

Education Angel Group: clear routes, accountable claims and a useful umbrella

The evidence supports examining labels, navigation depth and task context. It does not show that adding brands creates trust, that a larger ecosystem delivers better education or that EAG needs a complex portal.

Research by Education Angel Group. Last substantive review: September 19, 2026.

Education Angel Group is developing Education Angel Group and has an interest in the proposed product. This review does not establish its effectiveness.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date: September 19, 2026. EAG owns the proposed umbrella and has an interest in its success. This is a focused research report, not an independent evaluation or evidence that the proposed service is operating successfully.

1. Proposition, audience and the meaning of a useful umbrella

Education Angel Group is intended to provide a concise explanation of its mission, public identity, relationships among its entities and routes to the appropriate child site or action. Its stated tagline is “Turn participation into possibility.” The umbrella’s immediate job is orientation: help someone understand what EAG is, determine whether a destination fits their purpose and recognize who owns the next step. This definition comes from EAG’s product authority, not a measured user need or a finding of effectiveness.

The relevant audiences have different starting questions. A family may have an activity in mind but not know an entity’s name. A school representative may need to understand the resource model before considering contact. A prospective supporter may need to distinguish a membership from a donation. A journalist or community member may arrive principally to check an assertion. Returning visitors may already have the correct child link and need no umbrella journey at all.

Overview. The evidence supports examining labels, navigation depth and task context. It does not show that adding brands creates trust, that a larger ecosystem delivers better education or that EAG needs a complex portal. The defensible hypothesis is narrower: a short explanation and an accurate handoff could reduce misunderstanding for people who do not already know where to go. A simple directory or direct child link may work equally well or better. The proposed umbrella should earn its place through this comparison.

The intended boundary matters to that hypothesis. Child sites retain their own product functions and access decisions. Runstr is the designated identity authority where a child action requires an account; shared identity does not establish permission to view a particular record or perform an action. The umbrella would explain and route, without becoming a combined account dashboard or reproducing support, payment or resource transactions. These are intended responsibilities, not claims of completed integration.

2. Questions and the evidence needed to answer them

This review asks five related questions:

1. When does an umbrella explanation help a person identify an appropriate destination?
2. Does portfolio breadth create confusion, or do ambiguous labels and unsuitable grouping explain more of the difficulty?
3. What would distinguish warranted confidence from an attractive appearance or a reassuring brand association?
4. How can resource discovery and identity handoffs remain understandable without duplicating the child experience?
5. What findings would justify simplifying or removing parts of the umbrella?

These questions require different evidence. A navigation experiment can describe behavior in a specified information structure. A consumer-choice synthesis can challenge universal assumptions about too many options. An existing institutional site can demonstrate a possible division of navigation responsibilities. None establishes EAG's effectiveness. Accessibility guidance supplies a relevant design constraint, but following one criterion does not establish whole-site conformance.

The central unanswered question is comparative benefit for the actual audiences. No interviews, usability sessions, live EAG routing results, school adoption measurements or trust evaluations were collected for this report. The report therefore treats the audience jobs as hypotheses grounded in EAG's definition. It proposes tests that can disconfirm them, including the possibility that an umbrella adds an unnecessary step.

3. Context: finding a destination is different from choosing a product

Someone searching for a known entity and someone exploring an unfamiliar ecosystem face different problems. A directory can support the former without explaining all relationships. The latter may need enough context to decide whether a destination is relevant, available and appropriate. Requiring both people to learn the organizational structure could impose avoidable work. Conversely, forcing everyone through a task chooser could conceal a familiar name from a returning visitor. This is EAG's interpretation of the routing problem, not a measured distribution of its visitors.

Larson and Czerwinski's 1998 experiment involved 19 experienced web users completing searches in three encyclopedia structures with 512 destination nodes. The deeper structure was significantly slower than either shallower structure; the two shallower structures did not differ significantly in reaction time. Categories were editor-created rather than user-tested for comparable meaning, and nontarget content

varied. The study concerns historical desktop retrieval, not modern family services. It cautions against hiding destinations behind extra levels, without establishing a universal number of links.

