LEARNING TO LEARN · AN EVIDENCE-BASED ESSAY FOR PARENTS

He’s “Not a Self-Starter,” and You’ve Become His Calendar

In 67 school studies, children taught to plan, check and look back did better

15-minute read Every figure sourced below By George Weber Nothing here is for sale

It is 4:20 on a Tuesday. The kitchen still smells of the toast he ate standing up. His bag is open on the floor, and one sheet of paper has made it to the table. A paragraph about a book, due Thursday. The page has his name at the top and nothing else.

He is sitting in front of it. That counts for something. He has sharpened his pencil twice. He has asked what’s for dinner. He has looked at the page the way you look at a form from the insurance company.

You have said “Just start” three times now, in three different voices. The last one was not your best.

Across the table, his younger sister finished her math twenty minutes ago without being asked. She is already zipping her bag for tomorrow.

Same house. Same parents. Same table.

Later, on the phone with a friend or in the car with your partner, you say it the way people say things they have already decided: *He’s just not a self-starter.* You say it lightly, almost fondly. It sounds like a description.

Under it there is a quieter sentence, the one you do not say out loud. *Maybe I’m not one either. Maybe I’m just not organized enough to make him one.*

The one who holds the plan

Look at what you were doing at 4:20. You were not only waiting. You were holding the plan.

You knew the paragraph was due Thursday. You knew it would take him forty minutes if he started now and two hours if he started at eight. You knew which part would stop him: the first sentence. You were watching the clock for him. And you were ready to read the page when he finished, because you knew he would not read it himself.

That is four jobs for one adult at one table: calendar, alarm clock, first-step finder and checker. You may do all four every evening, and then wonder why you are tired by six.

The feeling under the tiredness is not only fatigue. It is a fear about time. If this is who he is, you will still be holding the plan when he is fifteen. And nobody holds a nineteen-year-old's plan.

So when you say *He's just not a self-starter,* you may mean something closer to this: *I am tired of being his starter, and I am afraid it is permanent.* Both halves of that are fair.

From his side of the table, it may look different again. He hears "Just start" and does not know what the first move is. To him the page is not a task with a beginning. It is a wall with his name on it.

Now picture where most children spend their working hours. In a room with one adult and a full room of children, the plan tends to live with the adult. A bell says when to start. The board says what comes next. The teacher says what "done" looks like, and a grade, days later, says how it went.

That is a sensible way to run a room like that. Many teachers work hard against its pull, with goal sheets, planners and "show me your plan" before anyone starts. But the default runs one way: unless someone builds the handover in on purpose, a child can learn to follow a plan very well without often being asked to make one.

If you teach him at home, you may have found the same default in a different shape. Whoever can see the whole week ends up holding the plan, and at your table that is you. It lives in your head, or in your planner, or on the whiteboard by the fridge. He follows it. You hold it.

So when he sits in front of a page with no bell, no board and nobody else starting, the missing piece shows. And because it shows in him, it gets named after him.

None of this is anyone's failure. It is not his teacher's, and it is not yours. A room built for one adult and many children tends to keep the plan with the adult, because that is what makes it work. That is our reading of how such rooms run; no study we found measured how often ordinary classrooms hand children the plan. Handing it over is extra work the design does not ask for.

• • •

The belief, said kindly

> Some kids are self-starters. Mine isn’t. It’s who he is.

Much of it is true. Children differ, and you are not imagining it. You may have seen it from the crib: one baby who reached for everything, and one who watched first. Some children find waiting easier. Some are steadier from the start. Parents of more than one child know this before anyone tells them.

Some of it is age, too. Most parents of a seven-year-old would not expect him to carry a week’s plan in his head, and nobody should ask him to. A ten-year-old who loses track of a Thursday deadline is not a broken fourteen-year-old.

The belief is also kind. “Not a self-starter” is gentler than “lazy,” and many parents reach for it for exactly that reason. It says he is made this way, and that it is not his fault.

It is kind to you, too. If it is who he is, then it is not something you failed to give him.

Hold on to the kindness in it. Nothing below asks you to give that up.

There is one thing the belief does, though, that is worth seeing. It closes the question. If starting is a trait, there is nothing to teach. There is only waiting to see whether he grows into it, and holding the plan until he does.

The question worth asking is narrower than “Is he a self-starter?” It is this: what is a self-starter actually doing, and where does it come from?

