals from professionals. A special educator or learning centre recommendation may make a parent more open to trying the platform. In the B2B segment, schools and learning centres can become institutional users or distribution partners. According to Gulati (1998), strategic networks support new enterprises in gaining access to knowledge. As per Dyer and Singh (1998), interorganisational relationships give rise to relational advantages when complementary resources are combined.

Table 12: Practical Partnership Plan

Partner type	Practical role	Commercial arrangement	Expected benefit
Special educators	Referral of suitable students and participation in webinars	Free training resources or discounted platform access	Trust and expert credibility
Learning support centres	Use of the platform with their students	Institutional licence from €2,500/year for up to 30 students	B2B revenue and wider reach
Private schools	Pilot use with students needing additional support	Annual school licence or group subscription	Institutional adoption
Speech therapists / occupational therapists	Referral of families needing learning support	Referral reward or co-created parent resources	Lower-cost customer acquisition

Partner type	Practical role	Commercial arrangement	Expected benefit
Child psychologists	Guidance on student needs and parent concerns	Professional collaboration, not clinical replacement	Stronger service credibility
Parent associations	Awareness campaigns and webinars	Free webinars and educational material	Community access and trust
Education organisations	Joint events, content and inclusive education initiatives	Project-based collaboration	Reputation and visibility

According to digital and B2B marketing research, partnerships enhance customer engagement and drive value. According to Vieira et al. (2019), digital marketing for business-to-business (B2B) relies on management, strategy and relations. According to Salonen et al. (2024), if digital content along the B2B customer journey is delivered at the right time and in the right form, it can support engagement. These partnerships refer to far more than referral arrangements, that much is clear. Webinars, co-created educational content, pilot programs, teacher training, and institutional licenses can also be added. For example, a learning support centre could buy an annual licence from €2,500 for 30 student accounts, with extra student access costing €70 per student per year. This provides the platform with a realistic B2B distribution channel rather than being solely dependent on individual parental subscriptions.

Nonetheless, most partnerships require stewarding. The platform should not collaborate with organizations solely to boost growth. When partnerships are misaligned, they create reputational risk and reduce stakeholder confidence. Since this program caters for special needs students, the credibility and professional standards of all partners are critical. A partner must possess dependable values, expertise, and ability to assist learners. Because of this, each partner must be evaluated according to simple criteria, including professional

qualifications, experience with learning difficulties, ethical standards, quality of communication and compatibility with the values of inclusive education on the platform.

For sustainable supplier involvement in a digital offering the value, trust and coordination must be clear. (Lundin, 2025). Morgan and Hunt (1994) note relationship marketing theory is strongly linked with trust and commitment in a relationship for long- term cooperation. Thus, strategic alliances must be seen as partnerships, not as mere launch promotions. If they are employed correctly, they will add to credibility, lower the cost of customer acquisition and open up the institutional market without compromising service quality.

CHAPTER 5: OPERATIONAL PLAN

5.1 Platform Functionality

The operational plan should demonstrate how the online learning platform business idea will work in practice. The platform must not be perceived as just an online repository of digital material. It should be considered as one that complements the integrated learning environment of students with learning disabilities. All user groups must be effectively catered to by the functionalities of the system that is students, parents, educators and the platform internal team. More than delivering content, the platform value proposition is enhancing accessibility, personalisation, progress monitoring and due after-support. The continuing innovations bring behavioural change. The platform should provide a unique learning profile for every student with essential accessibility features, live online classes, pre-recorded resources along with worksheets, interactive activities, assistive tools and a progress dashboard. Based on the learning profile, being aware of the key concerns, learning preference, extent of assistance required, and aims of each student. Students would listen to live lessons with specialist teachers, while the resources and exercises recorded would allow students to revisit it. Learners with disabilities particularly benefit from the need for repeated presentations and visual prompts and from less pressure to respond.

The features of learning platforms should be based on Universal Design for Learning. CAST (2018) highlighted the need to provide students with choices to stay engaged during classes. In effect, this means that the platform should not offer the same materials to all students. It must have texts, audio, visuals, interactive tasks and alternative ways of completing activities. For instance, a student having trouble with reading might use text-to-speech, while a student having trouble paying attention might have shorter tasks and visuals. Nonetheless, they must not end-up adding innumerable features, which do not serve a clear purpose, as this will only increase cognitive load and decrease usability.

The platform must have progress reports, notifications, communication tools, and guidance materials for parents. The feedback should be clear and easy to understand, not overloaded with technical information. The platform should include lesson planning tools, student notes, adaptation options and access to progress records for educators. According to Hodges et al. (2020), there is a clear distinction between emergency remote teaching and proper

online learning. Moreover, effective online learning entails planning, pedagogical design and support. Therefore, they should not just shift their tutoring online but also plan learning in a structured and evidence-informed way. The platform team considers user management, scheduling, data protection, quality monitoring and technical support essential for operational reliability.

Table 13: Approach for user groups

User group	Main platform functions	Purpose
Students	Live lessons, exercises, assistive tools, progress dashboard	Accessible and personalised learning
Parents	Reports, communication, guidance	Transparency and reassurance
Educators	Lesson tools, student records, adaptation options	Better instructional support
Platform team	User management, data protection, quality control	Operational reliability

The functionality of the platform must balance completeness and usability critically. A learning disability student platform needs to be simple and visually non-overloading and easy to navigate. The competitive advantage of the system will depend not on the number of features that it has, but on whether those features help to learn directly, reduce barriers and create confidence for users.

5.2 Technology Requirements

The platform in question necessitates a technological infrastructure that is reliable, secure, and user-friendly. The main requirements should include responsive web design, access using laptops, tablets and mobile phones, secure login, video-conferencing integration, learning management system functions, cloud hosting, encrypted data storage, learning

analytics, progress monitoring dashboards and accessibility tools. Because the platform will serve different users namely children, parents and specialist educators, and possibly institutional partner, a stable and easy-to-use system will be essential. Because families may have different devices, it is important for technology to be accessible across platforms. To be more user-friendly, parents should be able to check progress reports, teachers and manage appointments from mobile devices. Simultaneously, it may be necessary for students a bigger screen for live lessons, exercises and more. Hence, it must allow maximum flexibility with usability.

For live sessions with educators, video-conferencing integration is necessary. All the same, this feature should not function independently of the learning environment. As a rule, live sessions should be linked to student profiles, lesson notes, learning plans and follow-up tasks. It would ensure continuity in synchronous and asynchronous learning. Effective online teaching depends on course design, assessment, facilitating and evaluating the course, not just the use of video tools (Martin et al. 2019). Learning management system functionalities are also needed, namely the user account system, course arrangement, assignment of material, task tracking and storing of learning resources. Nonetheless, alterations are supposed to be made to these features. Structured design of online learning and consistent support are responsible for creating quality online learning (Martin et al., 2017). Thus, the technical quality must be linked to the educational quality.

Data security is also critical. The platform will process personal and educational data of users including children's learning difficulties which may be a sensitive issue. In order to ensure this, one must integrate secure authentication, access controls, encrypted storage, and data backup from the beginning. In a nutshell, technology can act as a custodian and a risk. Low grade video quality, a confusing navigation, an inaccessible design or weak support system can quickly erode parental trust. Thus, the educational purpose of the platform should determine the technology.

5.3 Human Resources

The human resources design for the proposed platform need planning. Since it offers personalized support, access and specialist educational guidance, it cannot rely on software alone for its value proposition. The essential human resources should consist of specialist educators, designers of educational content, platform administrator, technical support staff,

customer support staff, marketing support and a data protection or compliance advisor. Specialized educators are the most important human resource. Experience in distinctive instruction or online learning is also considered an asset. The assistance and support provided by parents to their children in the learning process is also essential for an effective learning process. Educators should modify their approach to meeting a student's learning disability, not follow a script, as students tend to have different needs. According to Martin et al. (2019), the quality of online teaching depends on design, facilitation, assessment and evaluation. In order to meet this goal educators will require training in not just subject knowledge but also digital pedagogy.