Larson and Czerwinski, S1

The distinction between finding and choosing also limits the transfer of choice-overload research. A person trying to reach an already selected destination is not necessarily comparing competing products for purchase. An ecosystem directory may contain complementary functions rather than substitutes. The EAG question is whether a visitor can predict the destination from its explanation, not whether the visitor enjoys having fewer choices. A small menu can still fail when each label is obscure or when several categories plausibly contain the same task.

Figure 1

Evidence answers different questions

Retrieval experiment

Finding a destination

Historical structure comparison. Does not establish an EAG card limit. S1.

Choice syntheses

Context changes interpretation

Average effects and moderators answer consumer-choice questions. Neither forecasts EAG routing. S2, S7.

Institutional comparators

Division of navigation roles

Existing task and service patterns demonstrate alternatives, not EAG efficacy. S4, S5.

Evidence types are not interchangeable. This is an EAG comparison of relevance, not a quantitative quality score.

Evidence answers different questions

Evidence types are not interchangeable. This is an EAG comparison of relevance, not a quantitative quality score.

- S1
- S2

- S4
- S5
- S7

These equivalents accompany the reader figures. Source IDs refer to the report references. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Figure 1. Evidence answers different questions

Evidence types are not interchangeable. This is an EAG comparison of relevance, not a quantitative quality score.

Retrieval experiment: Finding a destination. Historical structure comparison. Does not establish an EAG card limit. S1.

Choice syntheses: Context changes interpretation. Average effects and moderators answer consumer-choice questions. Neither forecasts EAG routing. S2, S7.

Institutional comparators: Division of navigation roles. Existing task and service patterns demonstrate alternatives, not EAG efficacy. S4, S5.

Sources: S1, S2, S4, S5, S7.

Figure 1. A comparison of evidence types, not a ranking of quality or an estimate of EAG benefit. Retrieval experiments, choice research and institutional examples address different parts of the problem. Text and data alternative.

A useful first inventory would record real incoming questions, without collecting unnecessary personal details. The same public question might map to more than one legitimate destination. The inventory should preserve that ambiguity rather than inventing a single correct answer to make evaluation easier. No such inventory is available here, so the examples below are proposed research situations.

4. Existing alternatives and the case against duplication

Two institutional sources illustrate alternatives to an all-purpose ecosystem dashboard. GOV.UK's navigation guidance separates organization-wide identity and tools from service-specific identity and navigation. It also warns that navigation need not enumerate the entire service and that focused transactions may not need general navigation. This is operational guidance, not an EAG effect estimate. Its governmental authority and largely unified website differ from EAG's circumstances. GOV.UK Design System, S4

USA.gov combines task wording, subject routes, life-event navigation and a separate agency directory. Its public homepage illustrates how users can begin with a need or with organizational knowledge. The inspected material was readable public HTML; this review did not test its transactions, mobile rendering or accessibility. Government status and eligibility language do not transfer to EAG. USA.gov, S5

The strongest alternatives for EAG are also the simplest. Direct child entry avoids a mandatory introductory journey when the destination is known. A plain, maintained list of approved public destinations could explain names and availability with little interface complexity. A concise mission page with contextual links could support verification without trying to route every possible activity. These are design baselines, not evaluated EAG products.

Alternative	When it could fit	What could go wrong	What the umbrella must add
Direct child entry	A visitor already knows the destination	Unclear ownership or return route	Optional context without delaying the task
Plain public directory	A visitor recognizes a name	Similar names conceal different purposes	Better distinction between destination and action
Task-oriented orientation	A visitor knows a goal but not a name	Labels or forced categories misclassify the need	More accurate routing without extra burden
Mission and evidence page	A visitor wants to verify EAG	Facts are too general or stale	Specific, current, inspectable claims

The EAG-specific opportunity is the relationship explanation between distinct child purposes, resource discovery and Runstr identity. That opportunity does not require duplicating the child tools. For example, an umbrella summary can state what a destination is intended for and what happens on arrival. It need not reproduce checkout, record access or an editor. If accurate links and short descriptions already resolve uncertainty, more elaborate guidance lacks a demonstrated benefit.