• • •

What starting is made of

Watch his sister, the one who “just starts,” and slow it down.

Before she picks up the pencil, she has made a small plan: what this is, what done looks like, which part goes first. While she works, she checks. Is this going the way I meant? Is this right? Am I stuck? At the end, she looks back. Did that work? What would I do differently?

Researchers call these three moves planning, monitoring and evaluating. A 2025 review of programs that teach them to young children describes such a learner as one who plans, keeps track of her progress, changes her approach when something is not working, and reflects on what she learned.

For his paragraph, a plan could be one sentence long: *First I'll say who the book is about.* A check could be one glance: *Did I say it?* A look back could be one thought at the end: *The first sentence was the hard part. Next time I'll start there.* None of that is big. All of it is invisible.

Nobody can say for sure where his sister picked up her small plan. Maybe she was born steadier. Maybe she watched you more closely than you knew. Probably some of both.

From across the table, you only see the first move, or its absence. The checking and the looking back you cannot see at all, unless you are the one doing them for him.

"Not a self-starter" is often the name we give a missing plan. That is our reading; no study below measured starting itself, only whether children could be taught to plan, check and look back, and whether their schoolwork improved.

The checking part grows slowly, too. In one small lab study, older teens judged how well they had done more accurately than younger teens, and the ability leveled off going into adulthood. It did not test schoolwork. Still, it raises a question about the page he hands you with "It's fine," when it isn't: is that a flaw in him, or a part that is still growing?

Nor does an early start settle it. When researchers re-ran the famous marshmallow study with a larger, more varied group of children, the link between a preschooler's patience and later achievement was much smaller than first reported. The slow start you have watched in him since he was small is real. Whether it is a verdict is a different question.

You are right that something real is going on at your table. The question is what it is made of, and whether it can be taught.

• • •

Speeches, apps and games

If you have tried to fix this, you have probably tried a speech. Maybe the one about how his brain is like a muscle. Maybe an app that promised to train his focus.

If you gave that speech, you were not wrong to hope. It was a kind thing to say. Both ideas have been tested, though.

Brief growth-mindset programs teach children that ability can grow with effort. A 2023 review pooled the studies of them. In the best-designed studies, those short messages did almost nothing for grades. A national US experiment, in which about 12,500 ninth graders were assigned by chance, did find a small benefit for lower-

achieving teens, and only in schools where classmates' attitudes backed the message. A message about effort, it turns out, is not the same as a plan.

Brain-training has a similar record. Reviews of the studies with children find that the training improves the narrow skill it drills, but the gains do not reliably spread to other skills or to schoolwork.

Programs built to train the mental tools for making a plan, holding a goal in mind and resisting a distraction tell a related story. Summing up that research in a 2016 review, the developmental scientists Adele Diamond and Daphne Ling found that practice did move those tools. But the gains were narrow. They needed steadily harder challenge. And they shrank once practice stopped.

None of that is the paragraph on his table. That leaves a plainer question. Can planning and checking themselves be taught, the way you would teach any other part of schoolwork? And if so, who hands them over?

• • •

His own goal, his own record

Two habits sit inside planning and checking: setting a goal, and keeping track of it.

Think about the goal you hand him now: "Work on your paragraph." It is a whole wall at once.

Does it matter whose goal it is, and how big? We found only a little evidence on children: one small study, worth telling. In a classic 1985 experiment, sixth graders who struggled in math worked through subtraction lessons. Some set their own short-term goal each session. Others were handed comparable goals by an adult. The children who set their own ended up more confident and more skilled at subtraction than the children handed comparable goals. The goals were short-term, for one session, with the end in sight. "The paragraph" is a long goal. "Write one sentence that says who the book is about" is a short one.

Most of the rest of the evidence on goals comes from adults. The goal-setting researchers Edwin Locke and Gary Latham, summing up decades of studies, report that specific, hard goals work better than vague ones like "do your best."

Keeping track has its own evidence. A 2016 review of 138 experiments, almost all with adults working on health goals, found that people prompted to track their progress reached their goals more often, by a small-to-moderate margin. It helped most when they wrote their progress down or reported it to someone.

Put those together, and our reading for a Tuesday is something small: a goal short like the sixth graders' and specific like the adults', written down, and reported to someone. At a kitchen table, that someone would usually be you.

A goal and a record are what a plan is made of. You may already keep both for him, in your head. They are also the kind of thing that can be handed over.

