

Students Need More: useful help, authentic action and the next question

Historical review of student explanations and self-directed next steps. The current editorial-first publication model was not evaluated.

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

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

Historical research scope. This September 19, 2026 report examines the earlier Students Need More guidance proposition. The current entities are editorial-first publications: Education Needs More is the editorial umbrella within Education Angel Group, and the individual Need More publications sit beneath it. This report does not evaluate the newer editorial model. The findings, proposed mechanisms and prior tagline below belong to the earlier research scope, not a claim about current product effectiveness or availability.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date:

September 19, 2026. EAG is developing Students Need More and has an interest in its success. This report examines the proposed service and relevant research; it is not an independent evaluation or evidence that the service improves student learning.

1. Proposition, audience and present limits

In the earlier proposal, Students Need More was intended to help a student clarify a project, assignment, skill or future question, choose a manageable action, use an appropriate resource and reflect on what remains unclear. The student should retain control over the question and the work. The proposed role is orientation and practical preparation, rather than a system that supplies graded answers or predicts what a student should become.

The intended audience includes a student who does not understand an assignment, someone trying to practice a skill and someone exploring a future pathway. These are different jobs. An assignment has a teacher-defined task and assessment context; skill practice may allow more open-ended goals; future exploration involves uncertainty and decisions that cannot be reduced to a correct answer. A useful service needs to recognize those differences rather than apply one generic productivity sequence to all three.

EAG's canonical definition excludes an LMS, gradebook, tutor, counselor, admissions service, public ranking and outcome guarantees. Reading, explanations and initial action should not require an account. A student's artifact or reflection remains private unless a separately approved sharing arrangement exists. Runstr's identity or reward functions do not turn an educational question into an account-acquisition or supporter-recruitment event. Teachers Need More remains a separate proof dependency for activation. These are product boundaries, not verified operating capabilities. EAG proposition authority, A0

Overview. The evidence supports examining how students seek explanations, regulate their work and judge what they understand. It also shows why better help behavior cannot be assumed to produce better subject learning. Most retained evidence concerns structured instruction, particular subjects or adult-mediated resources. Students Need More would need direct evidence that its narrower path helps students take their own useful next step without confusion, excessive effort or loss of agency.

2. Research questions and meaningful outcomes

Five questions guide this report:

1. How can a student distinguish a need for explanation from a request for an answer?
2. What do help-seeking and self-regulation studies establish about behavior, learning and transfer?
3. Which existing resources already help students interpret tasks, assess sources or explore future options?
4. What might a short question-to-action path contribute while preserving teacher and student roles?
5. How should usefulness, independence, accessibility and unintended effects be evaluated?

A meaningful immediate outcome might be the student's ability to state the task, identify the sticking point and choose an action they can explain. These are not synonymous with completing an assignment, receiving a higher grade or mastering a subject. The service should be explicit about which outcome it is trying to support at a given step.

Reflection needs the same precision. A student saying "I understand now" reports a judgment. A student explaining an idea or attempting another problem provides different evidence. Neither a completed reflection form nor a confidence rating should be presented as a validated mastery score. The proposed product can help a learner notice uncertainty without claiming to measure everything they know.

Transfer is another separate question. A strategy learned in one geometry tutor may help with another topic in that tutor while doing little for independently asking a teacher for clarification. Broad claims about lifelong learning require evidence beyond a successful interaction in a familiar system. This report therefore keeps task, environment, age and support conditions attached to each finding.

3. Need and context: the sticking point comes before the resource

An online resource can be accurate and still miss the student's actual need. A student who cannot interpret an assignment verb may not need more subject content. Someone who understands the task but lacks a required source needs a different path. Someone unsure whether an approach follows the teacher's instructions may need a question for the teacher rather than another explanation.

These distinctions define EAG's proposed contribution. The service would help the learner locate the uncertainty before sending them elsewhere. This is a hypothesis about a practical problem, not a prevalence estimate. The research did not collect student interviews, inspect assignments or establish how often any particular obstacle occurs among future users.

A hypothetical example is a student asked to compare two explanations of an event. The student might know facts about both explanations but not understand what counts as a comparison. A useful path could help identify that ambiguity and prepare a clarification question or locate a relevant general example. It should not write the comparison the teacher intends the student to produce.