Figure 2

Three entry routes worth comparing

Known destination

Direct child entry

A useful baseline for returning visitors. Test whether umbrella context can remain optional.

Known name or broad interest

Plain public directory

Names, concise purposes and honest availability. Test confusion between similar destinations.

Known task, unknown name

Task-oriented introduction

Help a person map a purpose to a destination. Test category ambiguity and added effort.

Proposed EAG comparison conditions, not evaluated interfaces. A fast, informed exit can be success.

Three entry routes worth comparing

Proposed EAG comparison conditions, not evaluated interfaces. A fast, informed exit can be success.

- A0. EAG product definition
 - S4
 - S5
-

Figure 2. Three entry routes worth comparing

Proposed EAG comparison conditions, not evaluated interfaces. A fast, informed exit can be success.

Known destination: Direct child entry. A useful baseline for returning visitors. Test whether umbrella context can remain optional.

Known name or broad interest: Plain public directory. Names, concise purposes and honest availability. Test confusion between similar destinations.

Known task, unknown name: Task-oriented introduction. Help a person map a purpose to a destination. Test category ambiguity and added effort.

Sources: A0, S4, S5.

Figure 2. Proposed comparison conditions. Direct entry is a legitimate baseline, and successful departure from the umbrella can be a good outcome. Text and data alternative.

5. Evidence, counterevidence and limits on trust claims

Scheibehenne, Greifeneder and Todd's 2010 synthesis included 50 experiments, 63 conditions and 5,036 participants. Its average choice-overload effect was near zero, with substantial variation across settings. That finding counters the claim that adding options inevitably impairs decisions. It does not establish that overload never occurs. Outcomes included consumer choice and satisfaction, which are not equivalent to correct service routing. Scheibehenne and colleagues, S2

A later synthesis by Chernev, Böckenholt and Goodman examined conditions under which assortment size matters, emphasizing choice complexity, task difficulty, uncertainty about preferences and decision goals. This is useful counterevidence to treating the earlier average as the final answer. Its consumer-choice framework still does not identify an optimal EAG menu. A published corrigendum corrects statistical notation and test values in the original paper's discussion of the mean effect; this report does not reproduce those coefficients or derive a product forecast from them. Chernev and colleagues, S7; corrigendum, S8

Taken together, these sources justify studying the task and the meaning of choices instead of declaring a fixed maximum number of entities. This is an inference for EAG. It leaves open two competing explanations: breadth itself may make orientation harder for some visitors, or a poor explanation may make a manageable set look confusing. A test should vary presentation while holding available destinations and descriptions as constant as possible.

The umbrella's trust role needs a separate standard. A participant saying a page looks credible does not show that its assertions are accurate, that its services are safe or that institutional acceptance exists. Similarly, recognizing the EAG name does not establish understanding of a child service. This report has no direct experiment showing that an EAG umbrella improves warranted trust. It therefore proposes assessing whether people can find the operator, identify evidence for a material statement and distinguish a current fact from an intended feature.

A credible result may involve lower confidence. If a visitor discovers that a feature is not yet available or that a claim lacks supporting evidence, deciding not to proceed can represent informed judgment. Evaluating the umbrella solely by willingness to continue would reward reassurance even when uncertainty should remain. This is an explicit proposed evaluation principle, not an observed behavioral result.

6. Proposed mechanism: orientation, handoff and responsibility

The mechanism begins with a recognizable purpose. A visitor reads enough to identify the next destination, predicts the action available there and understands the transition. The destination then confirms that expectation. When it cannot, the person gets an honest explanation and a way to recover. Each link is proposed and requires observation; none is a causal finding about EAG.