There's also a need for educational content designers, specifically for the early stages. The function would produce informative worksheets, exercise videos, and organized routes for learning. The materials shall follow Universal Design for Learning, which offers different means for students to engage with the content as well as demonstrate the understanding (CAST, 2018). Lacking this function, the platform may become too reliant on individual teachers with the risk of quality inconsistency. The platform administrator would manage user accounts, scheduling, internal processes and communication between different actors. The platform's technical support staff will ensure the platform works properly and that users receive technical help when problems occur. Assistance may be needed by parents regarding bookings and payments, reports or more generally questions. The management of digital communication, campaigns and user acquisition requires marketing support. As the platform will handle data relating to children and education, a compliance advisor is necessary.

Human resources derive value and cost at the same time. The platform's major differentiator is likely to be specialist human support. However, this makes the model expensive and harder to scale up. A generic content platform can grow with relatively low marginal cost but a platform offering live support and personalised feedback depends on qualified people. If the platform cheapens the quality of the educators, it jeopardises its value proposition. Reliance on expert educators may lead to overwhelming costs that will render financially unsustainable. Consequently, the operational model should combine human and technological performance. It is possible to automate many routine processes, such as scheduling and very basic reporting, but the instruction, feedback, and adaptation to learning needs should remain human.

5.4 Service Delivery Process

The course of service delivery should articulate how the platform goes from first contact to learning support and review of progress. A clear process is necessary because parents must know what they are purchasing, while students must receive structured support. Registration and profile creation should be the starting process. A parent sets up an account, fills in some basic child information, indicates the primary learning difficulties, and chooses the type of support needed. The second step is an initial needs assessment. The function of formal diagnosis need not be achieved here. Diagnoses should not occur outside the proper professional limits. Rather, it must assist the platform to learn the learner's present needs, difficulties, strengths and goals. The evaluation may consist of a brief survey, parent feedback, and an initial meeting with a teacher. The result must be a first learning plan.

The matching and planning phase comes third. Based on the learner profile, the platform will be able to recommend a pathway, educator or package of support. Live sessions, asynchronous resources or a mix of the two can be used. The fourth stage is the delivery of learning. Through exercises or tasks between live sessions, students learn alongside their educators. The system to be easy to use and repetitive, as the students with learning disabilities may need more time. The fifth stage entails tracking of progress. The platform should monitor attendance, completed activities, participation, and educator observation. However, monitoring progress should not be mechanical. Data analysis should be done with caution so as to improve support. The sixth stage introduces a review and adjustment. The learning program should be periodically reviewed by the educators and parents. The plan should be modified if the student has difficulties.

Table 14: Service Delivery Process

Stage	Activity	Responsible actor	Expected outcome
1	Registration and profile creation	Parent/platform	Basic learner information
2	Needs assessment	Educator	Initial learning plan

Stage	Activity	Responsible actor	Expected outcome
3	Matching and planning	Platform/educator	Suitable support pathway
4	Learning delivery	Educator/student	Live and asynchronous support
5	Progress monitoring	Platform/educator	Evidence of engagement and progress
6	Review and adjustment	Educator/parent	Improved personalisation

This process has been planned as a service and not some random online teaching. It was argued by Hodges et al. (2020) that online education of high-quality requires their planning and not emergency delivery. In addition, it is important to have support services in an online learning environment as students may need guidance, feedback, and assistance to remain engaged (Pham, Le and Do, 2021). This is particularly relevant for students with extra learning needs. It is important to design the process structured enough to guarantee quality but flexible enough to be suited to individual learners. The process of personalisation will be weakened if it gets too rigid. The inconsistency of the quality of the service may occur if it.

CHAPTER 6: FINANCIAL PLAN

6.1 Cost Structure Analysis

The financial plan must evaluate whether the proposed system is financially feasible. A good place to start is a cost structure that distinguishes start-up costs, fixed operating costs, variable costs and growth costs. Such distinction is key because of the platform's digital infrastructure and specialist human support. Thus, the cost structure is distinct from a simple content site. Among the spending required to get the platform up and running are the design of the platform, initial accessibility design, branding, incorporation of the company, preparation for compliance, initial educational content and launch marketing. Mostly, these are non-recurring expenses that are incurred prior to commencing operations of the platform. The design of the platform is likely to be the biggest use of funds since it must have user profiles, timetabling, live lesson integration, progress dashboards, secure login and access functionality. Original content must also be sufficiently developed at the beginning for the platform to have enough structured material to look credible.

Table 15: Estimated Start-up Costs

Start-up cost item	Estimated cost
Platform development and technical setup	€45,000
Initial accessibility design and testing	Included in platform development
Initial educational content	€15,000
Branding, website presentation and payment setup	€5,000
Legal setup and GDPR compliance	€4,000
Launch marketing campaign	€8,000
Software, equipment and administrative setup	€5,000
Total initial investment	€82,000

Fixed operating costs include hosting, software subscriptions, platform maintenance, administration, marketing and customer support infrastructure. These costs recur no matter how many users are involved. Payments to teachers, customer service time, transaction charges and new learning costs are variable costs. As the platform becomes more popular, these costs will increase. Incorporating sophisticated analytics, enhanced marketing, additional content, and new staff, are growth costs. Business plans must be practical and plausible and not purely optimistic (Barringer, 2015). Many start-ups underestimate the actual cost of quality of service, as per many experts. According to Brigham and Ehrhardt (2020), understanding of profit and financial viability will improve through the separation of costs. Since the platform has fixed costs for technology and variable costs for live support and specialized educators, it has to be sufficiently differentiated.

Table 16: Cost-structure Analysis

Cost category	Examples	Cost behaviour	Estimated amount
Start-up costs	Platform development, branding, initial content, legal setup	One-off	€82,000
Fixed costs, Year 1	Hosting, maintenance, administration, software licences, marketing, support infrastructure	Annual	€126,000
Fixed costs, Year 2	Higher marketing, platform maintenance, administration and content updates	Annual	€158,000
Fixed costs, Year 3	Larger team, stronger marketing, analytics and service expansion	Annual	€210,000
Variable costs	Educator payments, support time, transaction fees	Increase with users	About €156 per active customer/year plus 3% payment fees

Cost category	Examples	Cost behaviour	Estimated amount
Growth costs	Marketing scale-up, advanced analytics, new content	Increase with expansion	Included gradually in Year 2 and Year 3 fixed costs

There are more important costs of the platform than just the technical ones. The expenses incurred in differentiation are real costs because you need specialist educators, adaptable learning material, various parent support quality and data protection. The edtech platform will be very high quality technically, but will not be educationally useful. Ultimately, effective cost control must not compromise the premise embedded in the value of their proposition. The platform must not reduce its prices in ways that will impact the service's accessibility, the quality of its learning, or users' trust, since these are the main reasons for parents choose to use the service.

6.2 Revenue Forecast

The revenue estimates must take account of the hybrid revenue model detailed in the business model. The most important revenue streams include: monthly subscriptions, session packages and future B2B agreement. With a subscription plan that allows for payment per month, a user can access learning materials, assistive tools, and progress tracking. Qualified educators will assist you live on the web in your session packages. Subsequently, business agreements can take the form of institutional licences or bulk access for schools and learning support centres. Do not regard the forecast as certain. Each scenario should be evaluated as a separate case. According to a conservative case, users may be slow to adopt the platform as parents may wait since it is a new service. A supposed realistic scenario envisages growth largely driven by digital marketing, referrals and service quality that is visible. The rosy scenario assumes that faster growth will come from successful partnerships, better retention and good word of mouth.