Help is not inherently a failure of independence. A student may make a sound decision by asking for an explanation, requesting an accessible format or identifying that the instructions conflict. Conversely, repeatedly opening hints can lead to an answer without showing understanding. The product should avoid both extremes: discouraging legitimate help and making answer collection look like learning.

Age and setting are material uncertainties. A resource written for university students may be useful to an older secondary student but inaccessible to a younger reader. A classroom strategy can depend on feedback that an independent website cannot provide. No age range has been validated for the proposed service in this report. The first tested path should name its intended audience and show that the wording and choices work for that audience before expanding.

Future exploration adds a different kind of uncertainty. A student asking about an occupation needs current information and multiple possibilities, not a personal forecast. An aggregate wage or typical qualification can support a question about a pathway; it cannot determine whether the student will enjoy the work, obtain admission or secure a job. The service must retain those distinctions even when a single recommendation would be easier to present.

4. Existing alternatives and the proposed contribution

Figure 1

Existing resources answer different student questions

Purdue OWL | Assignment meaning

Interpret the prompt and ask the instructor

University-oriented guidance; age fit must be tested before use with younger students.

Civic Online Reasoning | Source evaluation

Examine identity, evidence and corroboration

Educator-mediated lessons; some access requires registration. Availability is not a product-effect estimate.

BLS Handbook | Future exploration

Understand occupations and training context

Verify the chosen page and measured year. Aggregate descriptions cannot predict personal outcomes.

Existing resource roles compared by EAG, not an effectiveness ranking.

Existing resources answer different student questions

Existing resource roles compared by EAG, not an effectiveness ranking.

- S4
 - S5
 - S6
-

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. Existing resources answer different student questions

Existing resource roles compared by EAG, not an effectiveness ranking.

Purdue OWL | Assignment meaning: Interpret the prompt and ask the instructor. University-oriented guidance; age fit must be tested before use with younger students.

Civic Online Reasoning | Source evaluation: Examine identity, evidence and corroboration. Educator-mediated lessons; some access requires registration. Availability is not a product-effect estimate.

BLS Handbook | Future exploration: Understand occupations and training context. Verify the chosen page and measured year. Aggregate descriptions cannot predict personal outcomes.

Sources: S4, S5, S6.

Figure 1. Source-described alternatives compared by task. This is not an effectiveness ranking. Age fit, access conditions and the selected resource's date still require checking. Text and data alternative

Purdue OWL's *Reading Practices for Assignment Prompts* helps readers identify unclear wording, task verbs, audience, source requirements and scheduling questions. It refers unresolved interpretation to the instructor. The page is a relevant direct alternative for assignment clarification, but its university and multilingual-student context is not evidence that it works for every school-age learner. No publication date was established from the page. Purdue OWL, S4

Digital Inquiry Group's Civic Online Reasoning provides lessons and assessments about source identity, evidence and corroboration, including lateral reading. The current resource and research-index pages establish the availability of an educator-mediated alternative. This review does not infer an effect size from the provider's research-based description. A linked original curriculum evaluation was inaccessible in the earlier source search, some material requires registration, and videos were not watched. Digital Inquiry Group, S5, research index, S5b

The Bureau of Labor Statistics' Occupational Outlook Handbook offers occupation descriptions and education or training context. The landing page was last modified August 27, 2026. Its student/teacher audience page also contains a legacy 2012-22 projection link, showing why the date of the destination matters even within an official site. This review verified the resource's general role, not current occupation-specific figures or local opportunities. BLS Handbook, S6, student/teacher page, S6b

These resources leave little justification for building another undifferentiated link directory. Students Need More's plausible contribution is selecting a help route after the learner identifies a particular sticking point, explaining why the route fits and helping the learner return to an authentic action. It should be possible to go directly to the original when the need is already clear.

Source suitability is more than the presence of a citation. A useful annotation would tell the student what the resource can answer, what it assumes and when another person should clarify the task. It should not invent a credibility score or imply that every item from a respected organization is current, age-appropriate or sufficient for the assignment.

The teacher's instructions remain part of the actual task. A general resource should not silently override them. If a student encounters a conflict about format, permitted tools or expected work, the proposed service should help formulate a question for the teacher. It cannot appoint itself as the authority on an assignment it did not set.

5. Evidence and counterevidence: behavior, learning and transfer differ

Figure 2

Answer-level hint use is a process measure

Study 1: grades 10-11 in Pennsylvania | Published 2011; collection year unverified

Hint sequences reaching the answer-level hint

Help condition: 48%



Control condition: 70%



Zero baseline | Shared scale: 0-100%

Published percentages only; no confidence intervals transcribed or inferred. Assignment balanced achievement without an explicit randomization procedure.