The public Digital Resource Kit Library adds a concrete example. Under EAG's definition it is a section of the umbrella, not another entity. Discovery starts from what a person wants to make. Descriptions, requirements and previews are public by default, subject to justified restrictions. Opening an interactive resource, downloading a kit or generating a file requires the designated identity route and any applicable authorization. The intended return is to the exact resource and action, not an unrelated landing page. A public preview therefore does not imply unrestricted action access.

Figure 3

Proposed routes preserve responsibilities

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Public destination

1. Recognize a purpose
↓ proposed link
2. Understand child destination
↓ proposed link
3. Follow a verified route

Unknown: prediction accuracy and recovery when the destination differs.

Resource action

1. Read public description and requirements
↓ proposed link
2. Choose a specific resource action
↓ proposed link
3. Continue through Runstr identity
↓ proposed link
4. Destination checks permission and restores intent

Identity does not grant access. No working integration is claimed.

Claim verification

1. Find a material statement
↓ proposed link
2. Inspect its source and date
↓ proposed link
3. Decide whether evidence is sufficient

Confidence may appropriately decrease. No institutional endorsement is implied.

Conceptual only. Explanation, authentication, authorization and claim verification have different responsibilities.

Proposed routes preserve responsibilities

Conceptual only. Explanation, authentication, authorization and claim verification have different responsibilities.

- A0. EAG product definition
 - S4
 - S6
-

Figure 3. Proposed routes preserve responsibilities

Conceptual only. Explanation, authentication, authorization and claim verification have different responsibilities.

Public destination. Recognize a purpose → Understand child destination → Follow a verified route. Unknown: prediction accuracy and recovery when the destination differs.

Resource action. Read public description and requirements → Choose a specific resource action → Continue through Runstr identity → Destination checks permission and restores intent. Identity does not grant access. No working integration is claimed.

Claim verification. Find a material statement → Inspect its source and date → Decide whether evidence is sufficient. Confidence may appropriately decrease. No institutional endorsement is implied.

Sources: AO, S4, S6.

Figure 3. Conceptual paths only. Umbrella explanation, identity and destination authorization remain separate. The diagram establishes neither working integration nor access rights. Text and data alternative.

The weakest point may be the transition rather than the homepage. A well-labeled resource can still fail if sign-in loses the selected action, if the destination no longer exists or if an unavailable function looks usable. The proposed mechanism therefore includes failure and return paths as part of routing, not as peripheral polish. It also permits direct child entry to bypass the umbrella entirely.

A resource can still be unsuitable because of inaccessible formats, unclear requirements or untested safety assumptions. Resource usefulness and umbrella routing should be examined separately.

7. Design concepts to test, not approved interface decisions

The first concept is a concise task-oriented introduction with a visible route to a public directory. It would offer a small set of purpose statements that visitors can recognize without learning EAG terminology. A person who already knows a destination could use its name. The benefit hypothesis is reduced uncertainty; the principal risk is that broad categories hide legitimate overlap or imply that every visitor fits one role.

The second concept is a public directory organized by destination purpose, with a one-sentence description, honest availability and an explicit next action. It minimizes guided steps and provides a useful comparison baseline. Its risk is that similar entity names remain difficult to distinguish. A research session should check whether the description changes participants' first choices, rather than treating name recognition as understanding.

The third concept is a short mission and verification page linked from child sites. It prioritizes operator identity, relationship explanation and sources for material claims. It may be sufficient for visitors who arrive with the correct child link. Its risk is weak support for open-ended exploration. It could coexist with direct routes without forcing an ecosystem tour.

For all three, a link should convey its purpose through its text or programmatically associated context. The W3C explanation of WCAG 2.4.4 supports meaningful link context and continuity between a link and its destination. It does not require every repeated action label to be unique out of context. Applying it still

requires testing the actual implementation. W3C, S6

These concepts are research conditions, not a chosen layout or implementation specification. Their comparison should preserve the same approved descriptions, destination set and availability statements. Otherwise a better result could reflect more accurate content rather than the navigation approach. The intended output is a defensible choice about what explanation is useful, not a visually impressive map of the organization.