• • •

Handing over the plan

If planning and checking are skills, someone has to show them first. What does showing look like?

One clear public description is guidance for teachers from the Education Endowment Foundation, which sums up school research for schools in England. It uses the same three words, planning, monitoring and evaluating. Its first edition, from 2018, says, in plain words:

- Teach planning, checking and looking back on purpose, as skills in their own right.
- Let children hear the adult think. Say out loud how you plan, how you notice you are stuck and how you check.
- Then hand the work over in stages: guided practice, with the adult alongside; then the child working alone; then a structured look back at how it went.
- As the child takes over, the adult shifts to watching, and steps in only when needed.

The 2025 edition of that guidance, as reported by Norfolk Research School, one of England's research schools, puts adults thinking aloud at the center: saying how they plan, check and fix their own work.

What does thinking aloud sound like at a kitchen table? One illustration, said over his paragraph before he starts: "When I have to write something, I don't start with the whole thing. I ask what the first sentence has to do. This one has to say who the book is about. Then I check: did it?" It takes thirty seconds. It is not a lecture about effort. It is the plan, said out loud, so he can hear that there is one.

This is a teachers' model, used here as an analogy for home. Its shape is the opposite of the room's default described earlier. The adult starts by showing the thinking and guiding the practice. That is holding the plan on purpose, at first. Then, on purpose, the adult gives it away, one piece at a time.

And the first piece handed over is small. Not the whole plan. One goal for one hour. One check halfway. One look back at the end.

In a model like this, a stall means something different. It is information for the adult, not a verdict on the child. It says which piece has not been handed over yet.

Handing it over is not the same as walking away. In this model the adult is still in the room, watching. How much freedom and how much structure a child needs is its own question, taken up in the essay "Learner-Led Doesn't Mean Left Alone."

A model can sound wise and still not work. So the fair question is a plainer one than whether this exact sequence works. When children were actually taught to plan, check and look back, in programs built many different ways, did they do better?

• • •

When children were taught

They did.

In 2025, three researchers pooled 67 studies of preschool and elementary children in programs that taught them skills such as planning, checking their progress and looking back on their learning. The children who were taught did better than children who were not, on measures of managing their own learning and doing their schoolwork, taken together.

What those programs taught was planning, checking and looking back: the same small moves his sister makes without being asked.

Starting isn’t only a trait he was born with.
Part of it is a skill he hasn’t been handed yet.

So the sentence you said in the car was missing one word. He is not a self-starter *yet*: the plan has not been handed to him. Some of what you see at 4:20 may be temperament. Some of it may be the small plan underneath starting, and in school studies, that was something children could be taught.

The first part of the belief still stands. Children differ. His sister may always start faster. Nothing in these studies says differences in temperament disappear. What they say is that the skill moves when it is taught.

The quieter sentence, the one about you, gets the same answer. *Maybe I’m just not organized enough to make him one.* Holding the plan for him was never proof that you failed. In the teachers’ model, the adult shows and guides first, and that is where the handover starts. What changes is the next part: holding the plan out loud, and then giving it away in pieces.

How big was the difference? By our arithmetic, not the authors’, the average taught child did better than about 2 in 3 untaught children right after the programs, on that mix of measures. That is about half a standard deviation, a yardstick for how spread out children’s scores are. Tested again later, the benefit was smaller, small-to-moderate, but still there: better than about 3 in 5. Older reviews of school students point the same way. A 2008 review of 84 school studies concluded that “self-regulated learning can be fostered effectively at both primary

and secondary school level.” A 2018 review of 48 programs measured schoolwork alone and re-tested students after the training had ended; there the advantage had not faded, and students from poorer families benefited most over the long term.

Who did the teaching mattered, in both directions. In the 2008 review, programs run by researchers did better than programs run by regular teachers. In the 2025 review, programs delivered by ordinary teachers, or built into the lesson materials themselves, did better on two measures of how children managed their own learning. No study we found tested a parent. What these studies do show is that it was not only experts who handed this skill over. Ordinary teachers did it too.

• • •

A Monday at your table

Picture a Monday some months on.

It is 4:20 again. The toast is the same.

Before he sits down, you say your own plan out loud while you unload the dishwasher. “Three things before dinner. The phone call is the hard one, so it goes first. I’ll check the list at five.” You feel a little silly saying it. He does not seem to be listening. Then again, last week you heard him mutter “hard one first” over his math, once.