Roll et al., Study 1, Table 2, p. 273. Behavior changed inside a geometry tutor; no added domain-learning benefit was reported.

Answer-level hint use is a process measure

Roll et al., Study 1, Table 2, p. 273. Behavior changed inside a geometry tutor; no added domain-learning benefit was reported.

- S1

Figure 2. Answer-level hint use is a process measure

Roll et al., Study 1, Table 2, p. 273. Behavior changed inside a geometry tutor; no added domain-learning benefit was reported.

Measure	Help condition	Control condition
Hint sequences reaching the answer-level hint	48%	70%

Hint sequences summarized within Help and Control conditions; not percent of students attaining mastery

Published percentages only; no confidence intervals transcribed or inferred. Assignment balanced achievement without an explicit randomization procedure.

Direct transcription of 48% and 70%; common zero-based 0-100% scale; no causal product effect computed.

Sources: S1.

Figure 2. Published Study 1 process measure from Roll and colleagues, Table 2 and accompanying results, printed page 273. The denominator is hint sequences summarized within condition, not percent of students who learned. No uncertainty interval or product effect is shown. Text and data alternative

Roll and colleagues' 2011 paper reports two studies of metacognitive support inside a geometry tutoring system. Study 1 involved 58 Pennsylvania students in grades 10-11, ages 15-17; assignment balanced prior achievement, without a stated randomization procedure. The Help condition reached answer-level hints less often, 48% versus 70%, but the authors reported no added domain-learning benefit. Missing inner-city-school posttests limited some analyses. Study 2 involved 67 students assigned by class with teacher consultation, not randomization. Behavior transferred to new content within the same tutor, with uneven effects across measures. This is not evidence of broad independent transfer.

Roll, Aleven, McLaren and Koedinger, S1

The difference between a process result and a learning result is central to Students Need More. EAG should not claim that fewer answer-level hints automatically mean more understanding, nor use the result to make students reluctant to ask for appropriate explanations. The proposed service's job is to make the reason for seeking help clearer. Whether that produces better work or learning remains a separate empirical question.

The tutor also differs substantially from a public help path. It operated within an instructional environment with contextual feedback and detailed behavioral information. Importing its results does not justify importing hidden monitoring, automated proficiency judgments or the assumption that an external site knows when a student should ask for help. A more limited service must be evaluated on its own support conditions.

What the broader instructional evidence adds

Figure 3

Instructional evidence has bounded scope

Mathematics review | S2 | 2020

Combined strategies, varied evidence

36 school-age studies; mixed designs and missing effect data. Cross-study patterns do not prove one reflection prompt works.

IES practice guide | S3 | 2007

Evidence ratings differ by recommendation

Explanatory questions: Strong. Worked-example interleaving: Moderate. Delayed judgments: Low. Historical categories, not effect sizes.

Transfer to Students Need More

A direct test remains necessary

Classroom support, age and subject matter differ from independent website use. No universal duration or mastery score follows.

Research synthesis and historical instructional guidance serve different purposes. No shared numerical scale or product validation.

Instructional evidence has bounded scope

Research synthesis and historical instructional guidance serve different purposes. No shared numerical scale or product validation.

- S2
 - S3
-

Figure 3. Instructional evidence has bounded scope

Research synthesis and historical instructional guidance serve different purposes. No shared numerical scale or product validation.

Mathematics review | S2 | 2020: Combined strategies, varied evidence. 36 school-age studies; mixed designs and missing effect data. Cross-study patterns do not prove one reflection prompt works.

IES practice guide | S3 | 2007: Evidence ratings differ by recommendation. Explanatory questions: Strong. Worked-example interleaving: Moderate. Delayed judgments: Low. Historical categories, not effect sizes.

Transfer to Students Need More: A direct test remains necessary. Classroom support, age and subject matter differ from independent website use. No universal duration or mastery score follows.

Sources: S2, S3.