8. Risks, equity and maintenance burden

The main claim risk is transfer: an accurate statement about one destination may be read as a guarantee about the whole ecosystem. A relationship diagram can unintentionally imply shared records, shared permission or equivalent availability. Public descriptions should make the relevant responsibility explicit without exposing private operations. Public eligibility does not itself establish that an entity is live or that all of its functions are available.

For families, broad role labels can be awkward. A parent may also be a school employee or a supporter. A student may be exploring without wishing to identify themselves. Requiring a role declaration before showing public information could add friction and unnecessary disclosure. This is a risk to test, not evidence that a particular chooser has already harmed users. Optional routes and understandable descriptions can be compared without collecting a profile at discovery.

Accessibility and practical access require more than short copy. Similar names can be hard to distinguish when read aloud. A relationship conveyed only through position or color may disappear in a linear reading order. Long diagrams may be difficult on a small screen. A reasonable evaluation should include keyboard and screen-reader use, text enlargement, narrow screens and understandable text equivalents. These are proposed checks; no EAG conformance result is asserted here.

Maintenance is part of usefulness. Every duplicated child claim creates another place to become stale. A concise summary can reduce that exposure, but even a simple directory requires link checks, named content ownership and a correction path. A working URL alone does not prove a promised function works. Conversely, unavailable services should not invite an action that can never complete. The umbrella should minimize what it has to restate and make updates possible without changing the child's function.

There is also opportunity cost. Building a complex orientation system could displace effort from making one child journey work. Until evidence shows a routing problem that simpler pages cannot solve, the research favors keeping the umbrella's operational ambition modest. This is a design judgment based on the defined scope and missing evidence, not a calculated return on investment.

9. Evaluation and criteria for changing direction

A proposed formative study would compare direct entry, a plain directory and task-oriented orientation. Recruitment should include people unfamiliar with EAG as well as people who recognize a child name. Relevant school, family, supporter and verification situations should be represented, with accessible participation arrangements. No sample size or effect threshold is invented here; those choices require the actual task mix, intended inference and feasible recruitment.

Before sessions, the team should identify acceptable destinations for each situation, including multiple correct answers when appropriate. It should define what counts as a consequential misunderstanding: expecting a donation transaction, assuming that signing in grants all access, or mistaking a proposed function for an available one. Participants should explain their expectations before following a link. The study should not count a lucky click as informed routing.

Figure 4

Evidence that would change the design

Directory works as well

Simplify orientation

Retain the lower-burden route when guided categories add no observed value.

Correct click, wrong expectation

Repair the explanation

Check availability, action and ownership understanding before counting routing success.

Direct visitor delayed

Make context optional

Do not require an ecosystem tour before a known child task.

Claim cannot be verified

Qualify or remove it

A polished presentation cannot replace an adequate source.

Prospective decision criteria. No participant results or numerical targets are claimed.

Evidence that would change the design

Prospective decision criteria. No participant results or numerical targets are claimed.

- A0. EAG product definition
- S1
- S2
- S7

Figure 4. Evidence that would change the design

Prospective decision criteria. No participant results or numerical targets are claimed.

Directory works as well: Simplify orientation. Retain the lower-burden route when guided categories add no observed value.

Correct click, wrong expectation: Repair the explanation. Check availability, action and ownership understanding before counting routing success.

Direct visitor delayed: Make context optional. Do not require an ecosystem tour before a known child task.

Claim cannot be verified: Qualify or remove it. A polished presentation cannot replace an adequate source.

Sources: A0, S1, S2, S7.

Figure 4. Evaluation decisions are prospective. No participant results or numerical targets are claimed. Findings should determine whether to keep, revise or simplify the umbrella. Text and data alternative.