On the table is an index card in his handwriting. It says: *One sentence. Who the book is about. 20 min.* He wrote the goal. All you did was ask two questions: “Which part feels least clear?” and “How will you know that piece is done?”

Halfway, you do not say “Just start.” You ask, “How’s it going against your card?” Sometimes the answer is “Bad.” Then you sit down, write the first line with him, out loud, and get up again.

Not every day goes like that. On Wednesday he stares at the card for ten minutes, and you feel the old sentence rise in your throat. You sit down instead. “Which part feels least clear?” “All of it.” “Then just the first word. Say it out loud.” He does. It is a small start, and it is his.

At the end there are two questions, the same every day. What worked? What will you change tomorrow? His answers are short. Some days they are “Nothing” and “Nothing.” The card goes on the fridge with the others. By Friday there are five, and he can see them. So can you.

On Friday you look back together, standing at the fridge. Which card was easiest? Which goal was too big? He decides Monday’s first card should be smaller. That was his idea. You let it be.

His sister still finishes first. She probably always will.

But the calendar, the alarm clock and the first-step finder are no longer all in your head. Some of it is on a card, in his handwriting. You still check. You check a little less.

That weekend, someone asks how he is doing. You hear yourself say something different. “He’s not a self-starter yet. We’re working on the starting part.”

It sounds like a plan, because it is one.

ABOUT THE WRITER

Who wrote this, and why

My name is George Weber. My wife, Jaclyn, and I have five children, all under eleven.

My second son is Jordy. When he was seven, we sat at the kitchen table after dinner, and I asked him to explain why reading and discussion were so hard. This is a boy who will stand at a workbench for hours without looking up. He taught his little brother and sister to ride a bike, and then to use a screw gun. He builds things I could not build. That night he kept his head down. Twice, all he gave me was “I don’t know.” Then he said it:

> “I’m just not good at school.”

He was not describing a difficulty. He was describing himself.

Here is the part I would rather not say. I had seen it coming for a while. That night I was interrogating a seven-year-old for a reason he did not have, when what he was really carrying was shame. And I kept sending him, because I could not see what else to do.

For years, Jaclyn had told me the truth about the other option. She would not become the entire staff of a school with five children in it, and if we did this, I would have to free at least fifteen hours a week. She was right on both counts, and I could not find the hours. So I know the arithmetic in these essays from the inside.

Before this work, I made more than $4 million building six personal-training studios. I have stepped away from them. I have given the next twenty years to two things: helping parents make the right choice for their own children, whatever that choice turns out to be, and helping lead what I believe is a coming change in how families educate their children.

I am not an academic. The research in these essays belongs to the people named in the sources. My job was to read it carefully and tell you what it says, and what it does not. That is why every essay ends with what it does not claim.

I wrote them for the parent I was that night at the kitchen table.

George Weber

FATHER OF FIVE

READ NEXT

The Opposite of Talking Back Isn’t Silence. It’s a Reason

If the one thing he starts without being asked is an argument

WHAT THIS ARTICLE DOES NOT CLAIM

- Every study of children here ran in schools or labs, from preschool through secondary school; the goal-setting and goal-tracking evidence comes mostly from adults. No study we found tested parents teaching planning, checking and looking back at home. What we suggest for a family is reasoning from those studies, not a result.
- The picture of a classroom that keeps the plan with the adult is our reading of how a room for many children tends to run. No study we found measured how often ordinary classrooms hand children the plan, and every positive study here ran in classrooms.
- The teachers' guidance on handing over the plan (think aloud, guided practice, the child alone, a structured look back) is recommended practice, not a tested sequence. The reviews tested teaching these skills in many different program designs, not that sequence.
- The averages are not promises for any one child. When school programs of all kinds were tested in 141 large, independent trials, the typical effect was much smaller than research averages suggest. That review did not test these programs on their own.
- Whether gains last is mixed. They held in the 2018 review of school students and shrank, while staying positive, in the 2025 review of young children. Only studies that re-tested children later could count.
- The Education Endowment Foundation, as of its 2025 update†, rates teaching these skills in school as high-impact and low-cost. It also notes that many of the studies behind that rating were not independently evaluated, and it calls its findings "best bets" for what might work, not definitive claims.
- Some summaries turn these averages into "months of progress." That is an average effect put through a fixed table, a way to compare approaches, not growth measured in any child. We print no such figure.
- Method detail: the 2025 review's effects were g = 0.48 right after and g = 0.29 later; the percentile arithmetic is ours. Those figures pool measures of how children managed their own learning with measures of schoolwork, and the abstract does not split them, so they are not schoolwork-only effects. In that review, children's belief that they could do the work rose only at the later test. The 2008 review's average (0.69) pools school performance, strategy use and motivation, so it is not a grades figure. The 2018 review's effects were g = 0.50 and 0.63. Goal tracking: d = 0.40.
- These skills matter, but they are not everything. A 2016 review of elementary and secondary students found children's planning-and-checking habits linked to their achievement, but modestly

(r = .20): a link, not a cause.