Table 17: Pricing and Revenue Assumptions

Revenue stream	Price / assumption	Revenue logic
Basic Plan	€29/month	Low-cost access to core learning material and tools
Standard Plan	€49/month	Main subscription plan and expected core offer
Premium Plan	€89/month	Higher-support plan with live sessions included
One-to-one tutoring	€25 per 45-minute session	Extra revenue from users needing additional support
Four-session package	€90/package	Discounted package for regular tutoring
Institutional licence	From €2,500/year	Up to 30 student accounts for schools or centres
Average annual B2C revenue per user	€768/year	Based on subscription revenue plus limited tutoring uptake

Table 18: Revenue Forecast, Realistic Scenario

Year	Average paying users	Subscription and tutoring revenue	Institutional licences	Total revenue
Year 1	120	€92,160	€0	€92,160
Year 2	350	€268,800	€7,500	€276,300
Year 3	700	€537,600	€20,000	€557,600

When pricing their products, sellers or manufacturers should consider customer perception. As stated by Nagle and Müller (2018), pricing should be linked to value. In such a situation, parents may be persuaded to spend more if they are under the impression that specialist assistance would be able to yield measurables and boost learning confidence. The demonstrated value should be clear. Parents will compare prices if they see the platform as another online tutoring service. Nevertheless, the pricing can be justified at a higher level if customers see the service as specialist, accessible and structured.

It is essential to factor uncertainty into revenue forecasting. While there may actually be an educational need for the product, need and payment are not the same. While parents may endorse the concept, they do not purchase for reasons of cost, distrust of online learning or previous negative experiences with providers. The retention of customers is important for revenue. If users churn, the recurring revenue will end up weaker-than-expected. Hence, the forecast should incorporate not just new users, but churn and repeat purchases as well.

Table 19: Scenario-Based Revenue View

Scenario	Main assumption	Year 3 average users	Year 3 estimated revenue
Conservative	Slow adoption and limited brand awareness	400	€317,200
Realistic	Gradual adoption through marketing and referrals	700	€557,600
Optimistic	Strong partnerships and high retention	1,000	€798,000

The platform must not exaggerate initial income from institutional customers. Schools and educational institutions can become profitable B2B clients. Yet, they often take longer to decide due to a longer lead time for building trust and connecting to the educational ecosystem. Revenue from parents through B2C subscriptions is likely more realistic in the early stage, while B2B revenue should be seen as a future growth opportunity. Therefore, the realistic scenario should be used as the base case for the financial plan, while the

conservative and optimistic scenarios should be used mainly to understand financial risk and growth potential.

6.3 Break-even Analysis

The determination of the level of activity required in incurring costs by the proposed platform is known as break-even analysis. This is the point where total revenue equals total costs and the company makes neither profit nor loss (U.S. Small Business Administration, 2024). The calculation system pertaining to this platform primarily relies on fixed costs which take place every month, average revenue obtained per customer and variable costs related to educator time, platform support and transaction costs.

The basic formula is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Break – even number of customers} \\ = \text{Fixed costs} / \text{Contribution margin per customer} \end{aligned}$$

In a realistic early-stage scenario, the platform may have fixed annual costs of €126,000, which equals approximately €10,500 per month. The included items are hosting, software licences, platform maintenance, administration, marketing and customer support infrastructure. The average revenue per customer per month is estimated at €64, based on a blended model consisting of subscriptions and some packages for live sessions. This follows the revenue forecast assumption that the average annual B2C revenue per user is approximately €768. If the average per-customer variable cost is estimated at €15 per month, mainly due to educator payments, support time and transaction fees, the contribution margin will be approximately €49 per customer per month.

Table 20: Break-even Analysis

Item	Estimated amount
Fixed annual costs	€126,000
Fixed monthly costs	€10,500
Average revenue per customer/month	€64
Variable cost per customer/month	€15

Item	Estimated amount
Contribution margin per customer/month	€49
Break-even customers	215 customers

Based on these assumptions, the platform would need around 215 active paying customers per month to break even. Achieving this target will take some doing, but is not impossible if the platform works towards earning parent trust through referrals, digital marketing and partnerships with educators/learning centres. The revenue forecast indicates that the average of 120 paying users in Year 1 would not be enough to be profitable; however, the Year 2 target of 350 average paying users would allow it to move above break-even. As a result, the business is likely to undergo pressure on finances in the first year, but can become viable operationally if more customers are acquired and retained in the second year.

Even so the break-even point does not indicate success for the firm. If the platform compromises on the quality of educators or restricts features that enhance accessibility only to get 215 customers, it can destroy the differentiating value proposition. To the same effect, if excesses use low-cost subscriptions without live support, revenue could be hindered going forward. Consequently, it is important to measure break-even alongside retention, learning outcomes and parent assurance. The aim should not merely be to break even, but must also ascertain the financial viability of the platform whilst maintaining its educational credibility.

6.4 Financial Sustainability

The financial sustainability refers to its ability to continue operating and improving over time. The sustainability of the proposed platform will depend upon its repeat revenues, customer retention, costs, scalability of technology and revenue diversification. When customers view a monthly charge as valuable, it can create a more reliable income stream. More users can be leveraged for income by way of session packages that need such. Nonetheless, the number of educators and the expenses involved can restrict this in the future. Although it may take time to foster B2B partnerships, they lead to greater stability. Brigham and Ehrhardt (2020) asserted that effective management of cost, revenue and cash flow leads to financial sustainability. Business plans should have realistic financials,

according to Barringer (2015) The assumption of growth cannot be the only reason that this platform is financially sustainable. It should rely on careful cost control, gradual scaling, and strong retention.

Table 21: Cash-flow Forecast and Project Evaluation

Item	Initial investment	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
Revenue	-	€92,160	€276,300	€557,600
Fixed costs	-	€126,000	€158,000	€210,000
Variable costs	-	€21,485	€62,889	€125,928
Operating cash flow before tax	-	-€55,325	€55,411	€221,672
Tax-adjusted cash flow	-€82,000	-€55,325	€43,221	€172,904

Based on these assumptions, the platform is expected to face a negative cash flow in Year 1, mainly because the average number of paying users is still below the break-even point. In Year 2, the business becomes more stable, while Year 3 shows stronger cash generation due to a larger customer base and the first meaningful contribution of institutional licences. Using a discount rate of 10%, the net present value of the project is estimated at approximately €33,330. The internal rate of return is estimated at approximately 20.8%, while the payback period is approximately 2.5 years. These indicators suggest that the project can be financially viable, but only if user growth, retention and cost control follow the realistic scenario.

Table 22: Investment Evaluation Indicators

Indicator	Estimated result	Interpretation
Initial investment	€82,000	Required before launch
Discount rate	10%	Used for NPV calculation
Net Present Value	€33,330	Positive value, indicating potential viability

Indicator	Estimated result	Interpretation
Internal Rate of Return	20.8%	Higher than the assumed discount rate
Payback period	About 2.5 years	Investment is recovered during Year 3

The major challenge pertaining to sustainability is affordability versus quality. The platform caters to families that may already be paying for tutoring, therapy or similar support. If the prices are very high, the platform may potentially shut out some users and compromise its inclusivity mission. If pricing is too low, the platform might not be able to pay specialist educators properly or maintain effective support. Thus, price should reflect both social viability and operational excellence. Pricing should be related to value, according to Nagle and Müller (2018). Accordingly, the platform should not primarily seek to compete as a low-cost alternative. It should instead explain why its service is valuable: specialist teachers, accessible design, structured learning, progress tracking and parent support. Nevertheless, outcomes must provide evidence of value. When parents do not notice any progress taking place, they will eventually stop paying for the platform, even if it is well designed.

Sustainability is also supported through diversification. First, the platform would essentially rely on parental subscriptions and session packages. In the medium term, institutional partnerships, school licences and learning centre packages can be added. This decreases dependence on a single income source. Diversification should be done gradually. Expanding too much in the name of growth may add complexity and cost. Ensuring financial sustainability is not merely an issue of numbers, but also of governance. It is strategic and ethical. The platform must be commercially sustainable without compromising its accessibility objectives. The most robust financial framework would be one that scales up over time, keeps a close watch on spending, maintains quality and builds retention based on trust.