Figure 3. Qualitative comparison of source scope and evidence judgments. No common numerical scale or Students Need More effect estimate is implied. Text and data alternative

Wang and Sperling's May 2020 review retained 36 school-age mathematics intervention studies from a 1990-2020 search window. Studies using combinations of cognitive, metacognitive and motivational strategies tended to have stronger results, but designs and measures varied. Eight studies lacked information for calculating mathematics effects and ten lacked it for self-regulation effects. The review found no consistent duration-effect pattern. Its inclusion criteria excluded studies focused on learners with learning disabilities or difficulties. These limitations prevent a universal prescription or an effect claim for one reflection prompt. Wang and Sperling, S2, Methods, Table 1 and Results

A cross-study pattern does not isolate the effect of every ingredient. Studies combining several strategies may differ in teacher support, subject content and assessment. EAG's interpretation is to test planning, action and reflection as a coherent sequence, while asking which parts students actually use. It would be premature to declare a minimum session length, optimal number of prompts or universal age threshold from this review.

The September 2007 IES practice guide *Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning* offers another form of support. Its Table 2 rates deep explanatory questions "Strong," alternating worked examples with independent problems "Moderate," and delayed judgments of learning "Low." These are the guide's historical evidence categories, not current pooled effects or product validation. The guide primarily supports educators organizing content learning and emphasizes comparison with ordinary alternatives. Pashler and colleagues, S3, printed pages 2-4 and recommendations 2, 6 and 7

A worked example can be useful instructional support without being the student's graded answer. The design challenge is to show a general method while leaving the learner's actual reasoning to them. Similarly, an explanation prompt can connect reflection to an attempt, but its presence alone does not prove understanding. A student needs a way to identify what remains unclear and when feedback from a teacher or other appropriate person is needed.

The combined evidence is a reason to test a bounded mechanism. It is not a broad verdict that metacognition, online guidance or all help-seeking interventions work equally well. Null learning findings, nonrandom assignment, missing measures and domain restrictions should influence what the service

promises and how its first study is designed.

6. Proposed mechanism: an action the student can explain

Figure 4

Students retain their action and reflection

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Proposed useful path

1. Name the actual sticking point
↓ proposed link
2. Choose an explained resource or manageable action
↓ proposed link
3. Do the thinking or work independently
↓ proposed link
4. Identify what changed and the next question

Unknown: added usefulness, effort, learning and transfer.

When the path does not fit

1. Recognize missing information, access or authority
↓ proposed link
2. Revise, ask an appropriate trusted person or leave

No public reflection, answer substitution, supporter recruitment or forced account.

EAG conceptual mechanism. An authentic next step is distinct from grades, mastery or a future outcome.

Students retain their action and reflection

EAG conceptual mechanism. An authentic next step is distinct from grades, mastery or a future outcome.

- A0. EAG product definition

Figure 4. Students retain their action and reflection

EAG conceptual mechanism. An authentic next step is distinct from grades, mastery or a future outcome.

Proposed useful path. Name the actual sticking point → Choose an explained resource or manageable action → Do the thinking or work independently → Identify what changed and the next question. Unknown: added usefulness, effort, learning and transfer.

When the path does not fit. Recognize missing information, access or authority → Revise, ask an appropriate trusted person or leave. No public reflection, answer substitution, supporter recruitment or forced account.

Sources: AO.

Figure 4. EAG conceptual mechanism. Every link is proposed. No step requires public reflection, recruiting supporters or accepting a fabricated mastery score. Text and data alternative

The proposed path starts with the student's question. A brief explanation helps separate the task from the obstacle. The student compares a small set of useful actions or resources, tries one and reflects on what changed. The ending can be another attempt, a narrower question, a teacher or trusted-adult conversation, or a decision to stop.

The immediate product hypothesis is that this structure helps a student move from "I am stuck" to an action they understand and own. The action need not be large. It could be restating the assignment, identifying an unfamiliar term, comparing a worked example with a new problem or noting a specific question for the teacher. These examples are proposed uses, not observed product behavior.

Reflection should refer to that action. "What could you do after this that you could not do before?" and "What is still unclear?" illustrate the kind of distinction EAG wants to support. They are original examples, not a validated instrument. A generic positivity prompt or progress badge would provide little evidence that the student has understood anything new.

The path should accommodate a change of mind. A student may discover that a resource assumes knowledge they do not yet have, that the assignment requires a different method or that the question belongs with an adult. Returning to clarification is part of the mechanism, not an error that must be overcome to finish a sequence.

The proposed service should explain its limits before a learner depends on it. It cannot know every teacher's expectations, judge a private situation from a brief description or guarantee that a future option will be available. A safe next question can be more useful than an unsupported answer. A missing local route should lead to verification, not invented contact information or automatic sharing.