- The self-set goal finding is one 1985 experiment with sixth graders who had been classified as learning disabled in math. Locke and Latham, from mostly adult evidence, report that goals work whether people set them, set them with someone, or are handed them, so letting a child write his own goal is a choice, not a proven rule. None of the goal or tracking studies here shows that a child who charts his own progress will learn more. The nearest school evidence is about teachers: a 2025 review of 25 studies, 7,379 students, found that teachers checking progress and changing their teaching in response had, overall, “a small positive effect” (g = 0.30). In that review, checking often, at least weekly, was part of what helped, and the effect was stronger when teachers got help acting on the data.
- The lab study of judging your own performance compared people of different ages at one point in time (cross-sectional): 56 people aged 11 to 41, on a visual task. No one under 11 was tested, and the task was not schoolwork.
- The mindset review, the brain-training reviews and the marshmallow study are given without numbers because we could not recheck their figures at the source.
- A 2026 working paper looked from the other direction: it pooled studies of school lessons in reading, language and math and found that children’s executive-function scores rose by a small amount. One reading, ours, is that the skills may grow inside real schoolwork, not only beside it. It is a working paper, not peer reviewed as of 2026†.
- Children really do differ in temperament and self-control. These studies show that the skill moves with teaching, not that the differences go away.
- The Tuesday at 4:20 and the Monday months on are composites.

SOURCES

- Eberhart, J., Schäfer, F., & Bryce, D. (2025). Are metacognition interventions in young children effective? Evidence from a series of meta-analyses. *Metacognition and Learning*, 20, Article 7. Meta-analysis: 67 studies, 349 effect sizes, typically developing preschool and elementary children; g = 0.48 at post-test, 0.29 at follow-up; self-efficacy improved only at follow-up; teacher- or materials-delivered programs beat researcher-delivered ones on two self-regulated-learning outcomes. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11409-024-09405-x ; https://opus.bibliothek.uni-augsburg.de/opus4/frontdoor/index/index/docId/118431 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Dignath, C., & Büttner, G. (2008). Components of fostering self-regulated learning among students: A meta-analysis on intervention studies at primary and secondary school level. *Metacognition and Learning*, 3(3), 231–264. Meta-analysis: 49 primary and 35 secondary studies, 357 effect sizes; average effect 0.69, pooling performance, strategy use and motivation; larger when researchers rather than regular teachers ran the training. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11409-008-9029-x (accessed 2026-10-04)
- de Boer, H., Donker, A. S., Kostons, D. D. N. M., & van der Werf, G. P. C. (2018). Long-term effects of metacognitive strategy instruction on student academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, 24, 98–115. Meta-analysis of 48 interventions with a follow-up test; academic performance g = 0.50 at post-test, 0.63 at follow-up; low-SES students benefited most long term. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1747938X18301374 (accessed 2026-10-04)