CHAPTER 7: RISK ANALYSIS

7.1 Market Risks

Risk analysis is needed as the market of the new platform is attractive but uncertain. According to ISO (2018), risk management is a systematic approach to risk identification, risk assessment and risk response. The key market risks for this platform include low uptake by parents, skepticism regarding online learning for students with learning disabilities, existing competitors, low-cost alternatives, and uncertain willingness to pay.

Accepting the danger is first. Even when parents recognize the need extra help, though, they may continue to forgo using an online site. Concerns surrounding the efficacy of online applications and their effect on children might make people wary of them. Parents are not purchasing mere digital tools; they are making a matter of choice for child education. This holds significance. Therefore, credibility carries as much weight as visibility. The danger of rivalry comes second. The platform will be launched in a crowded edtech market featuring online tutoring services, digital literacy tools, assistive tech and learning aids. When the value is not clear or integrated, then it compares purely with price. The third risk relates to the willingness to pay. The requirement of payment does not automatically arise from educational need. Some families may choose free resources, school assistance, or conventional tutoring. Consequently, the said platform will have evidence-based content, trial class, open communication and measurable outcomes to mitigate risk.

7.2 Operational Risks

Operational risks refer to the risks that hamper the uninterrupted channel of the platform. Improvements are most often needed in lesson quality, educator management, support, customer service, student engagement and progress monitoring. Within this business, such risks carry a serious threat as they impact parents' trust and user retention.

Technical breakdowns are one of the chief operational risks. When live sessions don't work, users can't log in, or dashboards are confusing, parents will quickly lose confidence. As the fraud prevention technology platform is predicated on digital delivery, it has a strong demand for reliability, cybersecurity and resilience. According to NIST (2024), it is crucial to identify, protect, detect, respond and recover in managing cyber security. This is important

as the platform will be processing personal and educational data. Another risk is the unpredictable quality of education. As per Hodges et al. (2020), an online learning experience must be designed properly and underpinned by appropriate support. Martin et al. (2019) claim that learning design (course design, assessment, facilitation and evaluation). Necessary are educator guidelines, training and quality monitoring. Student engagement has been addressed, in large part, because students with learning disabilities may be less motivated or attentive. In general, it is crucial to view operational reliability as part of the value proposition and not as a back-office problem.

7.3 Financial Risks

Financial risks refer to the uncertainty of the platform's not bringing in the expected revenue or costing more than expected. A key risk for any company undertaking a complex and costly platform development project is that pre-deployment demand is weak and initial sales are low. Other risks include high costs of customer acquisition, low retention, late institutional revenue and cash flow pressure. As the technology is being integrated with specialists' human support, the financial risk must be carefully looked at. Barringer (2015) states that realistic assumptions are to form a business plan. Overestimating customer adoption and underestimating costs often occurs to start-ups which is critical. The project may face higher than anticipated costs for technology development and accessibility design, data protection, marketing and educator recruitment. If not managed appropriately, the expenses may lead to a need for higher funds.

One more financial risk is revenue uncertainty. Parents may not turn into customers even if they show interest. Members can opt to cancel their subscription if they are not experiencing progress. While the sessions of live packages may result in revenue generation, they also entail a variable cost. The volume of sales does not mean higher profit always. According to Brigham and Ehrhardt (2020), one must deal with cost structures, cash flows and profitability. Due to incurring costs before earning enough revenue, the platform may experience cash flow constraints. Customer acquisition expenses are important information as well. When a platform is reliant on paid advertising, it can get expensive to acquire customers. A low customer lifetime value is a serious risk. Also, while a school or learning centre B2B revenue could be extremely attractive, these contracts take a long time to close. Holding up income from B2B clients could mean there's a disconnect in cash in.

The major financial risk is the trade-off between quality and price sensitivity. Due to tight family budgets, the platform needs specialist educators and robust tech. A low price may mean low quality. If the pricing is too high, the adoption gets limited. The affordability, perceived value and cost control must be balanced for it to be financially sustainable.

7.4 Legal and Ethical Issues

Because it will deal with children and process educational information, the proposed platform has legal and ethical issues at its core. Data safety is the most important legal issue. The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) offered primarily the legal basis for personal data processing in the context of Europe. The service must guarantee that processing is lawful. It must also guarantee that consent is clear and the purpose is limited. Further, it must also guarantee that there is data minimisation, suitable and secure storage, and respect users' rights including, access and deletion wherever applicable. Because the platform has children at its core, data protection must be especially protected. According to the UNESCO IITE (2020) protecting personal data in online learning environments requires a mix of technical, organisational and educational measures. According to UNICEF (2024), children's data requires specific protection since children may not completely understand the data collection and usage process. Since they may uncover sensitive information regarding a child's learning difficulties, progress tracking, learning profiles, and educator notes are relevant for the proposed platform.

According to the Data Protection Commission (2021), data processing should be child oriented. In other words, the platform shouldn't merely produce a privacy policy to defend legally. Privacy protections should be designed in a manner that is understandable to parents and children, where appropriate. The information gathered must only be limited and necessary for education purposes. The platform should not collect too much behavioural data just because it's easy to do so. Datafication is also an ethical issue to contend with. Nottingham (2022) claims that education in a datafied world raises issues around children's rights and institutional requirements. Tracking children's learning might help with their learning, but it can actually pose risks and misinterpretation or overuse of the data derived from tracking can lead mislead the child. The platform should not quantify learning using numbers. The evaluation of educators and interaction with guardians should still be a significant factor.

The ethics of marketing matter as well. It should never pledge to “cure” learning disabilities or provide instant fixes. This is misleading and harmful claim. The ethical way is to inform clients that they will receive structured assistance, accessibility, confidence and gradual development. To some extent, legal and moral issues do not obstruct the business model; rather it is conditions of trust.

7.5 Risk Mitigation Strategies

Risk mitigation shouldn’t be seen as a one-time exercise but as a continuous process. Risk management is defined as the continuous process of identifying, evaluating treatment and monitoring. ISO (2018) The platform mentioned above should provide solutions to market, operational, financial, legal and ethical risks.

Table 23: Risk Mitigation Strategies

Risk category	Main risk	Mitigation strategy
Market	Low adoption	Trial sessions, parent education, trusted referrals
Operational	Poor service quality	Educator training, quality standards, feedback loops
Financial	Weak cash flow	Conservative forecasting, phased scaling, cost monitoring
Legal/data	GDPR breach	Data minimisation, consent, encryption, access controls
Ethical	Overpromising outcomes	Transparent communication and realistic claims

Conducting trials for free or at low cost, producing informative content and having a parent webinar, and recommendations from trusted sources can lower market risk. Through these methods, parents can understand the services before committing them for a longer period. Regular feedback loops, technical validation, user assistance, standardization of services,

and improving teacher competence may contribute towards mitigation of operational risk. It must also monitor student engagement as well as parent satisfaction. Conservative forecasting, timely investment, and cost management can help to limit financial risk. Before it has proof of retention and willingness to pay, the platform should avoid scaling too soon. Risk of legal and data can be mitigated through privacy-by-design and data collection procedures, encryption, and access control mechanisms. Exaggerated marketing and poor communication of learning progress are two ways in which ethical risk could be lowered.

It is important that risks cannot be completely eradicated. A platform catering to special needs students will always carry uncertainty around adoption, outcomes, cost and trust. Nonetheless, if the platform expands progressively; safeguards information; supervises quality and is down-to-earth about what it can actually offer, the risks can be managed. In this case, risk analysis should not be treated merely as a defence. One way to improve the business model is to compel the platform to align educational quality with financial viability and ethical responsibility.