7. Design concepts for a coherent first test

The first candidate is an assignment-clarification path for a named age group. It would help a learner separate what they must produce, what they already understand and the phrase or requirement that remains unclear. The output would be a student-authored task statement and one next action. It would not require uploading the assignment or generating a submission.

A second candidate is a resource-and-attempt pair. A short annotation would explain why a resource fits, followed by a manageable action that the student does independently. The student could return to identify whether the resource answered the question. This would test the value of selecting and explaining a resource rather than rewarding the number of links opened.

A third candidate is a future-exploration comparison. A student might examine two official occupation descriptions, identify what interests them and prepare questions about training or local opportunities. It should remain exploration rather than matching the student to a destiny. Pay, demand and training figures would need checking at the specific current source, with no personal outcome prediction.

Only one of these should form the first complete test. The assignment path is closest to a bounded task with observable comprehension and a clear teacher role. Future exploration is less readily evaluated in a short session and can require different source and adult-support arrangements. That is a research-priority judgment, not implementation approval or a claim that one audience matters more.

The first test should use original, non-identifying scenarios that are understandable without a subject-specific data collection system. It should support a complete text route, keyboard use and a low-bandwidth option. Those are proposed access criteria, not claims about an interface that has not been built or inspected.

The student's language should remain recognizable. A highly polished generated question may hide whether the learner understands it. A useful test asks the student to explain the next step in their own words and act on it. It should not treat the formality or length of their response as evidence of intelligence, engagement or effort.

8. Risks, equity and burden

Answer substitution. A tool can make a task easier by doing the reasoning the student was supposed to practice. That may increase completion while undermining the intended job. The boundary should be expressed through concrete alternatives: clarify the instruction, explain a general method or prepare a question, while leaving the assessed work to the learner.

Unhelpful friction. The opposite failure is withholding useful explanation in the name of independence. A learner may need direct instruction, an accessible resource or teacher assistance. The service should not require repeated unsuccessful attempts before acknowledging that need. No universal “try harder before asking” rule is supported by the retained evidence.

Self-report mistaken for mastery. Confidence can be useful to discuss without being accurate. A product that labels students as proficient from reflection text would claim more than this evidence supports. Evaluation should compare what the student says with what they can explain or do, while keeping any research assessment separate from a public ranking or permanent profile.

Unequal fit. The mathematics review's exclusions make it particularly important not to generalize its findings to all learners. Disability, language, reading demands and assistive-technology use need direct consideration. An adolescent tutor study also cannot set the reading level for a younger child's independent help path.

Privacy and surveillance. Tutor research may use detailed logs, but the proposed product does not inherit a reason to collect them. Reading and initial action can be examined without names, location, grades, diagnoses or public reflections. If later research needs information about real student work, its purpose, permission and retention would need separate decisions. The first useful slice should not depend on building a student data profile.

Motivation distorted by engagement targets. Time spent, repeat visits and completed prompts can reward a product for delaying the student's real work. The appropriate question is whether the student can return to the task with useful understanding. An early exit after finding the right question may be better than a long session.

Authority and future certainty. A teacher controls assignment expectations; qualified school roles govern certain guidance decisions. A career resource describes occupations, not a student's future. The service must keep those authorities and uncertainties legible rather than presenting a confident recommendation where evidence is incomplete.

Burden transferred to supporters. A path may appear easy because a parent or teacher supplies unrecorded explanation. Research should identify that support rather than attribute the result entirely to the site. If adult help is necessary, the service should describe it honestly and avoid assuming every student has the same access to it.

9. Evaluation and criteria for changing direction

The first evaluation should ask whether the student understands and owns a useful next step. No Students Need More study has been conducted. Future research would require appropriate approval, youth safeguards and a clearly bounded collection plan.

Choose one age group and task type. Compare the proposed help path with a direct relevant resource or ordinary instruction sheet. Use tasks that permit several valid approaches, so the study does not reward students merely for reproducing a preferred sentence. Where feasible, vary task order and use separate but comparable tasks to reduce practice effects.

A useful rubric would distinguish task comprehension, obstacle identification, resource fit, authentic action and the quality of the next question. It should also recognize correct requests for teacher clarification and a justified decision that the available resource does not fit. A completed sequence alone would not satisfy the rubric.