- Education Endowment Foundation. Metacognition and self-regulation, Teaching and Learning Toolkit (as of its May 2025 update)†. Review of school studies; rated high impact for very low cost. Paraphrased; no months figure printed. READ LEVEL: publisher page. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit/metacognition-and-self-regulation (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Education Endowment Foundation. Using the Toolkits. Source of “best bets” for what might work; the Toolkits “do not make definitive claims” (quoted in part). READ LEVEL: full text. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/using-the-toolkits (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Education Endowment Foundation (2018). *Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning: Guidance Report* (first edition). Practice guidance for teachers, ages 3–18, England: teach planning, monitoring and evaluating explicitly; model your own thinking; guided practice → independent practice → structured reflection, with the teacher moving to “monitoring and intervening only when necessary.” Paraphrased; recommended practice, not a tested sequence. READ LEVEL: full text. https://d2tic4wvo1iusb.cloudfront.net/production/eef-guidance-reports/metacognition/EEF_Metacognition_and_self-regulated_learning.pdf (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Education Endowment Foundation (2025). *Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning* guidance report, updated edition, as reported by Norfolk Research School, “EEF’s updated guidance on metacognition and self-regulated learning: what’s new and why it matters” (13 Nov 2025). READ LEVEL: secondary report. https://researchschool.org.uk/norfolk/news/eefs-updated-guidance-on-metacognition-and-self-regulated-learning-whats-new-and-why-it-matters (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Diamond, A., & Ling, D. S. (2016). Conclusions about interventions, programs, and approaches for improving executive functions that appear justified and those that, despite much hype, do not. *Developmental Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18, 34–48. Review. READ LEVEL: full text (publisher page). https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1878929315300517 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Weil, L. G., et al. (2013). The development of metacognitive ability in adolescence. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 22(1), 264–271. Cross-sectional lab study, 56 participants aged 11–41, UK, visual task. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1053810013000068 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2016). The relation between self-regulated learning and academic achievement across childhood and adolescence: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 28(3), 425–474. Meta-analysis of correlational studies, elementary and secondary students; metacognitive processes and achievement r = 0.20. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10648-015-9320-8 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Watts, T. W., Duncan, G. J., & Quan, H. (2018). Revisiting the marshmallow test: A conceptual replication investigating links between early delay of gratification and later outcomes. *Psychological Science*. Longitudinal observational study, US children. Used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only (metadata). https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797618761661 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Macnamara, B. N., & Burgoyne, A. P. (2023). Do growth mindset interventions impact students’ academic achievement? A systematic review and meta-analysis with recommendations for best practices. *Psychological Bulletin*, 149(3–4), 133–173. Meta-analysis. Used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000352 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Yeager, D. S., et al. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement. *Nature*, 573, 364–369. Randomized experiment, 12,490 US ninth graders in 65 schools; small grade benefit for lower-achieving students where peer norms aligned with the message. READ LEVEL: publisher page. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-019-1466-y (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Kassai, R., Futó, J., Demetrovics, Z., & Takacs, Z. K. (2019). A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence on the near- and far-transfer effects among children’s executive function skills. *Psychological Bulletin*. Used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only (metadata). https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000180 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Sala, G., & Gobet, F. (2017). Working memory training in typically developing children: A meta-analysis of the available evidence. *Developmental Psychology*. Used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only (metadata). https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000265 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Dietrichson, J., et al. (2026). School-based language, math, and reading interventions for executive functions in children and adolescents: A systematic review. EdWorkingPaper 25-1198, Annenberg Institute. Working paper, not peer reviewed; used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://edworkingpapers.com/ai25-1198 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 265–268. Narrative review by the theory’s authors; evidence mostly from adults. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00449.x (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Schunk, D. H. (1985). Participation in goal setting: Effects on self-efficacy and skills of learning-disabled children. *The Journal of Special Education*, 19(3), 307–317. Small classroom experiment, three conditions, US sixth graders classified as learning disabled in math; sample size not stated in the abstract. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/002246698501900307 (accessed 2026-10-04)

- Harkin, B., et al. (2016). Does monitoring goal progress promote goal attainment? A meta-analysis of the experimental evidence. *Psychological Bulletin*. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000025. Meta-analysis of 138 experiments, N = 19,951, almost all adults with health goals; goal attainment d = 0.40; larger when progress was reported or made public and when physically recorded. READ LEVEL: full text (author accepted manuscript). https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/91437/ (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Fuchs, A., Radkowitsch, A., & Sommerhoff, D. (2025). Using learning progress monitoring to promote academic performance? A meta-analysis of the effectiveness. *Educational Research Review*, 46, 100648. Meta-analysis: 25 studies, 87 effect sizes, 7,379 students; reading, writing, math; “a small positive effect (g = 0.30)”; tests at least weekly. Teacher-run monitoring. READ LEVEL: abstract (publisher/institute page). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2024.100648 (accessed 2026-10-04)
- Lortie-Forgues, H., & Inglis, M. (2019). Rigorous large-scale educational RCTs are often uninformative: Should we be concerned? *Educational Researcher*, 48(3), 158–166. Review of 141 large randomized trials (UK and US, K–12). Used without numbers. READ LEVEL: abstract only. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/0013189X19832850 (accessed 2026-10-04)

- Illustrative composites: the Tuesday at 4:20 in the opening and the Monday some months on.