CHAPTER 8: METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONNAIRE

8.1 Research Design

This chapter analyses the acceptance of the designed system through a short questionnaire directed to potential users and buyers of the system. The research was descriptive and quantitative in nature. The study used an online questionnaire to find out teachers' attitudes, educational needs, willingness to use the platform and willingness to pay for the service that supports students with learning disabilities. The purpose was not to demonstrate causation, but to identify what demand may already be out there or user expectations which may support the business plan.

A quantitative design was suitable since it enabled the collection of comparable responses from a larger cohort of participants. When a researcher wishes to quantify various trends, attitudes, or preferences through usable and statistical techniques, quantitative research becomes useful (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). In this case, the questionnaire generated relevant market information regarding satisfaction with the current support, prior experience with online learning, perception of usefulness of proposed platform and pricing models preferences. The market is a common use of questionnaire tools. They will help the organization gain supportive information for market evaluation and pricing decision (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2023). Nevertheless, the investigation was exploratory. Because the platform has yet to launch, the survey gauged interest in and not actual purchase behaviour. Therefore, the results should be seen as preliminary market indications not as any confirmation of later revenue.

8.2 Questionnaire Development

The survey was designed to be short, simple and practical so that they would take around three to five minutes to answer. The overall survey had six sections namely, general info; existing educational support; present online learning experiences; interest in the platform; price; and other comments. The arrangement of the study was such that the profile of the respondent leads towards the existing problem and then towards the perceived value of the solution.

The first section asked some basic details including role of respondent, age group, age of child and whether the child was diagnosed for the learning difficulty. This exercise helped in identifying if the answers came mainly from parents or teachers or other relevant ones. In the follow-up research, respondents were asked if the child is receiving extra education (for instance, special needs education) and how satisfied they are with that extra education. The research finding is important as the business idea relies on the assumption that current support is not sufficient. The third segment examined previous experience with online learning platforms and possible concerns, such as loss of personal contact, costs, technical issues and data privacy. These are important items as perception of incorporation would depend on not only the benefits of the platform but also barrier and doubts. The fourth section ascertained the interest in the proposed platform after the respondents were given a brief description of the service. The fifth section looked at willingness to pay and preferred model, which supports the financial assumptions directly of the business plan.

To design a good questionnaire, the first step would be to make it clear and simple. In addition, unnecessary respondent burden can be avoided (Dillman, Smyth and Christian, 2014). The majority of inquiries posed were closed-ended as a result of this. Questions assessing satisfaction and perceived usefulness were measured on a Likert-type scale as these scales are suitable for capturing attitudes and degrees of agreement or evaluation (Sullivan and Artino, 2013). A five-point scale was chosen because it is easy for non-specialist respondents to complete (Taherdoost, 2022). Like any research tool, the questionnaire also has its limitations. The respondents may have their responses influenced if the description of the platform is overwhelmingly positive. To mitigate this risk, the description must be objective and must not make unrealistic promises. While the questionnaire can gauge user interest, it cannot penetrate deeper issues or emotional considerations surrounding the stated behaviour of parents when required to pay.

8.3 Sample Description

There are 72 respondents in the dataset. The individuals taking part in the study were mostly parents but also those who were teachers and professionals with a particular interest in or experience with learning support. Out of the total, 48 respondents, or 66.7%, were parents while 24 respondents or 33.3% were teachers or other. This distribution has been chosen for this business plan as parents are the expected payers. And teachers and professionals are the

expected users, influencers or future partners. The sampling technique of purposive and convenient sampling was used. It indicates that the respondents were chosen because they were relevant to the subject matter of the study. Plus, they were easily accessible to the researcher. Sampling for exploratory research is fairly common where the aim is not to become statistically representative but to gain some early insight (Bryman, 2016; Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2023). Nevertheless, it is evident that the sample cannot be regarded as representative of all parents, teachers or students with learning disabilities. It provides useful evidence of early market activity, but not market measurement.

Table 24: Sample profile

Sample characteristic	Result
Total respondents	72
Parents	48 / 66.7%
Teachers or other professionals	24 / 33.3%
Children aged 6–9	18 / 25.0%
Children aged 10–12	27 / 37.5%
Children aged 13–15	20 / 27.8%
Children aged 16–18	7 / 9.7%
Diagnosed learning difficulty	49 / 68.1%
No diagnosis / not sure	23 / 31.9%

The age distribution shows that the bulk of children are between the ages of 10 and 15, which would sit well with the platform’s focus on primary and lower secondary education. The sample was relevant for the target market as 68.1% of the respondents stated that they had a learning difficulty diagnosis. Nonetheless, it is beneficial to have respondents who do not have or are unsure of their diagnosis as many families may seek support prior to or without a formal diagnosis.

8.4 Data Analysis

Descriptive statistical analyses such as frequencies, percentages and mean scores were used to analyse the data. The method adopted seemed to be appropriate as the study was exploratory and descriptive in nature and not predictive or causative. The analysis aimed at understanding patterns in existing support, platform acceptance, feature preferences and pricing expectations. The study used percentages for closed-ended questions. The analysis, for instance, looked at how many respondents had used an online learning platform before, how many would think about using the proposed platform and which features were deemed most essential. Mean scores were calculated for Likert-type questions (for example, satisfaction with currently available educational support, usefulness of the proposed platform). Means of Likert-type data should be interpreted cautiously. However, they can provide useful summary information when used together with frequency distributions and the context in which it is used (Sullivan and Artino, 2013).

Table 25: Key descriptive indicators

Variable	Result
Satisfaction with current support	Mean = 2.8/5
Usefulness of proposed platform	Mean = 4.3/5
Likelihood of using platform	Mean = 3.9/5
Previous use of online learning platform	41.7% yes
Would consider using such platform	83.3% yes/maybe

The outcomes imply existing support leaves users moderately dissatisfied and a favorable inclination towards the proposed platform. However, one must be careful in interpreting these results. Though a high usefulness score does not guarantee that respondents are willing to pay. Likewise, the explicit readiness to engage with a platform may be clouded by the concept just sounding good. According to Creswell and Creswell (2018), quantitative findings should be interpreted in terms of the purpose and limitations of the research design.

In this instance, the information is beneficial for business planning but cannot substitute for a pilot test with actual usage and payment behaviour.

8.5 Key Findings

Participants are only moderately satisfied with their current support for education is an important finding. The average score for satisfaction is 2.8 out of 5. This indicates that current support is not described as completely ineffective but there is certainly scope of improvement. The conclusion contributes to the business case for a more structured and accessible site. The literature shows that students with learning disabilities must have appropriate structure, guidance and accommodations to access online learning, rather than just simple access to content (Petretto et al., 2021). The second finding was positive acceptance towards the proposed platform. The average usefulness score for the service/platform is 4.3 out of 5 and 83.3% of the people surveyed specifically declared that they would use such a platform or might consider doing so. It shows that there is market interest, indicating parents and professionals are appreciating the value of individualised online support. Nonetheless, this shouldn't be interpreted to mean guaranteed demand. The outcome indicates they are open to this idea, but not buying.

The third finding relates to features of platforms that they preferred. Some features that users appreciated the most were personalised learning plans (70.8%), live sessions with educators (66.7%), progress tracking (61.1%), flexible scheduling (45.8%) and communication with teachers (43.1%). This is vital since it indicates that respondents do not merely want more online material. They attach importance to personalisation, human support, and measurable progress. This lends support for the platform's proposed hybrid model (which combines asynchronous resources with educator led support). The pricing sensitivity is the fourth finding. The outcomes indicated that 18.1% will pay less than €20 per month, 38.9% will pay €20–40, 30.6% will pay €40–60, 9.7% will pay €60–80 and just 2.7% will pay more than €80. It follows that the platform must remain affordable yet have enough revenue generation to support quality. This goes in tandem with what Teece (2010) said about a business model created to capture value must also create the same over a prolonged period. If the pricing of the platform is too high, it may see limited adoption. Low pricing may lead to sufferings of educational quality.