Useful outcomes include first-choice destination, eventual appropriate destination, recovery after an incorrect route, understanding of the next action and recognition of who controls access. Time provides context but should not turn careful reading or assistive-technology use into failure. Perceived credibility should be recorded separately from source comprehension and the accuracy of participants' expectations.

If the directory performs as well as guided orientation with less effort, retain the simpler option. If names cause repeated confusion, revise descriptions or grouping before adding features. If direct entrants are delayed by umbrella prompts, make those prompts optional. If a fact cannot be verified, qualify or remove the claim rather than polishing its presentation. If identity transitions lose resource intent, repair and test that transition before expanding the catalog.

A later operational check could examine wrong-destination reports, broken or redirected links and stale availability statements, using minimal non-sensitive information. Longer visits, more page views and account creation are not by themselves success measures. A person who quickly finds the right child site, or correctly determines that EAG cannot meet the need, may have completed the umbrella's job.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This is a focused, question-led review, not a systematic review or meta-analysis. Sources were chosen for relevance to information retrieval, choice complexity, service navigation and accessible handoffs. Original research, author-hosted published papers and official institutional pages were opened on September 19, 2026. The search also checked corrections for the retained empirical papers and located the corrigendum described above. No comprehensive search of every correction registry was conducted; absence of another noticed correction is not proof none exists.

The empirical literature retained here is historical and indirect. It does not measure the current EAG audience, current mobile behavior or educational outcomes. Institutional guidance and current homepage content are useful comparators, not trials. The report has not tested the proposed site, verified all child availability or examined transactions. A broader contemporary review and direct audience research could change its conclusions. Sources supplied leads and constraints; EAG's proposed mechanisms and evaluation choices remain separately identified judgments.

References and exact reading locators:

- **S1.** Kevin Larson and Mary Czerwinski (1998), *Web Page Design: Implications of Memory, Structure and Scent for Information Retrieval*, CHI, pp. 25-32. Methods pp. 27-28; results pp. 28-29; discussion pp. 29-30. Original paper.
- **S2.** Benjamin Scheibehenne, Rainer Greifeneder and Peter M. Todd (2010), *Can There Ever Be Too Many Options? A Meta-Analytic Review of Choice Overload*, *Journal of Consumer Research* 37, pp. 409-425. Methods and results pp. 412-413; discussion pp. 418-421. Published author-hosted paper.
- **S4.** GOV.UK Design System, *Navigate a service*. "When to use," "When not to use," "Plan your GOV.UK header" and "Choosing and writing navigation links." Official guidance.
- **S5.** USA.gov, homepage snapshot accessed September 19, 2026. Task links, topics and services, life events and agency-directory link. Official homepage.
- **S6.** W3C, *Understanding Success Criterion 2.4.4: Link Purpose (In Context)*. Criterion, intent and benefits. Informative explanation, not a full conformance assessment. Official explanation.
- **S7.** Alexander Chernev, Ulf Böckenholt and Joseph Goodman (2015; online 2014), *Choice overload: A conceptual review and meta-analysis*, *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 25(2), pp. 333-358. Conceptual framework pp. 336-339, methods pp. 339-344 and discussion pp. 351-353. Author-hosted paper.
- **S8.** The same authors (2016; online July 27, 2015), corrigendum, *Journal of Consumer Psychology* 26(2), p. 312. Correction of p. 348 statistical reporting. Publisher correction.

EAG's canonical definition supplies the proposition and intended boundaries; it is not external validation. Corrections to this report should identify the sentence, source locator and reason for revision. A source revision, changed destination or altered product definition should prompt rechecking the affected conclusion. The current conclusion remains conditional: the umbrella is worth developing only insofar as it makes relationships, claims and next steps clearer than simpler routes for the people it is intended to serve.

Figure text and data alternatives

Complete semantic alternatives accompany each figure in this reader and its text download. Source IDs refer to the references in this report. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Corrections and entity context

Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Education Angel Group provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.