Observe whether students can describe the source's purpose and limitation, then attempt the next step without having the site perform it. Ask separately how confident they feel and how much effort the path required. Differences between confidence and demonstrated understanding are informative; they should not be hidden inside an overall satisfaction score.

Access testing should include reading difficulty, keyboard and assistive-technology use where applicable, limited bandwidth and students who decline to enter personal details. The first exploratory sample cannot prove population-wide fairness. It can reveal concrete barriers and help determine which audience the service can responsibly support next.

A later test could examine transfer to a new task without the same prompts. That would provide stronger evidence of independent use than immediately repeating a familiar sequence. It would still not establish long-term learning, attainment or future outcomes. The Roll studies show why transfer within a familiar tool and broader transfer should be measured separately.

Continue if students produce more useful self-authored action than with the existing alternative, at reasonable effort, without extra disclosure or authority confusion. Revise if they can navigate but cannot explain the task, if prompts become another burden or if a resource repeatedly assumes inaccessible prior knowledge. Narrow the audience if one age or task group benefits while another does not.

Stop or reconsider if ordinary instructions work equally well with less effort, if the apparent benefit comes mainly from answer substitution, or if the service needs hidden student monitoring to support its claims. An honest product decision can be to retain a small source-backed guide rather than expand into a tutor, assessment system or prediction service.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This focused review was completed September 19, 2026. It is not a systematic review, meta-analysis or exhaustive inventory of student support. The EAG product definition supplied product scope. External sources were chosen for help-seeking, self-regulation, instructional guidance and existing alternatives, with original retrieval before retained claims.

The CMU author PDF initially failed in the web reader but was retrieved directly from the same university URL and extracted locally. The original confirmed that the Study 1 hint measure is in Table 2, printed page 273, rather than Table 3. The report preserves this corrected locator. It also uses the 2007 IES PDF's "Low" evidence label rather than substituting terminology from later evidence systems.

The 2011 paper does not establish the studies' data-collection year in this review. Its publication year is therefore not presented as an intervention year. Study 1 used achievement-balanced assignment without an explicit randomization procedure; Study 2 used teacher-informed class assignment. Missing posttests and bounded within-tutor transfer limit interpretation. The mathematics review mixes study designs and has incomplete effect data; its cross-study patterns do not identify isolated component effects.

The process chart transcribes two published percentages without calculating a product benefit or confidence interval. Its denominator is hint sequences summarized by condition, not students achieving mastery. Other figures compare source roles, evidence scope or a proposed mechanism. No numerical effect forecast, ranking, imputed value or pooled result was created.

No direct product evaluation, age-specific comprehension study, Arkansas-specific user evidence, disability-access assessment or verified local school handoff was obtained. Resource descriptions do not establish effectiveness, reproduction rights or accessibility conformance. The inaccessible DIG evaluation was excluded from empirical claims. Videos and restricted downloads were not assessed.

Source corrections should update the specific claim, locator, figure and text alternative together. Current occupation pages and school routes need checking when used; an official landing page does not make every linked item current. No comprehensive correction/retraction registry search was performed. Absence of a visible notice is not proof that a source has never changed.

Retained references

- **A0.** Education Angel Group, Students Need More product definition, reviewed September 19, 2026 for this report. Defines intended scope, not implementation or effectiveness.
- **S1. Roll, I., Aleven, V., McLaren, B. M., and Koedinger, K. R.** *Improving students' help-seeking skills using metacognitive feedback in an intelligent tutoring system*, 2011, *Learning and Instruction* 21, 267-280. DOI: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2010.07.004. Author-university full paper.
- **S2. Wang, Y., and Sperling, R. A.** *Characteristics of Effective Self-Regulated Learning Interventions in Mathematics Classrooms: A Systematic Review*, May 29, 2020. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2020.00058. Original review.
- **S3. Pashler and colleagues.** *Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning*, September 2007, NCER 2007-2004. Full IES guide; current WWC listing.
- **S4. Purdue OWL.** *Reading Practices for Assignment Prompts*, undated page retrieved September 19, 2026. University resource.
- **S5/S5b. Digital Inquiry Group.** *Civic Online Reasoning* and research index, retrieved September 19, 2026. Curriculum; research index.
- **S6/S6b. Bureau of Labor Statistics.** *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, last modified August 27, 2026, and *Student or Teacher* resource page. Handbook; audience page.

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. Students Need More provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.