CHAPTER 9: CONCLUSIONS

9.1 Summary of Findings

This research project investigated the design of an online platform to help disabled students. The main finding indicates that there is both educational and business opportunity in the region. Despite the increase in the use of e-learning devices, the existing e-learning tools mainly remain generic and content-driven. Moreover, they are not quite well suited to the needs of students with learning disabilities. Thus, the main necessity is not more online learning but better online learning which is accessible and personal, with structured support and measurable progress.

Chapter 1 has set the business concept and argued that the proposed platform reacts to a clear gap in the market. The platform is primarily designed to offer accessible and personalised online learning support, aided by specialist educators and progress tracking. According to Chapter 2, the market need is meaningful, because students with ‘learning disabilities’ make up a sufficiently large set that is also sufficiently diverse. Further, the needs of this group tend to remain largely unaddressed. Moreover, it also revealed that competitor offerings are generally disparate and typically focus on literacy, numeracy or assistive tools.

Chapter 3 utilized Business Model Canvas to illustrate value creation, delivery and capture by the platform. A well-defined value proposition, targeted customers, efficient channels, trust-based relationships, hybrid revenues, specialist resources and credible partners makes a good business model. Chapter 4 showed that marketing strategy should focus on trust, credibility, evidence-based communication and not aggressive promotional claim. The significance of this matter stems from the fact that parents are opting for their children’s education, rather than merely buying a digital thing.

Implementation, financial planning and risk management are vital according to chapters 5-7. It is necessary to have reliable technology, specialist human resources, planned service delivery, realistic financial assumptions and strong safeguards around data protection and ethical communication. Lastly, Chapter 8 presented questionnaire-based evidence of positive initial interest for the platform, particularly for personalized learning plans, live sessions and progress tracking. However, the research also revealed price sensitivity, which

shows that the business model needs to be affordable yet beneficial. Consequently, the thesis indicates that the platform has a robust conceptual foundation, but success is not automatic. Execution, trust and service quality matter; so do measurable outcomes and financials.

9.2 Business Viability

Under certain conditions, the proposed platform can be considered potentially viable. There are four elements that support the feasibility of the proposal. They are a compelling market need, a differentiating value proposition, a hybrid revenue model and the imbibing of trust-based relationships between parents, educators, and institutions. There is a strong market need and demand for learning content as students with learning disabilities need more. Accessible interfaces, structured learning pathways, individualised feedback, assistive tools and human guidance are often required. The suggested platform meets this need by combining technology with specialist educational assistance. As a result, this makes the value proposition much stronger than just an online tutoring service or any learning platform.

Viability is also strengthened by the hybrid revenue model. One can earn through a monthly subscription which brings in recurring income and can earn additional revenue from those who want live sessions. A potential collaboration with schools / learning centres for B2B partnerships could see further growth in the future. It is imperative to rely on this flexibility as the families will have different needs and willingness to pay. This type of business does involve risks. The principal dilemma is achieving quality at an affordable price. The development of the platform will need specialists' educators, accessible design, data protection and customer support. Such components add to expenses. The survey results indicate that many families are sensitive to pricing at the same time. Hence, the platform must offer more than just high pricing. It has to prove its worth through progress, trust and quality of service.

According to Teece (2010), value-creating business models should also capture value. The central challenge here is that. A platform that offers educational value will not be sustainable if it cannot cover its costs. When cost reduction is overly aggressive and harms support quality, differentiation will diminish. A simple approach is to launch a viable but highly credible service, i.e., a dedicated user segment, a simple but credible technical platform, a small group of qualified educators, a limited set of high-quality learning resources, and

gradual scaling after pilot testing. Thus, the platform is practical as a cautious and staged business idea, not as a massive launch. Whether or not its success will depend on if it can turn interest into paid use, retention and show meaningful learning benefit.

9.3 Future Recommendations

The first recommendation is to initiate a small test run before launching in the entire market. A limited group of students, parents and educators should be involved in the pilot. It should allow the platform to test usability, pricing, communication, learning pathways and progress reporting. It is important because answers to questionnaires show interest, but actual use of the platform is needed to test behaviour, satisfaction and willingness to pay. Another suggestion is to establish evidence-based credibility. The platform must gather information pertaining to engagement, satisfaction, completed tasks and learning progress. This ought to be completed scrupulously and ethically. Learning decisions should be guided by progress data, not by endless monitoring. Given that the service relates to children data protection must be built into the business model.

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) calls for the processing of personal data to be lawfully as well as transparent and limited (European Parliament and Council of the European Union, 2016). Also, child-oriented data protection guidance highlights that children require special protection in a digital environment (Data Protection Commission, 2021). The Irish DPC indicates that when processing data with children on the focus, this must consider the specific vulnerabilities and awareness of the child on the data-related risks.

The third recommendation is to gradually develop partnerships. To begin with, the platform should aim for B2C users, primarily parents. In the second stage, it may deal with schools, learning support centres, special educators and child development professionals. Strategic collaborations can boost referrals, reinforce credentials, and enhance B2B earnings, provided that the selected partner is pertinent. The next recommendation is to have realistic communication. The platform must not promise quick fix for learning disabilities. The soul of education refers to structured support, easily accessible input, confidence building and gradual progress achieved through education. It is both more ethical and safer to be sustainable for brand trust.

Ultimately, future studies must work with a larger sample and, preferably, data from pilot implementation. The business plan would thereby assess usage, satisfaction, and retention and willingness to pay as opposed to merely stated interest. The proposed platform is potentially a good educational or business idea but can only be successful in the long term if it transforms the promise of accessible, personalised learning into a safe, ethical and financially viable service.

References

- Akpen, C.N., Asaolu, S., Atobatele, S., Okagbue, H. and Sampson, S. (2024) 'Impact of online learning on student's performance and engagement: a systematic review', *Discover Education*, 3, Article 205.
- Almeqdad, Q.I., Alodat, A.M., Alquraan, M.F., Mohaidat, M.A. and Al-Makhzoomy, A.K. (2023) 'The effectiveness of universal design for learning: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *Cogent Education*, 10(1), Article 2218191.
- American Psychiatric Association (n.d.) What are specific learning disorders? Available at: <https://www.psychiatry.org/patients-families/specific-learning-disorder/what-is-specific-learning-disorder> (Accessed: 10 June 2026).
- Amit, R. and Zott, C. (2001) 'Value creation in e-business', *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), pp. 493–520.
- Atanga, C., Jones, B.A., Krueger, L.E. and Lu, S. (2020) 'Teachers of students with learning disabilities: Assistive technology knowledge, perceptions, interests, and barriers', *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 35(4), pp. 236–248.
- Baden-Fuller, C. and Haefliger, S. (2013) 'Business models and technological innovation', *Long Range Planning*, 46(6), pp. 419–426.
- Barney, J. (1991) 'Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage', *Journal of Management*, 17(1), pp. 99–120.
- Barringer, B.R. (2015) *Preparing Effective Business Plans: An Entrepreneurial Approach*. 2nd edn. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Brigham, E.F. and Ehrhardt, M.C. (2020) *Financial Management: Theory and Practice*. 16th edn. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
- Bryman, A. (2016) *Social Research Methods*. 5th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- CAST (2018) *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. Wakefield, MA: CAST.
- Chaffey, D. and Ellis-Chadwick, F. (2022) *Digital Marketing: Strategy, Implementation and Practice*. 8th edn. Harlow: Pearson.

- Choi, G.W. and Seo, J.Y. (2024) 'Accessibility, usability, and universal design for learning: Discussion of three key LX/UX elements for inclusive learning design', *TechTrends*, 68(5), pp. 936–945.
- Cinquin, P.-A., Guitton, P. and Sauzéon, H. (2019) 'Online e-learning and cognitive disabilities: A systematic review', *Computers & Education*, 130, pp. 152–167.
- Creswell, J.W. and Creswell, J.D. (2018) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 5th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Cumming, T.M. and Rose, M.C. (2022) 'Exploring universal design for learning as an accessibility tool in higher education: a review of the current literature', *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 49(5), pp. 1025–1043.
- Data Protection Commission (2021) *Children Front and Centre: Fundamentals for a Child-Oriented Approach to Data Processing*. Dublin: Data Protection Commission.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D. and Christian, L.M. (2014) *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. 4th edn. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Dwivedi, Y.K., Ismagilova, E., Hughes, D.L., Carlson, J., Filieri, R., Jacobson, J. et al. (2021) 'Setting the future of digital and social media marketing research: Perspectives and research propositions', *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, Article 102168.
- Dyer, J.H. and Singh, H. (1998) 'The relational view: cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage', *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), pp. 660–679.
- Dynamo Maths (n.d.) *Free trial or buy now*. Available at: <https://dynamomaths.co.uk> (Accessed: 31 March 2026).
- European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2022) *Inclusive digital education*. Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union (2016) *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, and repealing Directive 95/46/EC*. *Official Journal of the European Union*, L119, pp. 1–88.

Eurostat (2025) *Disability statistics – access to education and training*. Luxembourg: European Commission.

Everway (n.d.) *Read&Write features*. Available at: <https://www.everway.com> (Accessed: 1 April 2026).

Fernández-Batanero, J.M., Montenegro-Rueda, M., Fernández-Cerero, J. and García-Martínez, I. (2022) ‘Assistive technology for the inclusion of students with disabilities: a systematic review’, *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 70(5), pp. 1911–1930.

Friedman, M.G. and Bryen, D.N. (2007) ‘Web accessibility design recommendations for people with cognitive disabilities’, *Technology and Disability*, 19(4), pp. 205–212.

Gassmann, O., Frankenberger, K. and Csik, M. (2014) *The Business Model Navigator*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: FT Press.

Gulati, R. (1998) ‘Alliances and networks’, *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(4), pp. 293–317.

Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) (2025) Surveys on Pre-Primary and Primary Education (Kindergartens and Primary Schools): End of school year 2022/2023. Available at: <https://www.statistics.gr/documents/20181/b592c07e-35a9-c638-f38d-c23227285dea> (Accessed: 12 June 2026).

Hellenic Statistical Authority (ELSTAT) (2026) Surveys on Secondary General and Vocational Education: End of school year 2023/2024. Available at: <https://www.statistics.gr/documents/20181/14042444-2b8d-8eed-0530-d602bb163735> (Accessed: 12 June 2026).

Herhausen, D., Miočević, D., Morgan, R.E. and Kleijnen, M.H.P. (2020) ‘The digital marketing capabilities gap’, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 90, pp. 276–290.

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T. and Bond, A. (2020) ‘The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning’, *EDUCAUSE Review*.

Hollebeek, L.D. and Macky, K. (2019) ‘Digital content marketing’s role in fostering consumer engagement, trust, and value: Framework, fundamental propositions, and implications’, *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 45, pp. 27–41.

- Homburg, C., Jozić, D. and Kuehnl, C. (2017) 'Customer experience management: toward implementing an evolving marketing concept', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(3), pp. 377–401.
- ISO (2018) *ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management — Guidelines*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- Johnson, M.W., Christensen, C.M. and Kagermann, H. (2008) 'Reinventing your business model', *Harvard Business Review*, 86(12), pp. 50–59.
- Kannan, P.K. and Li, H.A. (2017) 'Digital marketing: a framework, review and research agenda', *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 34(1), pp. 22–45.
- Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. (2010) 'Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of social media', *Business Horizons*, 53(1), pp. 59–68.
- Keller, K.L. and Swaminathan, V. (2020) *Strategic Brand Management: Building, Measuring, and Managing Brand Equity*. 5th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Kotler, P., Keller, K.L. and Chernev, A. (2022) *Marketing Management*. 16th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Kurzweil Educational Systems (n.d.) *Text-to-speech solutions*. Available at: <https://www.kurzweilededu.com> (Accessed: 30 March 2026).
- Lemon, K.N. and Verhoef, P.C. (2016) 'Understanding customer experience throughout the customer journey', *Journal of Marketing*, 80(6), pp. 69–96.
- Lexia Learning (n.d.) *Dyslexia solutions*. Available at: <https://www.lexialearning.com> (Accessed: 28 March 2026).
- Lundin, L. (2025) 'Customer engagement strategies for digital offerings: An empirical study of B2B suppliers', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 131, pp. 46–57. Η καταχώριση αυτή επιβεβαιώνεται ως άρθρο του 2025 στο *Industrial Marketing Management*.
- Magretta, J. (2002) 'Why business models matter', *Harvard Business Review*, 80(5), pp. 86–92.

- Market Data Forecast (2026) Europe Online Learning Market Size, Share and Analysis, 2034. Available at: <https://www.marketdataforecast.com/market-reports/europe-online-learning-market> (Accessed: 14 June 2026).
- Martin, F., Polly, D., Jokiahio, A. and May, B. (2017) 'Global standards for enhancing quality in online learning', *Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 18(2), pp. 1–10.
- Martin, F., Ritzhaupt, A., Kumar, S. and Budhrani, K. (2019) 'Award-winning faculty online teaching practices: Course design, assessment and evaluation, and facilitation', *The Internet and Higher Education*, 42, pp. 34–43.
- McNicholl, A., Casey, H., Desmond, D. and Gallagher, P. (2021) 'The impact of assistive technology use for students with disabilities in higher education: a systematic review', *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*, 16(2), pp. 130–143.
- Morgan, R.M. and Hunt, S.D. (1994) 'The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 58(3), pp. 20–38.
- Nagle, T.T. and Müller, G. (2018) *The Strategy and Tactics of Pricing: A Guide to Growing More Profitably*. 6th edn. New York: Routledge.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2024) *Students with disabilities*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Institute of Standards and Technology (2024) *The NIST Cybersecurity Framework (CSF) 2.0*. Gaithersburg, MD: National Institute of Standards and Technology.
- Nessy (n.d.) *Pricing information*. Available at: <https://www.nessy.com> (Accessed: 7 April 2026).
- Nottingham, E. (2022) 'Education in a datafied world: Balancing children's rights and school's responsibilities in the age of COVID-19', *Computer Law & Security Review*, 45, Article 105664.
- OECD (2023) *OECD Digital Education Outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Osterwalder, A. and Pigneur, Y. (2010) *Business Model Generation*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

- Osterwalder, A., Pigneur, Y., Bernarda, G. and Smith, A. (2014) *Value Proposition Design*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Palmatier, R.W., Dant, R.P., Grewal, D. and Evans, K.R. (2006) 'Factors influencing the effectiveness of relationship marketing: a meta-analysis', *Journal of Marketing*, 70(4), pp. 136–153.
- Payne, A., Frow, P. and Eggert, A. (2017) 'The customer value proposition: evolution, development, and application in marketing', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 45(4), pp. 467–489.
- Payne, A.F., Storbacka, K. and Frow, P. (2008) 'Managing the co-creation of value', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), pp. 83–96.
- Perelmutter, B., McGregor, K.K. and Gordon, K.R. (2017) 'Assistive technology interventions for adolescents and adults with learning disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *Computers & Education*, 114, pp. 139–163.
- Petretto, D.R., Carta, S.M., Cataudella, S., Masala, I., Mascia, M.L., Penna, M.P., Piras, P., Pistis, I. and Masala, C. (2021) 'The use of distance learning and e-learning in students with learning disabilities', *Clinical Practice & Epidemiology in Mental Health*, 17, pp. 92–102.
- Pham, A.T.V., Kieu, N. and Vu, T.T.T. (2021) 'Student support services in an online learning environment', in *Proceedings of the 2021 5th International Conference on E-Society, E-Education and E-Technology*. New York: Association for Computing Machinery, pp. 93–97.
- Porter, M.E. (1985) *Competitive Advantage*. New York: Free Press.
- Ramasundaram, A., Pandey, N., Shukla, Y., Alavi, S. and Wirtz, J. (2023) 'Fluidity and the customer experience in digital platform ecosystems', *International Journal of Information Management*, 69, Article 102599.
- Reichheld, F.F. and Scheffer, P. (2000) 'E-loyalty: your secret weapon on the web', *Harvard Business Review*, 78(4), pp. 105–113.
- Ritter, T. and Pedersen, C.L. (2020) 'Digitization capability and the digitalization of business models in business-to-business firms: Past, present, and future', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 86, pp. 180–190.

- Ritz, W., Wolf, M. and McQuitty, S. (2019) 'Digital marketing adoption and success for small businesses: The application of the do-it-yourself and technology acceptance models', *Journal of Research in Interactive Marketing*, 13(2), pp. 179–203.
- Rohn, D., Bican, P.M., Brem, A., Kraus, S. and Clauss, T. (2021) 'Digital platform-based business models – An exploration of critical success factors', *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 60, Article 101625.
- Salonen, A., Mero, J., Munnukka, J., Zimmer, M. and Karjaluoto, H. (2024) 'Digital content marketing on social media along the B2B customer journey: The effect of timely content delivery on customer engagement', *Industrial Marketing Management*, 118, pp. 12–26.
- Saunders, M.N.K., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2023) *Research Methods for Business Students*. 9th edn. Harlow: Pearson.
- Shard, Kumar, D. and Koul, S. (2024) 'Digital transformation in higher education: A comprehensive review of e-learning adoption', *Human Systems Management*, 43(4), pp. 433–454.
- Sjödin, D., Parida, V., Jovanovic, M. and Visnjic, I. (2020) 'Value creation and value capture alignment in business model innovation: A process view on outcome-based business models', *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 37(2), pp. 158–183.
- Smith, W.R. (1956) 'Product differentiation and market segmentation as alternative marketing strategies', *Journal of Marketing*, 21(1), pp. 3–8.
- Stalk, G., Evans, P. and Shulman, L.E. (1992) 'Competing on capabilities', *Harvard Business Review*, 70(2), pp. 57–69.
- Starks, A.C. and Reich, S.M. (2023) 'Barriers and enablers for teaching with technology in special education', *Computers & Education*, 193, Article 104665.
- Sullivan, G.M. and Artino, A.R. (2013) 'Analyzing and interpreting data from Likert-type scales', *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 5(4), pp. 541–542.
- Taherdoost, H. (2022) 'What is the best response scale for survey and questionnaire design; review of different lengths of rating scale / attitude scale / Likert scale', *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 8(1), pp. 1–10.

- Teece, D.J. (2010) 'Business models, business strategy and innovation', *Long Range Planning*, 43(2–3), pp. 172–194.
- Tiago, M.T.P.M.B. and Veríssimo, J.M.C. (2014) 'Digital marketing and social media: why bother?', *Business Horizons*, 57(6), pp. 703–708.
- U.S. Small Business Administration (2024) *Break-even Point*. Washington, DC: U.S. Small Business Administration.
- UNESCO (2023) *Global Education Monitoring Report 2023: Technology in education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO IITE (2020) *Personal Data and Privacy Protection in Online Learning: Guidance for Students, Teachers and Parents*. Moscow: UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education.
- UNESCO IITE (2024) *Digital technologies for inclusive education*. Moscow: UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education.
- UNICEF (2024) *Data Protection in Schools: Guidance for Legislators, Policy-Makers and Schools*. Geneva: UNICEF.
- Vargo, S.L. and Lusch, R.F. (2004) 'Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing', *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), pp. 1–17.
- Verhoef, P.C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J.Q., Fabian, N. and Haenlein, M. (2021) 'Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research agenda', *Journal of Business Research*, 122, pp. 889–901.
- Vieira, V.A., de Almeida, M.I.S., Agnihotri, R., da Silva, N.S.D.A.C. and Arunachalam, S. (2019) 'In pursuit of an effective B2B digital marketing strategy in an emerging market', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 47(6), pp. 1085–1108.
- Wagner, R.K., Zirps, F.A., Edwards, A.A., Wood, S.G., Joyner, R.E., Becker, B.J., Liu, G. and Beal, B. (2020) 'The prevalence of dyslexia', *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 53(5), pp. 354–365.

Wang, N., Wan, J., Ma, Z., Zhou, Y. and Chen, J. (2023) 'How digital platform capabilities improve sustainable innovation performance of firms: The mediating role of open innovation', *Journal of Business Research*, 167, Article 114080.

Wedel, M. and Kamakura, W.A. (2000) *Market Segmentation*. 2nd edn. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Xie, X., Han, Y., Anderson, A. and Ribeiro-Navarrete, S. (2022) 'Digital platforms and SMEs' business model innovation: Exploring the mediating mechanisms of capability reconfiguration', *International Journal of Information Management*, 65, Article 102513.

Yankelovich, D. and Meer, D. (2006) 'Rediscovering market segmentation', *Harvard Business Review*, February.

Zott, C., Amit, R. and Massa, L. (2011) 'The business model: recent developments and future research', *Journal of Management*, 37(4), pp. 1019–1042

Appendix A: The questionnaire

Survey on Online Learning Platforms for Students with Learning Disabilities

This questionnaire is part of a postgraduate dissertation examining the development of an online learning platform for students with learning disabilities.

All responses are anonymous and will be used for academic purposes only. The survey will take approximately 3-5 minutes to complete.

Section 1: General Information

1. What is your role?

- Parent
- Teacher
- Other

2. What is your age group?

- 18–25
- 26–35
- 36–45
- 46–55
- 56+

3. What is the age of the child?

- 6–9
- 10–12
- 13–15
- 16–18

4. Has the child been diagnosed with a learning difficulty?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Section 2: Current Educational Support

5. Does the child currently receive additional educational support?

- Yes
- No

6. If yes, what type of support is provided? *(Select all that apply)*

- Private tutoring
- Special education teacher
- Therapy (e.g. speech therapy, occupational therapy)
- School support programs
- Other

7. How satisfied are you with the current support?

(Scale: 1 = Not satisfied at all, 5 = Very satisfied)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

8. What are the main challenges faced by the child? *(Select up to 3)*

- Reading difficulties
- Writing difficulties
- Attention issues (e.g. ADHD)
- Understanding instructions
- Lack of motivation
- Limited personalized support
- Other

Section 3: Online Learning Experience**9. Have you ever used an online learning platform?**

- Yes
- No

10. Would you consider using an online platform for learning support?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe

11. What concerns would you have about using an online platform? (Select all that apply)

- Lack of personal interaction
- Effectiveness of online learning
- Cost
- Technical issues
- Data privacy
- Other
- No concerns

Section 4: Interest in the Proposed Platform

Please read the following description:

An online platform that provides personalized learning support for students with learning disabilities, including live sessions with specialized educators, customized learning plans, and progress tracking tools.

12. How useful do you find this type of platform?

(Scale: 1 = Not useful at all, 5 = Very useful)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

13. How likely are you to use such a platform?

- Very unlikely
- Unlikely
- Neutral

- Likely
- Very likely

14. Which features would be most important to you? (Select up to 3)

- Live sessions with educators
- Personalized learning plans
- Progress tracking
- Interactive exercises
- Communication with teachers
- Flexible scheduling

Section 5: Pricing

15. How much would you be willing to pay per month for such a service?

- Less than €20
- €20–40
- €40–60
- €60–80
- More than €80

16. Which pricing model do you prefer?

- Monthly subscription
- Pay per session
- Package deals (e.g. 10 sessions)

Section 6: Additional Comments

17. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions?

(Open-ended)

Author's Statement:

I hereby expressly declare that, according to the article 8 of Law 1559/1986, this dissertation is solely the product of my personal work, does not infringe any intellectual property, personality and personal data rights of third parties, does not contain works/contributions from third parties for which the permission of the authors/beneficiaries is required, is not the product of partial or total plagiarism, and that the sources used are limited to the literature references alone and meet the rules of scientific citations.